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

In a range of rural workplaces and under limited supervision, graduates can -

- Recognise, mitigate and document hazards associated with VMI related primary industry tasks;
- Take responsibility for the safety of self and others in relation to VMI related primary industry tasks;
- Undertake VMI related primary industry tasks in a safe and appropriate manner; and
- Take appropriate action for identified basic maintenance issues, in accordance with workplace protocols.

Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Education Organisation</th>
<th>Final rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ara Institute of Canterbury</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Based Training Limited</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Poutini Polytechnic</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

The 45 credit New Zealand Certificate in Agriculture (Vehicles, Machinery and Infrastructure) (Level 3) (NZ Cert Ag (VMI)) is designed to develop graduates who, under limited supervision will be able to safely carry out a range of activities for the efficient operation of a rural workplace. The range of activities includes the use and maintenance of workplace vehicles, machinery, and infrastructure.

The qualification is for learners from a wide range of rural workplaces, and aims to increase skills and knowledge to enable improved job performance across a range of non-specialised competencies.

Evidence

The tertiary education organisations provided some of evidence, mainly relating to the robustness, alignment and relevance of the programme, to demonstrate that their graduates met the graduate profile outcomes.

The criteria used to judge the evaluation question were:
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- The nature, quality and integrity of the evidence presented by 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.

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

A range of documentation was provided to indicate consistency, including:
- evidence of the rigor and applied nature of the programmes. All programmes had extensive work-experience either on externally owned rural properties, or on institution owned farms;
- assessments undertaken in a real-world context and managed by teaching staff demonstrating the practical and applied nature of the programmes;
- the incorporation of unit standards, purposefully aligned with the graduate profile;
- some graduate destination data;
- employer feedback provided by two of the four institutes, with a third providing next user data from teaching staff teaching graduates of the programme;
- student feedback attesting to the value of the programme, providing positive affirmation of the programme and teaching.

Examples of good practice

All organisations included in the delivery of the programme real-world contexts to provide authentic practice and assessment. This is particularly relevant for achieving the graduate outcomes, and demonstrating that the consistency threshold has been met.

Issues and concerns

There were gaps in the evidence provided by all institutions. Overall, there was a focus on the structure and the practical nature of the programme, and a lack of emphasis on the graduate. Graduate and employer feedback that aligns with the graduate profile would greatly strengthen evidence of consistency.

While many documents were provided, it was evident that there had been limited analysis, interpretation and use of understandings gained from the data. This process is critical to reflection, self-assessment and evaluation of graduates’ skills, abilities and attributes against the graduate outcomes.

Overall the evidence made an adequate case to demonstrate that the graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

While there were no specific recommendations for the qualification developer, all organisation represented indicated a desire to be part of the review of this qualification. Their interest was in the narrowness of focus and the need for students to undertake another level 3 programme in order to gain sufficient skill to enter the industry. The potential for combining current qualifications to create a one-year comprehensive programme was briefly discussed.