Cc Robyn H
Jane Mc
Coralie
Susan
Grant.

Victorian **Registration &**
Qualifications Authority

Dr Anne Jones
Deputy Vice Chancellor and Director TAFE
Victoria University
Building K, Ballarat Road
FOOTSCRAY VIC 3011

Level 6, 35 Spring St
Melbourne VIC 3000

GPO Box 2317
Melbourne VIC 3001

T 61 3 **9637 2806**
F 61 3 9651 3266
vrqa@edumail.vic.gov.au

www.vrqa.vic.gov.au

Dear Dr Jones

Re: AQTF 2007 audit outcomes and renewal of registration

I write to advise you of the outcomes of the audit of the compliance of Victoria University with the *Australian Quality Training Framework 2007: Essential Standards for Registration* conducted on 28 and 29 October 2009.

In accordance with section 4.3.16, of the *Education and Training Reform Act 2006,* the VRQA granted registration to Victoria University on condition that the University maintains compliance with the *AQTF 2007 Essential Standards.* Based on the findings from the audit, I intend to renew your registration for a five year period, and I will confirm the new registration period in writing.

I acknowledge receipt of comments from Victoria University in relation to the audit reports and correction of matters of fact. My response to these comments are included in *Attachment 1.* Copies of the final audit reports are in *Attachment 2.*

I note that the audit reports outline some issues of non-compliance. Victoria University is required to provide the VRQA with an Action Plan by **30 May 2010** outlining any action that the University has already taken, or intends to take, to address the findings of the audit reports. Please include the dates by which all outstanding issues will be addressed. In due course, the VRQA will require evidence (such as minutes of meetings) of verification by the University's internal auditors of the actions taken in regard to non-compliance.

Thank you (and your staff) for the approach taken to the re-registration process and for the professionalism displayed throughout the audit process.

If you have any queries in relation to these matters, please contact me on (03) 9651 3207 or at timmins.robyn.l@edumail.vic.gov.au

Yours sincerely

Robyn Timmins
Deputy Director, VRQA

14th April 2010

VRQA's response to the provider's comments: Victorian University

Systemic Report

Reference	Extract from draft report	VU comment	VRQA response
Page 1, line 30	"The second stage of the audit consisted of a visit to the Institute by two ..."	Factual correction The second stage of the audit consisted of a visit to the *University* by two ...	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 2, line 8	"The third stage consisted of a confidential audit report to the RTO CEO, which includes ...:	Factual correction The third stage consisted of a confidential audit report to the RTO *Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Director TAFE,* which includes ...	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 2, line 28	"Centre for Vocational and Work-based Learning, which is ..."	Factual correction *Work-based Education Research Centre*, which is ...	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 4, lines 2-4	"Audit found that assessment, including RPL, was non compliant in each of the qualifications audited. An analysis of the assessment tools indicated that assessors were not adequately interpreting the requirements of the units of competency and therefore not collecting valid evidence."	The University would welcome a qualified response that identifies universally non compliant aspects of assessment at VU.	This is noted in the individual audit reports.
Page 4, lines 21-22	"VU has not developed a process for recording the arrangements for supervision and co-assessment agreed between the supervising teacher and the teacher subject to supervision	Factual correction. VU has not developed a process for recording the arrangements for *co-assessment* agreed between the supervising teacher and the teacher subject to *co-assessment*	Comments noted and changes made in the report.

	and co assessment."		
*-age 5, lines 10-12	"In addition, the Statement of Attainment was not compliant as it did not include the second clause, as required by the AQF Implementation Handbook, http://www.aqf.edu.au/Publications/AQFImplementationHandbook/tabid/198/Default.aspx."	Factual correction; the clause is provided in the reverse of the Statement of Attainment. This comment should be removed from the draft report.	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 6, line 9	"... reports; however, the Institute systems ..."	Factual correction ... reports; however, the *University's* systems ...	Comments noted and changes made in the report.

