

**Qualification Title:** New Zealand Certificate in Computing (Intermediate User)  
(Level 3)

**Qualification number:** 2592

**Date of review:** 29-30 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 not yet confirmed**

**Threshold:**

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

That graduates will be capable of:

- using a range of common digital tools and technologies to an intermediate level
- producing and processing information and operating effectively
- skills that will meet standard professional conventions and be internationally relevant.

These capabilities are expanded on further in the seven graduate profile outcomes:

- Use a wide range of features, functions and settings of common digital devices, software and techniques to search, combine and manipulate data to create, access, organise, present and store information and data.
- Investigate, plan, design and create solutions to meet the requirements of a specified brief.
- Identify risks and meet compliance requirements when using digital tools and digitally stored and transmitted information and explain procedures and implement solutions to meet security requirements in an organisation context.
- Consistently apply appropriate ethics, standards, principles and practices to comply with legal and organisational requirements
- Apply communication principles to effectively collaborate with others in a digital environment.
- Use a variety of digital devices to transfer data across multiple platforms.
- Trouble-shoot and fix a range of common hardware and software problems.

**Education Organisations with sufficient evidence**

The final decision on the sufficiency of an education organisation evidence, will be updated as other organisations show sufficient evidence.

Education Organisation	Final rating
Waikato Institute of Technology	Sufficient

## Interim Consistency Review Report

People Potential Limited	Sufficient
EmployNZ Limited	Sufficient
Ara Institute of Canterbury	Sufficient
Universal College of Learning	Sufficient
Eastern Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Otago Polytechnic	Sufficient
Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology	Sufficient
New Zealand School of Education	Sufficient
Northland Polytechnic (NorthTec)	Sufficient

### Introduction

The purpose of this 60-credit qualification is to provide Aotearoa New Zealand organisations and communities with graduates who have intermediate level computing user skills, and who can be employed in a range of entry level roles.

NZQA is the qualification developer and had a representative attended the consistency meeting. The qualification conditions noted that “Programme design and delivery, and assessment, where applicable, will be conducted in and for the context of real or realistic organisations and/or settings; and be relevant to current and/or emerging practice. A simulated approach (such as case study) is also appropriate for this qualification.”

Thirteen education organisations reported graduates during the review period and participated in the consistency review process. There was a range of part-time and full-time programmes being delivered face to face, online or a blend of both. The make-up of the student cohorts varied, including young people who were not in education or employment (NEET), stay at home parents (predominantly women), and mostly female retired people. Some programmes were designed to pathway graduates onto further training (IT or non-IT related), while one programme had students not intending to progress into further education or paid work. Few graduates progressed into formal paid IT roles, instead they worked in a broad range of often entry level roles which required some IT competency. Graduates also were using their capability in a range of community contexts as well as at home supporting their whanau/families.

### 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

## Interim Consistency Review Report

The three key sources of evidence the education organisations provided were: programme related evidence, graduate feedback and destination related evidence.

### Programme related evidence

- Many submissions provided clear explanations of the programme contexts and the key intentions of the student. Therefore, this had implications on what evidence was more relevant for each organisation. For example, in one case the primary purpose of the programme was for students to pathway onto a level 4 IT related programme: so, evidence of the graduates enrolling and potentially their results at Level 4 were more pertinent. Employer feedback was less significant in this context.
- The moderation evidence was mixed. Some submissions provided clear schedules of internal and independent moderation, a high or progressive coverage of the total programme assessment undertaken, a systematic moderation practice including the results, with analysis and actions to make improvements. Other submissions had some of these key characteristics.
- Some submissions reported programme design and delivery and assessment that were conducted in and for the context of real or realistic organisations. Often these had a project focus and often capstone assessments, which provided significant opportunities for professional practice and soft skills to be demonstrated. The qualification document expected these opportunities to be part of the programme delivery.

