Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Hospitality (Level 2)

Qualification number: 2108

Date of review: 20 and 21 November 2017

Final decision on consistency of the qualification: *National Consistency Confirmed*

Threshold:

The threshold to determine sufficiency with the graduate profile was determined as evidence of the graduate, under supervision, being able to:

- Understand, follow and apply basic health and safety requirements for the hospitality industry.
- Apply appropriate basic skills for entry level role(s) in the hospitality industry.
- Demonstrate basic communication, teamwork, problem solving and self-management skills for entry level role(s) in the hospitality industry.

Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

Tertiary Education Organisation	Final rating
Ara Institute of Canterbury	Sufficient
Avonmore Tertiary Institute	Sufficient
Community Colleges New Zealand	Sufficient
Eastern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Education Action Limited	Sufficient
EmployNZ	Sufficient
Front-line Training Consultancy	Sufficient
Horowhenua Learning Centre Trust	Sufficient
Intueri Education New Zealand Limited	Sufficient
MSL Training Limited	Sufficient
Nelson Training Centre	Sufficient
New Zealand School of Tourism Limited	Sufficient
Otago Polytechnic	Sufficient
People Potential Limited	Sufficient
Regent Training Centre Limited	Sufficient
Service IQ	Sufficient
Target Training Centre Limited	Sufficient
Trade and Commerce Centre Limited	Sufficient
VisionWest Community Trust	Sufficient
Wellington Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Whitireia Community Polytechnic	Sufficient
Workforce Development	Sufficient

Introduction

This level 2, 40 credit qualification aims to provide a pre-employment qualification for those who want to enter a range of basic positions in the hospitality industry. This qualification was developed in 2013 by Service IQ, the industry training organisation for a range of service industry qualifications.

At the end of the timeframe selected for this review there were 23 tertiary education organisations who had graduates from 2014 through to the end of 2016 with 1,555 graduates awarded the qualification. Graduates had been trained and assessed in the workplace or in a 'real world' hospitality environment (café, hotel front office and laundry or community hospitality events). Some workplace work was run within the education organisation itself.

Consistency review meetings were held in Wellington and Auckland on consecutive days. A representative of the ServiceIQ also attended the review meeting as the qualification developer.

Version 1 of the qualification was initially republished in August 2015 to include recommended standards for the qualification outcomes and then republished again on 25 February 2015 to update the evidence requirements for assuring consistency.

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 by most of the education organisations before (and after) the review includes mapping of their programmes to the graduate outcomes and unit standards/modules, their own internal reviews, graduate skills test assessments, a small number of capstone events, graduate destination data collection, graduate and employer feedback surveys, industry engagement, internal and (very few) external moderation outcomes. All organisations included significant real-world delivery, assessment and workplace contexts to provide authentic practice and assessment in the delivery of the programme. Some organisations needed to better track their graduates and a significant number needed to initiate involvement in external moderation of this programme to assure the validity of outcomes.

Many providers noted that this qualification doesn't always lead to employment in industry as it is a foundation programme and graduates are more likely to go on to a next level programme.

Sufficient evidence provided by most of the education organisations attests to the fitness for purpose of the programme and gives confidence that successful completion should result in the achievement of the graduate outcomes.

Key evidence presented for the review included:

Programme integrity and Graduate Profile Outcome mapping related evidence:
Clear mapping of the unit standards and the programme learning outline to the graduate profile outcomes was evident. Many education organisations provided descriptions of the programme delivery context, assessments methods and pre (some post) moderation outcomes assuring the validity of the outcomes.

Real World Evidence:
Organisations provided a wide range of 'Real World' evidence that appropriate basic skills training occurred and was assessed in real-world type environment, using equipment commonly found in the industry. Evidence included videos, photos of students in uniform in industry or in mock 'real' situations and at community events. Evidence was presented of assessment checklists, tutor observation sheets and attestations from employers and event organiser regarding student participation and work experience feedback (some linked to the graduate profile outcomes). Most evidence provided was directly linked to the graduate profile outcomes and represented the overall graduate group.   A few education organisations were not able to provide real ('industry') experience but it was evident that the 'mock' experiences offered were as life-like as possible.

