Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Business (Introduction to Team Leadership) (Level 3)

Qualification number: 2453

Date of review: 15,16 and 17 April 2019

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to: **31 December 2018**

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:

The graduate having the skills and knowledge to be effective in a team leadership role and to contribute to effective team performance.

This will incorporate the skills identified in the graduate profile of the qualification.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

Education Organisation	Final rating
People Potential	Sufficient
Te Wānanga o Aotearoa	Sufficient
Northland Polytechnic	Sufficient
Skills Organisation	Sufficient
The Learning Wave	Sufficient
Service IQ	Sufficient
Edvance Limited	Sufficient
Competenz	Sufficient
Leadership Management Australasia (NZ) Limited	Sufficient
Primary ITO	Sufficient
Cornerstone Education Group (Aspire 2)	Sufficient
Universal College of Learning (TANZ) Eastern Institute of Technology (TANZ) Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology (TANZ) Otago Polytechnic (TANZ) Northland Polytechnic (TANZ)	Sufficient

Final consistency review report

Introduction

The purpose of this 48-credit, level 3 qualification, is to provide Aotearoa New Zealand with people who have the potential to be appointed to team leadership roles or who have recently become a team leader. This qualification will provide New Zealand business entities with people who have the skills and knowledge to contribute to effective team performance and the potential to be effective in a leadership role within a team.

Graduates of this qualification will benefit New Zealand business entities by contributing effectively to team objectives and by developing their team leadership skills. They will be able to contribute effectively to an operational team in a bi- and multi-cultural environment.

The qualification was developed by NZQA National Qualification Services.

Consistency review meetings were held in Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington on consecutive days. Twelve organisations presented participated in the meeting.

In addition to the Education Organisations, the consistency review was attended by; a representative from NZQA as the Qualification Developer and observers from Waikato Institute of Technology, Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology and Skills Active Aotearoa Limited. These providers have a programme leading to this qualification but no graduates.

An observer from NZQA Monitoring and Assessment, attended the Wellington review as part of professional development.

NZQA is the qualification developer and a representative attended the consistency meeting. The representative was involved in the development of the qualification and is actively engaging with business stakeholders planning for an upcoming review of the business qualifications. The representative brought a focus to this consistency review, reflecting the views of business stakeholders: Education organisations needed to ensure their programmes met the conditions for programme context, that the: *"Programme design and delivery, and all assessment, will be conducted in the context of a real or realistic business entity, and in light of the requirements of that context. Programmes leading to award of this qualification must identify the context and must justify the allocation of credits to graduate profile outcomes within the programme, in light of the requirements of the context."*

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

The following types of data were provided:

- Graduate feedback

- Graduate destination data
- Employer feedback
- Programme related evidence
- Moderation of assessment - Internal and external results

In most presentations there was a heavy emphasis on on-job assessment, not only from the Industry Training Organisations but also from most of the Private Training Establishments. The real/realistic condition appears to be consistency meet by most organisations.

Programme related evidence, most submissions provided some evidence of the context in which the programme was delivered and assessed. All organisations delivered the programme through four courses and provided evidence of mapped learning outcomes and course content to the graduate profile. Some also mapped the graduate outcomes to relevant assessments and evidence of quality processes that ensure effective programme delivery. The qualification conditions for programme structure and context, created a good source of discussion and most providers addressed this in their presentations.

Moderation of assessments, in particular external moderation, was a weakness identified across several education institutes. This is of some concern given the achievement-based standards used to assess within the programme. The evidence of effective and robust internal moderation occurring systematically within education organisations was variable; this is disappointing considering moderation is a foundational academic quality assurance activity.

Graduate feedback provided an opportunity for all education institutes to provide strong evidence that their graduates matched the graduate profile outcomes at the appropriate threshold. However, many did not take full advantage of this opportunity. Although all education organisations conducted graduate surveys the response rate for some was low bringing into question the validity of conclusions and findings.

Almost exclusively the graduate outcomes were transposed into survey questions. It was recognised by education organisations that using the outcomes within the survey was useful for education organisations to map evidence for purposes of gathering evidence. However, the language and interpretation of the questions by graduates and employers may have varied and therefore not yielded responses that accurately reflected the outcomes as intended.

Graduate destination data was limited. The few education providers who gathered and explored this highly relevant evidence were better positioned to convincingly establish and demonstrate the outcome. Most education organisations did little more than identify if graduates were employed. This evidence in itself carried little weight as not all education organisations could confirm the numbers already employed at enrolment.

Employer feedback gathered mostly matched the graduate outcomes and the graduate survey for comparison. A few education providers were able to do this well. Most organisations did not know how many employers had graduates and therefore the response rate and relevance of the findings is less convincing.

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

Through the combination of evidence many education organisations at the consistency review and in the subsequent submission and self-review, demonstrated effectively that their graduates matched the graduate profile outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

Some education organisations had a strong focus on the programme, a low number of graduate responses to surveys or the graduate feedback did not validate the skills and knowledge for graduates at Level 3 had been attained, and with little or no internal and/or external moderation in place it was therefore not possible to establish sufficiency of evidence for those providers.

For some of the education organisations it was unclear from the presentations that the programme being described matched the actual qualification outcomes and that real or realistic assessment was taking place as described in the conditions of the qualification.

Examples of good practice

Some education organisations provided evidence that graduates are transitioning, as the qualification intended, onto further study and, for those already employed the evidence demonstrated the skills and knowledge gained contributed to increased responsibility or promotion.

Some providers ensured graduates were prepared and understood survey questions which reflected the graduate outcomes, to ensure graduates able to adequately respond to survey questions.

Almost all education organisations identified in the initial self-assessment or at the presentation, areas for improvement indicating an awareness of the need for continuous improvement. One of the areas discussed was ways to present qualitative evidence of student and employer stories in a more structured method.

Issues and concerns

Little analysis of data collected was evident. Where analysis had occurred few education, organisations demonstrated use of those findings. Generally little analysis of the data occurred and mostly providers anticipated the stated finding, usually in a percentage, and noted it was sufficient to indicate the extent that graduates considered they met the graduate outcomes.

Meeting the real or realistic condition outlined in the qualification (see introduction); through on-job assessment was demonstrated by a number of education organisations. This was a challenge for providers delivering the programme online. Some education organisations had used case studies of real businesses or hypothetical cases and explained how they would manage the scenarios. In many cases changes are required to meet the conditions of the qualification.

Some of providers have not engaged in external post moderation to validate the quality of assessment. This is considered a fundamental quality and academic process that needs to be systematically and robustly undertaken.

To enable effective analysis and review education organisations, might consider how to gather quality responses and not have a 'middle mark i.e. a 'Not so Confident' rating to ensure there is no too positive or too negative inclination of results during analysis.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

Providers recognised the value of the qualification to pathway both to further study and in employment, exactly as is intended.

An area for the qualification developer to follow up pertained to the 'real or realistic' condition within the qualification. Most education organisations demonstrated how this condition is met through on-job assessment. However, for some of the education organisations presenting, it was unclear that the programme being described matches the actual qualification outcomes.