### Graduate feedback

- Nearly all organisations sought feedback from their graduates on how well they perceived they demonstrated the graduate profile outcomes. Some submissions had clear graduate profile outcome related questions, used robust rating Likert's scales, explicit response rates and thoughtful analysis of the responses. A few compared these results with feedback from other stakeholders. One asked the graduates to rate themselves early in the programme and again upon completion, while another sought feedback 3 months after graduation, to enable the graduates to apply their digital capability in more real-world context.

### Destination related evidence

- The destinations varied depending on the programme context. Some submissions provided clear evidence of the programme and organisation onto which the graduate pathwayed or the name of the organisation and the workplace role for the minority who went into employment. Many, but not all clearly, identified the proportion of the total graduates who went to the differing destinations. Due to the diversity of roles, typically not being specific to an IT workplace, some submissions explained the degree and way in which the role required digital capability to be applied. A few also provided rich descriptions of how the graduates used their competency in voluntary roles or in their personal lives supporting friends, communities and/or whanau.
- Those whose graduates pathwayed onto higher level training in some cases had higher level tutors' comment on the graduate outcome capability of the graduates and/or the results on these programmes particularly if this was IT-related training. This was often convincing evidence.

### Overall Comments

## Interim Consistency Review Report

The submissions varied in how well the key claims were supported by robust evidence. A few focused clearly and consistently on how representative the evidence was of the total graduate cohort. A few triangulated and rated the quality of the different evidence to build a convincing case that the graduates had demonstrated the required capabilities. Some submissions directly addressed the gaps in the evidence provided and a few judged how significant these gaps were and the probability their plans would rectify these gaps. The analysis of the evidence and the justification were the weakest aspects of most submissions.

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

The thirteen organisations provided a range of programme related evidence. The quality of the moderation practice varied, and this impacted on the level of confidence in the assessment results. This was one of the key gaps that needs to be addressed.

Some programmes had a strong focus in their delivery and assessment on reflecting real world and realistic contexts; these built confidence in the capability of their graduates.

The graduate feedback was often highly representative of the total number of graduates, but the quality of the evidence was affected by the robustness of the design of the survey tool.

The destination evidence was strongest for those with clear pathways into further higher-level training. Some enhanced the quality of this evidence by including assessment results on mostly higher-level IT programmes and the tutor of these programmes rating the graduates' capability. Descriptions of how the graduates applied the capability were mostly anecdotal and little analysed. Some organisations triangulated and analysed the evidence soundly and a few strongly built a well justified overall case.

Some of the organisations meet the criteria for sufficiency through their written submission and their presentation. Some needed provide additional evidence and actions to address some gaps. The self-reflection and evidence supplied by those organisations found sufficient makes a convincing case to demonstrate that their graduates match the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

### **Special Focus**

None.

### **Examples of good practice**

One organisation asked their graduates to rate themselves against the graduate outcomes early in the programme and again at the end of study. This is good practice, providing better quality evidence than a rating at a single point in time.

Another organisation had graduates rate their confidence in demonstrating the graduate outcomes which included providing illustrations of what they did when they were demonstrating that capability. This review was completed in a facilitated discussion with the graduates and provided some high-quality evidence.

A few providers had analysed evidence of the Level 3 graduates passing Level 4 IT assessments that were related to the graduate profile outcomes of the Level 3 qualification. This was persuasive evidence.

## Interim Consistency Review Report

### Recommendations to Qualification Developer

Both review meetings reflected on the range of contexts in which graduates used their capability or went onto after graduation.

The employment pathway currently states:

*This qualification will equip graduates with intermediate level transferable digital skills which will assist them to obtain entry level positions or to further their professional development in a range of industries/contexts.*

The meeting participants noted their graduates used their digital competency in a more diverse range of formal and informal contexts than stated in the qualification. These roles were often not IT-specific and they included paid and voluntary roles. The graduates described using their digital capability in a range of informal contexts: helping children with their homework, supporting family members or contributing to a marae initiative.

The educational pathways were also diverse.

The graduates were equipped with an intermediate level of digital literacy that enabled them to contribute in society where these capabilities were being increasing in demand.