

Te Ingoa o te Tohu | Qualification Title: Te Pōkaitahi Reo (Rumaki, Reo Rua)
(Te Kaupae 2)

Te nama o te tohu | Qualification number: 3044

Te rā o te wānanga | Date of review: 24 August 2020

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification from: 1 January 2016 -
31 December 2019

Te whakataunga whakamutunga | Final decision on consistency of the qualification:
National consistency is confirmed

Te pae | Threshold:

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

Graduates have the language skills required to communicate with little support, in familiar everyday contexts, and in Māori environments where they feel comfortable. Graduates are able to use their foundation level te reo skills as expression of mana tangata, mana whenua, mana reo, and mana ao tūroa.

Ko ngā Wānanga, ngā Whare Ako rānei nā rātou anō i eke | Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE No.	Education Organisation	Final rating
6025	Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6014	Whitireia Community Polytechnic Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6007	Eastern Institute of Technology Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
8630	Te Wānanga o Aotearoa	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6017	Western Institute of Technology Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6015	Southern Institute of Technology Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6012	Northland Polytechnic Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6010	Manukau Institute of Technology Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi
6011	Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology Ltd	He Pounamu Kahurangi

Hei Tīmatanga | Introduction

Te Pōkaitahi Reo (Kaupae 2) is a 60-credit qualification designed for learners who want to gain language foundation level in te reo Māori skills that support their desire to contribute positively to the development of te reo or to fulfil a personal or professional interest.

There were ten educational organisations with approximately 9132 graduates between 2017 and 2019. Representatives from each organisation, with graduates, participated in the virtual consistency review meeting over two days. NZQA is the qualification developer and two representatives took part in the review meetings. The qualification is due for review in 2021.

Te paearu arotake | Evaluative criteria

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.

He kōrero taunakitanga | Evidence provided

The education organisations provided a range of programme evidence including evidence of internal and external moderation, moderation plans and policies; and programme maps showing the alignment between graduate profile outcomes (GPO) of the qualification and learning outcomes. In some cases, the GPOs were also mapped to assessments. Other documentation included programme approval documentation, annual programme review documentation, examples of assessments and enrolment and achievement data. This information is useful if it can be clearly linked to the organisations justification of GPOs being met in their self-reflection document. If this is not demonstrated, then organisations need to consider the value and purpose of submitting such documentation.

Some providers also made clear connections between their kaupapa and/or values as an organisation; ngā kaupapa o Te Hono o Te Kahurangi and the mātāpono within the qualification. While this in itself does not demonstrate consistency of graduate outcomes it does clearly indicate purposeful alignment which is valued in the context of a Te Hono o Te Kahurangi consistency review.

Evidence of feedback was also submitted from graduates, employers, next level tutors, and in some cases community stakeholders attesting to graduates meeting the graduate profiles outcomes in a range of contexts (whānau, marae, community and workplaces).

Te pātai arotake | The evaluative question

Mā te āta whakaputa i te kaupapa, me pēhea e tutuki pai ai te whakairinga kōrero me ngā taunaki a te whare ako e taurite anō ai te taumata tika o ngā whāinga putanga taurira, ki ōna anō putanga taurira?

Programme and graduate evidence were generally analysed and presented well in the self-reflection reports for those providers who were sufficient.

Moderation of assessment was variable across the organisations particularly external moderation. Some providers conducted external moderation since their programmes were offered to assure themselves of quality assessment and assessment practice. While most of the providers submitting samples and a moderation schedule it would be more useful to provide a summary of moderation activity (aligned to learning outcomes or GPOs) that has been completed including results and actions to be undertaken would be more useful to submit as evidence in addition to a small sample of individual moderation reports.

The amount of graduate feedback overall was minimal, and feedback gathered varied by organisation. One provider submitted no graduate feedback. This is a lost opportunity to not only demonstrate consistency of graduate outcomes but also to ensure the integrity of the programme and therefore the qualification for an important kaupapa, te reo Māori. Ideally

Final Wānanga Whakataurite Report

organisations should set internal benchmarks (or criteria) for what is considered a good graduate response rate in order to determine what can be justified, or not, as a reasonable and representative sample of graduates from which the organisation can draw valid conclusions about consistency.

Feedback was mostly gathered through online surveys, although one provider held a graduate focus group supported by follow up phone calls. There was good understanding of the survey data, the gaps and areas to improve. However, analysis of the information could be strengthened by:

- Analysing data across the GPOs to identify areas of strength and weakness and what this means for programme improvement
- Inquiring into areas where graduates felt they did not meet the GPOs to understand why and where the provider can strengthen the programme
- Analysing graduate outcomes across priority groups, by year, by locations and by delivery methods
- Analysing the data against the context in which the graduate is using their reo.

Destination evidence was also less convincing. There were weaknesses in the evidence across all providers (e.g. sufficient breadth and depth of feedback from employers, community stakeholders and next-level tutors). For those organisations where graduates have re-enrolled on higher level programmes it would be useful to demonstrate not only progression on to a relevant educational pathway but also whether the graduate has achieved success on a higher-level programme. Next level tutor feedback was also low despite many graduates continuing on to further education in the same organisation.

In this qualification, context is important as many graduates are enrolling in te reo for personal development reasons (in the home) and/or to contribute to whānau, hapū, marae and iwi. Understanding to what extent graduates are being able to demonstrate the GPOs in these contexts is important. However, more often than not feedback was sought from employers who could not reasonably make a judgement on how well each GPO was being met.

Stakeholder testimony about the success of graduates and the value of the programme is useful evidence if the provider can outline in its self-reflection report how the feedback aligns to the GPOs and why it provides justification of consistency.

Organisations with larger numbers of graduates need to strengthen their graduate tracking systems in order to provide assurance that the qualification is enabling graduates to follow pathways intended by the programme/qualification. Those education organisations who were not sufficient were more likely to have not submitted relevant evidence or there were significant gaps in evidence, or their analysis of the evidence was not convincing.

Ngā take | Issues

None

Ngā taunakitanga ki te Kaiwhakawhanake Tohu | Recommendations to Qualification Developer

None