

Qualification Title New Zealand Certificate in Music (Level 4)

Qualification number 3418

Date of review 27 April 2022

This report refers to graduates awarded this qualification prior to **31 December 2021**

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 graduates who wish to develop their experience and practice in Music. It provides the music industry with performers that have the technical ability to perform with confidence. Graduates contribute to the cultural, social and economic life of Aotearoa New Zealand.

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.

| MOE Number | Education Organisation | Final rating |
|------------|--|--------------|
| 6011 | Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology Limited | Sufficient |
| 6015 | Southern Institute of Technology Ltd | Sufficient |
| 6014 | Whitireia Community Polytechnic Limited | Sufficient |
| 6009 | Universal College of Learning (UCOL) Limited | Sufficient |
| 6006 | Ara Institute of Canterbury Ltd | Sufficient |
| 6025 | Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology Ltd | Sufficient |

Introduction

The New Zealand Certificate in Music (Level 4) is a 120-credit qualification designed for individuals who wish to develop their experience and practice in Music. It provides the music industry with performers that have the technical ability to perform with confidence. The intended education pathway to the New Zealand Diploma in Music (Level 5) [Ref: 3431] was evident. Graduates also engaged in this programme of study to develop their own personal interest and broaden their experience and networks within the music industry.

The consistency review was run over two half day sessions and seven education organisations with graduates presented. Two observers attended the virtual consistency review. Toi Mai - Creative, Cultural, Recreation and Technology Workforce Development Council (Toi Mai) is the qualification developer, and as a representative, participated in this

Interim Consistency Review Report

review. Graduate numbers totalled 299 across the four-year reporting range 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 programme of study which ensured that programme components led to the graduate profile.
- Evidence of moderation of assessor judgements and assessment, that assured the programmes were assessed at an appropriate level.
- Programme review incorporating planning areas for improvement.
- Destination data indicating graduate study was relevant to the qualification.
- Records of feedback from graduates confirming that the programme had provided graduates with a range of skills aligned to the graduate profile and appropriate to the level of the qualification.
- Next level tutor feedback by some education organisations.

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?

The education organisations submitted a range of evidence that could be triangulated to demonstrate that their graduates match the graduate outcomes at the appropriate threshold. Programme related evidence included moderation activities, programme alignment with the Graduate Profile Outcomes (GPO), and useful formal programme reviews. Some education organisations specifically addressed the general conditions of the programme and discussed how they are met.

Three education organisations reported that due to the highly practical nature of the programmes and intended delivery on-campus and at community events, delivery during the imposed lockdown events due to Covid-19 were difficult to navigate and impacted completion rates. This impact was further evident as GPO 8 'apply understanding of the music industry to develop own career plan' was rated less well in terms of graduate skills and knowledge compared to other GPOs.

Graduate feedback was less rigorous or compelling. Most education organisations used surveys to collect feedback. The quality of the survey tools and response rates were variable. Some surveys were aligned to the GPOs and the responses that were received were generally positive. Some survey questions focused on 'being prepared for study or work', rather than having the skills and knowledge stated in the GPOs. Where quality

Interim Consistency Review Report

feedback was gathered, not every education organisation took the opportunity to undertake meaningful analysis.

Graduate destination was the most convincing evidence. Many graduates progress to the New Zealand Diploma in Music (Level 5). In terms of other destinations, one education organisation had the initiative to ask graduates to tell them about any music or performance activities that provided any form of income, rather than focusing on generic questions about full or part time employment as an outcome. Additional questions specifically about graduates' engagement and participation in the music industry also had the potential to reveal the use of GPO related skills and provided the opportunity to gather authentic destination related feedback by asking questions relevant to the context of graduates.

Some education organisations attempted to gather data and information from employers. However, the response rates were low, and the quality of the responses was not compelling. Overall, the efforts made added little value or weight to the sufficiency of evidence.

On the whole, education organisations did not systematically gather graduate or other feedback over each of the years of delivery. Feedback was sought by all education organisations, bar one, for the first time in anticipation of the consistency review. This limits the likelihood of having representation from all years and cohorts and impacts the authenticity of feedback when graduates from preceding years try to recall their skill and knowledge in relation to the level of the qualification.

While there were areas for improvement identified, overall, the self-assessment and supporting evidence supplied, demonstrate that graduates meet the graduate outcomes at the determined threshold.

Special Focus: None

Issues and concerns

None

Recommendations to Qualification Developer

The qualification is due for review in 2022. Toi Mai plan to engage all education organisations with graduates, and industry, in the review.

Interim Consistency Review Report