TDT30402 Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Rail Operations)

Reference	Extract from draft report	VU comment	VRQA response
Page 3, Recommendation (element 1.1 AQTF 2007)	"RTO is to ensure that validation is sufficiently robust to identify issues inherent in the assessment tools. Refer 1.5"	The following evidence was supplied to the auditor: • An internal assessment validation report for the Unit THHCGS03B which details the adherence of the assessment materials to the training package requirements (which is inline with VU Assessment Validation Procedures) • A completed course development plan that had been discussed and signed by the Connex HR representative to ensure it met the needs of the Connex requirements (industry). This forms the external industry validation component • Each process informed changes to the assessment task or course development plan. VU would appreciate advice on how to improve this validation process.	Comments noted; nevertheless there is room in the validation process for improvement in relation to unpacking units of competency and assessment tools. Recent publication pertaining to validation and moderation on the NQC website may be of some use.
Page 8, Opportunities for Improvement	"Although the participants are screened via Connex's processes, it is strongly suggested that student learning and support needs should also be	VU staff members have sighted the instruments used by Connex throughout the recruitment process that assesses student literacy and numeracy needs, therefore the program teams believe that this information is adequate in determining the required literacy and numeracy standards for employees of	Comments noted. Please provide details as to how students are informed of the support made available to them. Please provide a copy of materials distributed to students informing them about access and equity,

(element 2.4 AQTF 2007)	addressed by VU processes"	Connex. In addition, students are informed throughout induction about access and equity, complaints and appeals and student progress processes that are available for the course. Therefore the processes that address the learning and support needs for each student are documented in line with both Connex and VU requirements. The University would like further clarification of the gaps in this approach.	complaints and appeals and student progress processes together with the Action Plan.
Page 9, Staff Competence (element 3.1 AQTF 2007)	"There is no strategy in place for teams to confirm supervision and co-assessment arrangements, to ensure that the strategies and actions employed meet requirements."	We believe that we did demonstrate an acceptable supervision strategy however acknowledge that VU does not have a formal strategy for co-assessment. If the auditors feel that the supervision strategy is also inadequate we would appreciate additional feedback.	Comments noted and changes made in the report. Please provide details of co-assessment strategies to be adopted in the Action Plan.

WRR30202 Certificate III in Retail

Reference	Extract from draft report	VU comment	VRQA response
Page 5, final para	"Please note that there was no trainer booklet submitted for this unit."	Trainer booklets were provided for both units. The University requests that the auditors reconsider this comment.	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 4 (and page 5)	"Sign off against 'safety and security test' and safety and security skills check' - these are not explained, but appear to be the summary outcome of the following. Assessment appears scored as a % is included - this is not commensurate with competency based assessment."	The assessment is competency based. In addition company tests are completed which.... This is noted as a part of the Assessors' Handbook which was provided to the auditor. It is only in this format as the Dominos tests are inserted directly into the workbook at this point, and this is their format (as this is a customized program). Clear guidelines are in the Assessors' Handbook and are given to the trainee in regards to what would constitute a competent outcome. The University requests that the auditors reconsider this statement	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 4 and 5	"Third party - supplementary evidence. Discussion with the training manager (MTD Fun Foods) indicated that this	These instructions are provided in the assessors guidebook which was provided after the audit as requested. The University requests that the auditors reconsider this statement.	Comments noted and changes made in the report.

	evidence is weighted less than the other methods. There is also the requirement that the supervisor knows the candidate for at least 6 months - this is not documented. There are no clear instructions to the workplace supervisor as to the context for assessment, e.g. duration of observation "		
Page 5, 18 and 19	"The assessment tool is not fully developed in terms of stimulus and response. In addition, there is no clear guidance about decision-making rules"	Decision making and stimulus response guidelines are clearly documented in the assessor's version of the assessors' tool. They detail exactly what constitutes an award of a competent decision and what does not constitute one. They also provide direction to the assessor in regards to how to conduct the assessment and in regards to stimulus and response.	The VRQA maintains that the assessment tools sighted could be further developed, e.g. tick sheets against the performance criteria etc do not provide sufficient response detail for decision making purposes. Please provide details of improvement measures to be adopted in the Action Plan.
Page 5	"Written Test - no expected answers provided "	Answer booklets were provided for this module, which include expected answers.	Comments noted and changes made in the report.
Page 5	"'CSR SOC' - which is a list of job tasks and observations (e.g. clothing) and also 'can explain' items. The level of performance is not described for each job task. This is signed by the Assessor with comments. The training manager indicated that the station observation checklist is undertaken over the course of an hour at busy times - this is not explained'.	The level of performance is provided in both the SOC guidebook and the trainer booklet that was provided for this unit Guidelines for station observation checklists are clearly outlined in the trainers' booklet which was provided.	Comments noted.
Page 7 and 21	"Induction kit outlines that there are 25 units to be completed in the nested qualification (Certificates I and II as well) when the Certificate III only requires 9	This was explained at the audit interview. Due to WRR02 Training Package rules there are 11 pre-requisite unit requirements prior to commencing Certificate III in Retail. However prior to 2009 Skills Victoria did not allow trainees to be enrolled in a partial Certificate to complete these pre-requisites,	The VRQA notes that an explanation was provided during the audit review. Nevertheless, the documentation distributed to students could be made clearer by including information pertaining to the

