

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Primary Products Food Processing (Level 3) with an elective strand in Product Quality Implementation

Qualification number: 2917

Date of review: 05 March 2021

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to: **31 December 2020**

Final decision on consistency of the qualification: National consistency is confirmed

Threshold:

The threshold to determine sufficiency with the graduate profile of the core qualification was determined as evidence of graduates who, working under limited supervision, will be able to:

- Apply knowledge of legislation to comply with workplace safety, environmental and quality assurance requirements at a primary products food processing operation.
- Work in a team in a primary products food processing operation.

Additionally, the threshold to determine sufficiency with the graduate profile of the Product Quality Implementation elective strand was determined as evidence of graduates who, under limited supervision, will be able to:

- Carry out product quality implementation check operations in a primary products food processing operation.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
6019	Waikato Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient

Introduction

The New Zealand Certificate in Primary Products Food Processing (Level 3) is a 40-credit qualification intended for new entrants to the primary products food processing industry. Through this qualification the industry is able to further the establishment of standards of basic technical performance for specific primary products food processing operations, which provide domestic and international markets with confidence in a quality range of primary food products.

The qualification is stranded to recognise the specific skills and knowledge required to work in either laboratory operations, environmental systems, or product quality implementation.

Graduates will be capable of working under limited supervision with responsibility for work outcomes.

There was one education organisation with graduates, who had a representative participating in a videoconference consistency review meeting. Primary ITO is the qualification developer, and a representative took part in the videoconference. The qualification was approved in 2015 and has been reviewed in 2020. Primary ITO indicated that the revised qualification has been approved, but not yet listed.

Final Consistency Review Report

The provider participating delivered the qualification in 2017 and 2018 to students already working in the primary food processing industry, in particular dairy processing and manufacturing, using a blended learning and block course format. The provider ceased delivering the programme after 2018 because its main client, which employed the majority of students, elected to offer its own “in-house” training.

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.

Evidence provided included:

- Confirmation that the education organisation had a coherent programme of study which ensured that programme components led to the graduate profile.
- Evidence of internal moderation to assure that the programmes were assessed at an appropriate level.
- Destination data and records of feedback from a small number of graduates, confirming that the programme had provided graduates with a range of skills appropriate to an entry level role in the primary products food processing industry.
- Student completion data and next-level tutor feedback for those graduates who progressed to higher level study.

How well does the self-assessment and supporting evidence provided by the education organisation demonstrate that their graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold?

The education organisation submitted a range of evidence that could be triangulated to demonstrate that their graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold. This included assessment and moderation evidence; programme to GPO alignment; graduate feedback; and destination data.

The education organisation provided good evidence related to the alignment of their approved programme of study with the GPOs, and of the quality and suitability of the programmes and assessments in terms of supporting graduate consistency with the graduate outcome. The education organisation provided evidence that their programme provided opportunities for a capstone assessment within realistic contexts aligned to the qualification.

Evidence relating to moderation was marginal, demonstrating sound internal moderation processes but no evidence of external moderation.

Graduate surveys confirmed that graduates had gained, and were using, the skills and knowledge and valued the programme. However, response rates to surveys were low. Destination data regarding success at next-level study however, provided a strong case for consistency.

Final Consistency Review Report

Overall, the self-assessment and supporting evidence supplied, by the organisation found sufficient, demonstrates that their graduates meet the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

Special Focus (includes special focus on a strand or outcome)

None

Examples of good practice

The evidence that was provided by the education organisation, was well-organised and relevant.

Issues and concerns

The education organisation had delayed actively seeking feedback and engagement with graduates and graduate employers until the Consistency Review date approached, leading to difficulty contacting employers and limited value from the feedback they provided. Engagement with graduates, and graduate employers, should not be left until the next Consistency Review but rather be done as a part of normal business each year and then used to inform ongoing improvements to programme design and delivery.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

None