Qualification Title: New Zealand Certificate in Foundation Skills (Level 2)

Qualification number: 2862

Date of review: 9 – 13 September 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, in a range of familiar contexts, of the graduate confidently using basic capabilities to succeed in education or employment pathways.

Graduates of this qualification will be able to:

- search, comprehend, use and communicate information from a variety of texts and digital media relevant to the context
- apply basic knowledge, including literacy and numeracy skills, to solve problems relevant to the context
- reflect on experiences with a range of people, cultures and communities
- work collaboratively and effectively in a team or group to achieve a task or outcome
- develop and reflect on relevant learning and career goals.

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
Ara institute of Technology	Sufficient
Capital Training Limited	Sufficient
Community Colleges NZ Ltd	Sufficient
EmployNZ	Sufficient
Endeavour Training	Sufficient
Future Skills Academy	Sufficient
Horowhenua Learning Centre	Sufficient
Lakeland Learning Company Limited	Sufficient
Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology	Sufficient
New Zealand Management Academies Ltd (Including Intueri Education New Zealand Limited)	Sufficient
New Zealand Institute of Sport	Sufficient

New Zealand Welding School	Sufficient
Oceana Career Academy	Sufficient
Otago Polytechnic	Sufficient
People Potential Ltd	Sufficient
Regent Training Centre Ltd	Sufficient
Tai Poutini Polytechnic	Sufficient
Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Training for You Ltd	Sufficient
Universal College of Learning	Sufficient
Wellington Institute of Technology	Sufficient
Whitireia Community Polytechnic	Sufficient
Waikato Institute of Technology	Sufficient

Introduction

The New Zealand Certificate in Foundation Skills Level 2 is a 60 credit qualification intended to assist people engaging or re-engaging with learning who have the basic capabilities needed to pursue education or employment pathways, but require further development to confidently use them to succeed.

Graduates are able to progress to further study or training at NZQF level 3, including the New Zealand Certificate in Study and Career Preparation (Level 3). In addition, graduates will be able to contribute effectively within their whānau and wider community, and work under general supervision in entry-level roles across a range of fields. This qualification provides a basic entry point into some occupations.

NZQA is the qualification developer (on behalf of and in collaboration with the sector); and a representative attended the consistency review meeting. The review was conducted over five days in three different locations. Thirty-eight organisations had between six and four hundred graduates of this qualification. Thirty-six education organisations attended the review to present their evidence; two other providers presented their evidence via teleconference with the reviewers. One provider was assessed using Te Hono o Te Kahurangi as the quality assurance framework for Mātauranga Māori providers. One education organisation with an approved programme of study leading to this qualification, but with no graduates to date, sent an observer to the review meeting.

The general conditions for programmes leading to the New Zealand Certificate in Foundation Skills (Level 2) includes a requirement that programmes specify one or more contexts supported by a range of activities in the community or simulating real work experiences. Education organisations presented evidence of delivering their programmes in a range of different settings including music, retail, business, computing, sport and trades. One provider was delivering the programme to inmates in a correctional facility and another provider was delivering the programme totally online/distance.

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.

Some providers presented coherent and focused presentations that highlighted the key features of the programme (including content/structure/context, number of graduates) and data that related specifically to graduate consistency against the graduate profile outcomes. However, providers still tended to focus too much on programme evidence including completion rates, programme content, assessments and student survey information.

Some education organisations were undertaking well-timed surveys post-graduation for each cohort (e.g. three months after programme completion). This generally resulted in good engagement and a higher survey response rate. Conversely, other organisations are undertaking surveys for all graduate cohorts at one time as a compliance exercise before the Consistency Review. This tended to result in less valuable information and more difficulty engaging with graduates.

Some providers designed GPO survey questions to suit the level of graduates and other stakeholder audiences, rather than copying the GPO wording directly from the qualification document. Other education organisations broke the GPOs down into parts to make it easier. Only one provider had a high response rate from its graduates, however generally the response rate was less than 20% which raises questions of overall validity.

Some providers were very conscious of ensuring a wider range of feedback from end-users including e.g. community groups, whanau and social service providers however for other providers gathering a breadth and depth of evidence was challenging. Recognition from some education organisations with unit standard-based programmes that achieving a list of unit standards does not necessarily equate to achieving the qualification's GPOs.

Most providers had an external moderation partner while others were struggling to find a compatible moderator for their assessments.

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?

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

None.

Examples of good practice

Good practices included feedback from whānau and community service providers; graduate focus groups to gather more qualitative data against the GPOs and documenting informal conversations with graduates and employers that relate to the GPO's.

Issues and concerns

Providers expressed concern over their ability to gather feedback from employers if the graduates do not give permission to do so. Privacy and confidentiality issues also need to be considered when gathering feedback from next level tutors. There were several providers delivering the programme in prisons who were struggling to gather good feedback against the GPO's. These providers should take the opportunity to discuss common issues in order to identify solutions.

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

During the review, education organisations identified areas for attention during the qualification review due to take place in 2020. These included: clarification of 'context' as used in the strategic purpose, GPOs, and programme conditions; reconsideration of the relative credit values of the GPOs; and inclusion of a 'Community Pathway' (in addition to the education and employment pathways).