

**Qualification Title:** New Zealand Certificate in Arts and Design (Level 4)

**Qualification number:** 2627

**Date of review:** 19 March 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 ability to:

- Apply fundamental practical, conceptual and research skills in the production of arts, craft and/or design work.
- Select and apply creative processes, methods and technologies to solve problems in response to a brief.
- Manage projects/briefs under broad guidance, apply standard work practices, and describe potential education and work pathways in arts, craft and/or design.
- Select and present work in context, communicate ideas,

**Tertiary Education Organisations with sufficient evidence**

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

<b>Tertiary Education Organisation</b>	<b>Final rating</b>
Intueri (Design and Arts College New Zealand)	Sufficient
Peter Minturn Goldsmith School	Sufficient
Toi Ohomai	Sufficient
UCOL	Sufficient
Western Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Whitecliffe College of Arts and Design	Sufficient

**Introduction**

The New Zealand Certificate in Arts and Design (Level 4) is a sixty-credit qualification that was first approved in 2015. In 2016 there were 62 graduates from only one provider. In 2017 there were five additional providers and a total of 146 graduates. Two organisations, awarded eighty per cent of the 2017 graduates.

**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 education
- 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

All education organisations provided evidence of the quality of delivery of their approved programme of study leading to the desired graduate outcomes. Evidence of moderation of assessments was also provided to demonstrate that assessment of graduates had been appropriate. Some education organisations were able to provide good information on graduate destinations although others had difficulty getting this information as their programmes had ended not long before this review. A similar situation occurred for feedback from employers and next study providers with some graduates only starting their further study the week prior to the review.

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

All education organisations provided evidence about the quality of the delivery of their approved programme of study. The learning outcomes in the approved programmes are mapped to the graduate outcomes and assessed. Providers often presented examples of student work as evidence that graduates were meeting the graduate profile. In the context of this review this type of evidence is of limited value as it requires the reviewer to make a judgement about the quality of the work. Additionally, there is the expectation that the work presented is representative of the achievement of graduates with little if any evidence to support this. Judgements about the quality of student work are better made by people with expertise in the subject and who view a cross-section of student achievement such as external moderators. However, evidence that assessment of students is robust was variable. For example, one provider has all courses internally moderated and externally moderated annually and has good systems to respond to the moderator's feedback, while others had limited internal moderation and no external moderation.

For some providers, there was insufficient external evidence to validate claims about consistency of graduate outcomes. Some education organisations provided evidence of external appreciation of student work, using projects for industry stakeholders and exhibitions and sale of student work, for example, other providers had similar opportunities, but evidence was not captured.

Most students went onto higher level study rather than related work. Feedback on graduates' preparation for this study was also variable. A common issue with gathering external evidence was that graduates from December 2017 had only just started their higher-level study or entered employment and providers found that there was insufficient time to gather comprehensive evidence.

Overall the available evidence does not make a convincing case for all providers that graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold.

### **Examples of good practice**

Good practice demonstrated by some providers included:

- Comprehensive external moderation of assessment provided confidence that that students were achieving the learning outcomes that contributed to the graduate profile.

- The use of industry based projects with industry feedback to demonstrate the appropriateness of student work and contributing processes.
- Analysis of graduate performance in destination programmes

### **Issues and concerns**

Two providers had graduates in the period covered by this review and have subsequently stopped delivery of the qualification. One of these providers fully participated in the consistency review. However, the other organisation chose to only submit their Self-Assessment Report for the consistency review and did not attend the review meeting or submit a post review reflection. Their limited participation in the review reduced their opportunities to reflect on their evidence and to address gaps.

This consistency review occurred approximately two and a half months after the end of the year in which most providers had their first graduates. This allowed insufficient time to gather meaningful destination data or employer, progressing course or graduate feedback. Many graduates had only started higher level study two weeks before the review meeting.

### **Recommendations to Qualification Developer**

The qualification developer attended the meeting and proposed delaying the qualification review scheduled for July 2018. There was general agreement with this proposal as many providers had only recently started delivery of the programme.

There were no recommendations for the Qualification Developer coming from this review.