

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Agriculture (Farming Systems) (Level 3)

Qualification number: 2220

Date of review: 16 April 2018

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: Graduates working under supervision and regular direction within pastoral farming systems, will be able to:

- apply theoretical knowledge of farming inputs and sustainable practices
- use technology
- assess and minimise risks to self, others and equipment
- assist with key livestock production tasks.

Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

Final decision on sufficiency of education organisations evidence, will be updated as other organisations show sufficient evidence

Tertiary Education Organisation	Final rating
Taratahi Agricultural Training Centre	Sufficient
National Trade Academy Limited	Sufficient
Te Runanga-o-Turanganui-a-Kiwa	Sufficient
Northland Polytechnic	Sufficient
AG Challenge Limited	Sufficient
Universal College of Learning (UCOL)	Sufficient
Eastern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Otago Polytechnic	Sufficient
Ara Institute of Canterbury	Sufficient
Land Based Training Limited	Sufficient
Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology	Sufficient

Introduction

The purpose of this 85-credit level 3 qualification is to provide the pastoral farming sector with graduates who have a broad theoretical understanding of New Zealand pastoral farming systems and practical capability in the pastoral farming sector. Eleven tertiary education organisations who had qualification graduates, participated in the consistency review process. The Primary ITO participated as the qualification developer.

Evidence

The education organisation 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.

Programme related evidence:

- Programme outlines presenting the five graduate profile outcomes mapped against the programme learning outcomes and a brief description of the assessments undertaken (many organisations used NZQA all unit standards).
- Evidence demonstrating that students were taught and assessed in the real-world environment on an operating farm. Examples included documents describing the key assessment tasks and the required on-job durations. These could be individual learning plans, student diaries and work experience workbooks which verifiers or tutors sign off that the students have completed the required tasks.
- A record of moderation activity and results. A few providers presented a clear moderation schedule showing coverage of the units/modules mapped against the graduate profile outcome. Few organisations provided moderation evidence that show coverage of the key delivery sites (Similarly, few organisations provided consistency review evidence that was clearly representative of the key delivery sites, or evidence such as such as employer or graduate feedback or destination outcomes).
- A few organisations used capstone assessment events where students were required to demonstrate the capability in a formal context.

Stakeholder feedback evidence:

- Feedback came from the key stakeholders including graduates, tutors, work placement, employers, tutors of a related or higher-level programme. Some feedback came from phone interviews and others from paper-based or online surveys. Some feedback was directly related to the graduate profile outcome and others less so. In some cases, stakeholders rated to what extent the graduate had demonstrated the graduate profile outcome. Some provided the response rates, that is what proportion of the total stakeholders provided feedback. A few organisations calculated the average ratings across the graduate cohort and one or two clearly triangulated the feedback about the graduate's competency from different stakeholder viewpoints.

Destinational evidence:

- Tertiary education organisations generally provided varying levels of detail about the destination of the graduates. However, after the consistency review meeting most supplied the name of the employer and the graduate's workplace role and/or the name of the subsequent programme in which graduates had enrolled and the name of the organisation delivering the programme. Some showed from which campus the graduate came.

A few organisations provided convincingly argued submissions which provided a clear case that their graduates match the graduate profile outcome at the appropriate threshold. Sometimes

organisations did not clearly reference the evidence that supported the clear and relevant claims being made in the submission.

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

The participating tertiary education organisations provided a range of programme, feedback and destination-related evidence that demonstrated to varying degrees that the graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold. The key programme-related evidence demonstrated that the graduates had for some specified duration, learnt and applied the required graduate profile knowledge, skills and attributes in the real-world of an operating farm. The key evidence was programme outlines, verification of on-farm activities and moderation confirming there was sound and appropriate assessment of the graduate's capability. Formal and informal feedback was gathered from key stakeholders that the graduate was consistently demonstrating the graduate profile outcomes in a real-world environment. The feedback came from graduates, tutors, work placements, employers and tutors of subsequent programmes in which the graduates had enrolled. The consistency review meeting agreed that these level 3 graduates need to be 'under supervision' and 'regular direction' in their workplace environment. Many of the graduates have either gone onto work in the pastoral farming sector or progress onto industry related programmes.

A few organisations met the criteria with their initial written submission. Most organisations, after participating in the consistency review meeting, needed to provide additional evidence. Generally, this enabled their submission to meet the criteria for 'sufficiency'. Typically, they needed more specific and verifiable evidence of the graduate's real-world experience, additional information about the moderation activities and results, and further details about the employment and further training destinations of the graduates. Most organisations also needed to develop action plans which would strengthen their consistency review processes to provide better quality evidence at the next review. A few organisations had gaps in their evidence and processes, however none of these gaps were serious. Therefore, these organisations were required to provide clear and specific verifiable action plans, which effectively addressed the gaps and enable them to meet the criteria for 'sufficiency'. Overall, despite this variability, the evidence (and justification) provided was sufficient to demonstrate that the graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Examples of good practice

One organisation provided a table which feedback from various stakeholders (graduates, employers, work placements) which was descriptive and a rating of how well the graduate matched the graduate profile outcomes. This table enabled the organisation to compare and analyse the similarities and differences of these different viewpoints. It provided highly triangulated feedback about the capabilities of the graduates.

One organisation provided (in their initial submission), a clear analysis of the gaps and weaknesses in some of their consistency review evidence. A specific and detailed action plan was provided to improve the quality of their future consistency review evidence. This enabled the organisation to clearly meet the 'sufficiency' criteria.

Issues and concerns

Two organisations no longer deliver the programme. Changes were recommended to the organisations that would be required if they were to continue to offer this programme.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

There was no specific recommendation to the qualification developer. However, the meeting did add one clarifying phrase to the threshold statement based on their real-world experience. It was not uncommon that farmers had expectations of the graduates beyond the attributes outlined in the qualification. The generic statement that the graduate will be 'under limited supervision' partly addresses this issue. However, the meeting agreed that a graduate of this Level 3 qualification should be 'under regular direction'. This phrase was added to the threshold statement.