Internal and External Moderation:
Some provided a few samples of moderated assessment and others provided moderation plans and policies. A few provided a detailed table showing the internal and external moderation schedule, a record of the results and follow up actions taken, and moderation coverage across campuses, and a few had mapped assessment and moderation activities against the graduate profile outcomes.
All organisations undertook internal pre-moderation for both the unit standard based and module based programmes. Not all undertook external post moderation. Internal post moderation was evidenced in some cases. This process does, to some extent; show good assessments are being undertaken in a real-world context. A significant proportion of organisations have not taken part in any external moderation due in the most part to the industry training organisation (ITO) not requesting the units used in this qualification for external moderation. Some, but not all, of those using a component approach and a small number using unit standards have taken part in external moderation whereby results were clearly reported and the standards were generally met or required minor modification. Moderation is relevant evidence that the assessment, of the graduates matching graduate profile outcomes, was valid and reliable. The quality of education organisation submissions in this area varied considerably and additional evidence was requested from those that had serious gaps. An outcome from the review meetings was that all the education organisations offering this qualification would ensure external moderation occurred for the 2017 year either with the ITO or another external agency.

Destination data was supplied from all education organisations; (some more formally obtained than others), confirming that graduates have either moved onto a higher level of hospitality qualification or continue to work or be involved in hospitality service. This shows that graduates are able to successfully meet the graduate profile especially around being able to apply basic health and safety and hospitality skills.

Student and graduate feedback:

This feedback confirms the value of the learning (students), and the effectiveness of the competencies in real-work contexts (graduates). The usefulness of this feedback was variable and depended on the level of engagement the organisations had with industry stakeholders. Where the feedback sought had been aligned to the graduate outcomes or purpose of the qualification, the feedback had value in providing evidence of consistency of outcomes. Course satisfaction surveys had little value as consistency review evidence.

Employer Feedback and customer surveys (or graduates):
Employer feedback – via surveys and attestation: Those employers surveyed confirmed the skills and knowledge gained by graduates after completing the qualification was as expected or higher.

Work experience employer surveys and customer surveys (of students):
As with Graduate feedback, the usefulness of this feedback was variable and depended on the level of engagement the organisations had with industry stakeholders. Employer/work experience feedback states that graduates are working at a greater level and that the graduate understanding of health and safety and basic hospitality skills is now greater than at the start of the qualification. For several providers, it was an affirmation of the quality of provision with no significant check of graduate outcomes being met although the feedback usually contained some reference to skills and ability.

Self-Assessment: The self-assessment and consequent (post review meeting) self-review documents sent in reflect mostly on the outcomes of analysis and confirm the statements made above concluding that consistency has been achieved. The self-review documents were revealing in the fact that the consistency meeting had significant impact on the understanding around what constituted good self-review and good evidence and as a result some good evidence was sent in following the meeting.

How well does the evidence provided by the education organisation demonstrate that its graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold?
The review meeting did identify what evidence would be required to ensure that organisations could demonstrate that their graduates met the graduate outcomes at the appropriate level. Key components identified were programme strengths, end user feedback (employer, pathway tutors, and graduates), evidence of robust internal moderation and the notion of external moderation being planned quickly, industry feedback on training and graduates and multiple sources of data to ensure triangulation. Programme review documentation was noted as giving good evidence of graduate outcomes as many reviews encompassed other qualifications. Those cases clearly demonstrating the graduates match the graduate profile outcomes at the appropriate threshold had well-organised self-review documents, clearly referencing each graduate outcome or claim with clear evidence that included programme, pathway/next user and stakeholder feedback evidence.
Overall this evidence makes this a convincing case to demonstrate that the graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Examples of good practice
Using a *Google Forms* survey via Facebook where there was a good response rate from graduates.
One education organisation asked the workplace to rate student performance against each graduate profile outcome using a numbered rating scale. This provided good evidence around whether the cohort had matched the graduate outcomes.

One education organisation uses composite classes for learning opportunities to maximise the various talents of training staff.

Issues and concerns
External post moderation within this qualification is necessary to assess the validity and consistency of assessment and achievement outcomes across the sector.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer
Ensure unit standards within the level 2 qualification are chosen each year by the ITO for moderation to ensure external moderation occurs each year.