

**TO: Chief Executive Officers, Tertiary Education Organisations  
NZQA Liaison Officers**

**ATTENTION: New Zealand Diploma in Business Programme Managers  
Heads of Business and related departments  
Lecturers of NZDipBus papers  
Local Business Advisory Committees**

### **Update on review of banking prescriptions 225 and 275**

General background to the reviews of the New Zealand Diploma in Business (NZDipBus) prescriptions was included in tertiary circular T2008/006.

Circular T2008/006 also provided information about the 2008 review of two banking prescriptions, 225 (676) *International Trade and Finance* and 275 (675) *Lending and Securities*. Please refer to that circular for an outline of the review process, the names of the prescription advisors and the initial review drafts of the prescriptions. The circular requested feedback on these review drafts.

Feedback was received on prescription 676 from three people, one from a tertiary education organisation (TEO) and two from the banking industry.

Tertiary Assessment and Moderation appreciates the time people have taken to provide feedback. Feedback has been considered by the advisors and minor modifications made to the prescriptions. Appendix I contains the sector feedback and advisors' responses.

#### **Next steps**

The prescription drafts will be presented to the National Advisory Committee for Business Studies (NACBS) for endorsement on 30 September 2008. Subject to NACBS endorsement and final approval by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), the reviewed prescriptions will be published on the NZQA website in October 2008 and TEOs notified.

**Contact details**

Please send any enquiries about the contents of this circular to:

Thomas Pilott  
Tertiary Assessment and Moderation  
NZQA  
PO Box 160  
WELLINGTON 6140

Phone: 04 463 3372  
Fax: 04 463 3114  
Email: tam@nzqa.govt.nz

Circulars are available from the NZQA website at:  
<http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/publications/circulars/tertiary.do>

Linda Glogau  
Manager  
**Qualifications Development and Tertiary Moderation**

## Appendix I

### NZDipBus Prescription Review 2008: Sector feedback and responses of review advisors

#### Prescription 675 (275) *Lending and Securities*

| Submission              | Sector feedback  | Review advisor responses   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| <b>General</b>          |  |  |
| Respondent 1            | My feedback would be ensuring regular review of banking practice and legal requirement elements of the course as they can change quickly.<br>Also, I suggest an emphasis in assignments on students being expected to develop their business writing skills. | Agreed.<br>The first point is covered by current assessment note 1.<br>An additional assessment note 4 was added: <i>Students are expected to communicate in a manner that is consistent with industry expectations (particularly in relation to learning outcomes 4 and 5).</i> |
| <b>Level</b>            | <i>Is the level appropriate?</i>   |  |
|                         | No response.   |  |
| <b>Aim</b>              | <i>Is the aim clear?</i>   |  |
|                         | No response.   |  |
| <b>Prerequisites</b>    | <i>Are the recommended prerequisites appropriate?</i>  |  |
|                         | No response.   |  |
| <b>Assessment Notes</b> | <i>Do assessment notes provide clear, appropriate and sufficient guidance?</i>   |  |
|                         | No response.   |  |
| <b>Weightings</b>       | <i>Will topic weightings ensure sufficient coverage?</i>   |  |
|                         | No response.   |  |

|                               |   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Learning outcome one</b>   | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>    |   |
|                               | No response.  |   |
| <b>Learning outcome two</b>   | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>    |   |
|                               | No response.  |   |
| <b>Learning outcome three</b> | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>    |   |
|                               | No response.  |   |
| <b>Learning outcome four</b>  | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>    |   |
| Respondent 2                  | Yes. The use of credit scoring to support the assessment process. | It is recognised that awareness of credit scoring is important and this should be taught to students. However, it is considered impractical for training providers to assess students in a case study situation on what is essentially a computer generated form of loan assessment, using software packages that vary between financial institutions. The information required for feeding into the system could be tested as part of the principles of lending element. |
| <b>Learning outcome five</b>  | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>    |   |
| Respondent 2                  | Yes. The use of credit scoring to support the assessment process. | As for learning outcome four.   |

|                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Learning outcome six</b> | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>  |   |
| Respondent 2                | Yes. Legal factors that impact on the lenders ability to realise security, e.g. where the lender has not made appropriate guarantor disclosure. | Agreed.<br>An additional component was added to key element c) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>legal factors that may impact on the lenders ability to realise security.</i></li></ul> |

**Prescription 676 (225) *International Trade and Finance***

| <b>Submission</b>           | <b>Sector feedback</b>   | <b>Review advisor responses</b>  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>General</b>              | No response.   |  |
| <b>Level</b>                | <i>Is the level appropriate?</i>   |  |
| Respondent 3                | Yes.   |  |
| <b>Aim</b>                  | <i>Is the aim clear?</i>   |  |
| Respondent 3                | Yes.   |  |
| <b>Prerequisites</b>        | <i>Are the recommended prerequisites appropriate?</i>  |  |
| Respondent 3                | No. <i>Nil</i> should be OK. Otherwise it conveys a message that those who did 520 and/or 570 have an advantage over those who didn't. | Prescription 676 is a level 6 prescription. Prescriptions 520 or 570 are not prerequisites, but noting that they cover useful underpinning knowledge and skills for 676 is helpful for students and NZDipBus programme planners. |
| <b>Assessment Notes</b>     | <i>Do assessment notes provide clear, appropriate and sufficient guidance?</i>   |  |
| Respondent 3                | Yes.   |  |
| <b>Weightings</b>           | <i>Will topic weightings ensure sufficient coverage?</i>   |  |
| Respondent 3                | Yes.   |  |
| <b>Learning outcome one</b> | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i>   |  |
| Respondent 3                | No.  |  |

|                               |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Learning outcome two</b>   | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |
| <b>Learning outcome three</b> | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |
| <b>Learning outcome four</b>  | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |
| <b>Learning outcome five</b>  | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |
| <b>Learning outcome six</b>   | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |
| <b>Learning outcome seven</b> | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |
| <b>Learning outcome eight</b> | <i>Should anything be considered for inclusion or removal?</i> |  |
| Respondent 3                  | No.  |  |