

Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Automotive Engineering (Level 3)

Qualification number: 3097

Date of review: 14 September 2020

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to: **31 December 2019**

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 graduates who, under limited supervision, can:

- Follow workplace policies, procedures and relevant regulations to work safely and effectively in an automotive workshop.
- Use tools and equipment to complete basic workshop engineering tasks.
- Apply fundamental automotive engineering knowledge to service engine, and driveline systems.
- Check operation of, and perform minor repairs on, electrical and electronic systems
- Apply fundamental automotive engineering knowledge to service steering, suspension and brake systems.

Education Organisations with sufficient evidence

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

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
6004	Unitec Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6006	Ara Institute of Canterbury Ltd	Sufficient
6007	Eastern Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6008	Wellington Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6009	Universal College of Learning Ltd	Sufficient
6010	Manukau Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6011	Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6012	Northland Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6013	Otago Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6014	Whitireia Community Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6015	Fairview Education Services Ltd	Sufficient
6015	Southern Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6017	Western Institute of Technology at Taranaki Ltd	Sufficient
6019	Waikato Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
6024	Tai Poutini Polytechnic Ltd	Sufficient
6025	Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology Ltd	Sufficient
8465	Endeavour Technical Training Ltd	Sufficient
9013	Motor Industry Training Organisation (T/A MITO)	Sufficient

Final Consistency Review Report

MOE Number	Education Organisation	Final rating
9328	Skills Update Training and Education Group	Sufficient
9656	Nelson Technical Institute Ltd	Sufficient

Introduction

This Level 3 qualification of 120 credits is intended for learners who are beginning a career in the automotive industry and seeking to work in an entry level position in the automotive industry.

Holders of this qualification will have the skills to service general automotive systems, under limited supervision.

This qualification replaced the National Certificate in Motor Industry (Foundation Skills) (Level 1) [Ref:1222], the National Certificate in Motor Industry (Entry skills) (Level 2) with strands in Automotive Electrical and Mechanical, and Collision repair [Ref:1252] and the National Certificate in Motor Industry (Vehicle Servicing) with strands in Brake and Clutch, Exhaust Systems, Radiator Repair, Steering and Suspension, Tyres, Underbody and general Service, and Vehicle Security, and with an optional strand in Heavy Vehicle [Ref:1420].

The last date for assessment against the replaced qualifications was 31 December 2019.

This qualification can lead to Level 4 qualifications in automotive engineering.

MITO New Zealand Incorporated is the qualification developer, and representatives attended the review meetings via zoom.

21 education organisations presented at the review. One organisation with a small number of graduates (less than 5) submitted a self-assessment report and supporting evidence but did not make a presentation.

There were 1687 graduates reported for this qualification.

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.

Evidence provided for this review included:

- Confirmation that the education organisation had a coherent programme of study, including theoretical and practical programme components that led to the successful achievement of the graduate profile outcomes.
- Employer and in some cases, next-level tutor surveys which confirmed that graduates had gained, and were using, the skills and knowledge outlined in the graduate profile.

Final Consistency Review Report

- Graduate surveys that triangulated the evidence gathered in the employer and next user surveys above.
- Confirmation that industry stakeholders were involved with, and contributed to, moderation of assessments and monitoring to ensure changes in industry practice are incorporated into training requirements.

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

Education organisations submitted a range of evidence that could be triangulated to demonstrate that graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold. This included assessment and moderation evidence, programme alignment, graduate, employer and next-level tutor feedback, and destination data.

Evidence relating to moderation was mostly well presented, with sound internal and external moderation processes. Strong performers either described or provided evidence of reflection on the moderation process, with subsequent changes made and improvements in delivery. Some education organisations were yet to formalise alternative external moderation partners but were able to describe and provide evidence of plans towards implementation.

All education organisations could provide evidence that they had practical components within the programme and had suitable resources for graduates to be assessed against the graduate outcomes. There were some comments from graduates as to the need for more up-to-date equipment in an increasingly technical sector. Many education providers provided evidence of involvement with an automotive consortium and automotive professional development as evidence of currency in meeting the requirements of the graduate outcomes.

Confirmation that graduates were performing successfully in the workplace was viewed as strong evidence. Employers surveyed, whilst sometimes low in representative numbers, were generally positive around the entry level capabilities of the graduates to the graduate outcomes in a work environment. Survey methodology varied in its usefulness. Most education organisations had moved from a more general form of questioning around the programme to more targeted questions. Strong performers had in place surveying mechanisms using lecturing staff to increase engagement with graduates and to build relationships with employers and next-level users. Many organisations had presented survey information that had been collated for the purposes of the review. Whilst it was understandable that organisations would seek to gain more up to date and full responses to strengthen their evidence, it was not always clear if the survey practice is routine and business as normal. This process needs formalising.

Overall, the self-assessment and supporting evidence supplied, by those organisations 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.

Final Consistency Review Report

Examples of good practice

Some education organisations provided both qualitative and quantitative data that had been aligned to the GPOs and analysed. Several organisations provided thoughtful interpretations of anecdotes and conversations with graduates and aligned them to the GPOs as they found this a more fruitful method of soliciting feedback. This led to the survey participants providing examples of competency against the graduate outcomes, or to express concerns. These organisations had made improvements to their programme as a result. Remaining connected with employers through the medium of teaching staff resulted in good engagement and a higher survey response rate thereby receiving useful information about attainment of GPOs and of the effectiveness of the training offered.

Some education organisations who offered both full time and part time managed apprentice programmes, were able to describe and evidence the similarities and differences between the two cohorts in graduate outcomes.

Issues and concerns

Some education organisations had delayed actively seeking feedback and engagement with graduates and graduate employers until the consistency review date approached, leading to difficulty contacting many graduates 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 used to inform ongoing improvements to programme design and delivery.

Several education organisations reported unrealistic expectations by some employers regarding what this qualification's graduates should be able to know and do. These employers' expectations were more aligned to the outcomes at Level 4 whereas at Level 3 graduates are just entering the industry. The education organisations concerned agreed that the solution to this issue lay in improved and more regular engagement between employers and education providers so that expectations could be discussed and understood.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

None.