	units. It is not made clear which units are those pertaining to Certificate III. Training Plan indicates 22 units when only 9 units are required – it is not made clear that this qualification encompasses other qualifications."	hence the term 'nested qualification' which is explained to trainees at induction. It was a Skills Victoria requirement that these additional units be included in a trainee's Training Plan (total of 11 + 9 = 22 units) however at no time is the trainee enrolled in any other qualification. This is made clear to trainees at induction. Please note that due to customisation of elective units for Certificate III in Retail Operations, additional units are included in the induction manual and trainees are assisted in choosing electives for their training plans from those listed in the induction manual.	requirements for each qualification.
Page 8	"Statement of Attainment which included greyscale logo NRT and did not include the second, additional clause as required by the *AQF Implementation Handbook.* "	Factual correction; the clause is provided in the reverse of the Statement of Attainment.	Comment noted and changes made in the report.
Page 10	"Statement of Attainment which included greyscale logo NRT and did not include the second, additional clause as required by the *AQF Implementation Handbook.* "	See item 9	Comment noted and changes made in the report.
Page 14	"An analysis of the booklets noted that there is a need to address the gap of bag checks and stuff."	The auditor was informed during the audit that where DOTTI does not address all of the elements/performance criteria/essential knowledge and skills (such as 'Bag checks'), these gaps have been addressed in an additional training booklet. This was provided to the auditor. Suggest that auditors reconsider this comment.	Comment noted.
Page 14	"Need to have password to see student progress."	The student progress tracking features of DOTTI were demonstrated at the site visit.	Comment noted.
Page 17	"The level of performance is not described for each job task"	The performance level is indicated in the performance criteria and essential skills and knowledge and is mapped to the different job tasks required to be performed by the trainee on the job. The performance level is therefore inherent in the job tasks.	Comment noted.

Page 26	"Statement of Attainment which included greyscale logo NRT and did not include the second, additional clause as required by the *AQF Implementation Handbook.* "	Factual correction; the clause is provided in the reverse of the Statement of Attainment.	Comment noted.
Page 26	The delivery team acknowledge that there needs to be a plan for competency upgrade; however, this has not occurred and the delivery team have been providing the new Training Package qualification since 1 January 2009.	This has been taken out of context. A plan for upgrade of competency has been developed but as we were not being audited on the SIR training package this was not deemed required for the audit.	Comment noted.

BSB50101 Diploma of Business

Reference	Extract from draft report	VU comment	VRQA response
Page 1 and throughout	School of Enterprise	Factual correction to the name of the School	The name of the school has been changed to the School of Business & Hospitality.
Page 5, Element 1.1, para 2	"Program Manager, School of Business& Hospitality, said that he would follow up with subject coordinator in China if there were aberrations in marking. This follow up is not documented and this is an opportunity lost as, although exam papers are changed in response to irregular processes, systemic issues are not effectively identified. It is suggested that the team more effectively document changes to assessment processes made in response to moderation."	This paragraph refers to an absence of formal documentation, which is accepted. No evidence is provided for the claim that "systemic issues are not effectively identified". Suggest change the word 'identified' to 'documented'	Comment noted and changes made in the report.

Page 7, Condition 6	"It was revealed at audit that, at system level, the Statements of Attainment were not compliant as they did not include the second clause as required by the AQF Implementation Handbook, http://www.aqf.edu.au/Publications/AQFImplementationHandbook/tabid/198/Default.aspx "	Factual correction; the clause is provided in the reverse of the Statement of Attainment.	Comment noted and changes made in the report.
Page 7, Condition 6, Recommendation	"The Institute will need to ensure that awards meet the requirements of the AQF Implementation Handbook".	Factual correction	Comment noted and the statement has been changed to read as 'The *University* will need to ensure that awards meet the requirements of the AQF Implementation Handbook'.
Page 7, contract management	"The agreement did not specify agreement monitoring and review processes. For example, there was no description of agreed responsibilities relating to neither quality-assurance requirements, nor clear plans in place for the scheduling and reviewing of these responsibilities."	The University would like the auditors to consider that the agreement includes an end-date at which time the agreement is reconsidered. Evidence (in the form of meeting notes) was provided at the audit of the regular discussions held between VU and Henan staff about the operation of the arrangement.	The explanation provided by VU is noted. However, if the only documented strategy for monitoring the agreement is at the end of the life of the agreement, please provide details of how VU ensures that students are provided with the quality of services they require and that the terms of the agreement are being adhered to by both parties. Please provide the details in the Action Plan.
Page 10	**"Moderation and assessment policy (this is a local policy, not a VU policy)** Director, Governance, Policy and Planning Services said that this is an example of local implementation of the VU policy). A sample of 20% of exams marked in China is collected each year. Moderation reports sighted. Program Manager, School of Business & Hospitality, said that he would follow up with subject	Factual correction: VU moderation and assessment policy applies.	Comments noted and the statement in the report has been changed to VU policies are applied for Moderation and Assessment but with local input to accommodate the off shore programs given the very large number of students.

	coordinator in China if there were aberrations in marking. In terms of follow-up this is not documented and this is an opportunity lost as, although exam papers are changed in response to irregular processes, systemic issues are not effectively identified. "		

TAA40104 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment – CILT Response

Reference	Extract from draft report	VU comment	VRQA response
Page 5, Student Sample	"CILT Assess Competence: A complete student file was not provided at audit. Tasks are to co-assess with the trainer, a fellow student who is facilitating training and also a classroom RPL activity."	Pieces of student work are not maintained in student files as they are returned directly to students, in accordance with the Public Records Act and VU policies and procedures. Evidence of competency outcomes are maintained in students files and was provided at the audit. Completed student work is scanned by some TAA teachers. Scanned copies of completed student work for assess competence including co-assessment with the trainer and a fellow student who is facilitating training and also a classroom RPL activity can be provided to auditors.	A number of completed student assessments were made available at the audit. The auditors found some inconsistencies with implementation of provider records maintenance policies and procedures and the response by the provider. It is recommended that the policy be reviewed so that examples of student work are maintained in some form for the purpose of assessment moderation and internal audits.
Page 6, Recommendation (element 1.1 AQTF 2007)	"RTO is to revise assessment for all TAA40104 programs so that it meets the requirements of the Training Package'"	The draft report does not make clear which elements of the Training Package are not being met. It would be helpful if this could be elaborated. Assess Competence is assessed through the following methods: • RPL role play is observed by the CILT teacher/assessor. Example observation checklist currently in use for assess competence include RPL role play checklist that assesses communication, negotiation and support as required by the unit. See checklists in use 2007-2009 • Candidates are required to provide documents from two	The VRQA concurs with the views of the auditors in that: • There was insufficient valid evidence collected to satisfy the unit of competency requirements • Specific evidence requirements of the unit of competency were not fully addressed • Instructions were not clear for CILT program • Tasks were not described in the

| | | in class validation sessions on decisions for improvement and do not write an essay. Candidates are required to record notes for improving assessment tools in the validation template and meeting minutes. See example validation templates and meeting minutes 2008-2009.

Participate in Assessment Validation is assessed through the following methods:

• Candidates are required to participate in two validation sessions using different validation approaches. All CILT teaching and learning materials for the in class validation meetings activity explicitly state and promote discussion on using different validation approaches. See example PowerPoint presentations for validation 2007-2009. There is much discussion on different validation approaches.

• CILT TAA teachers use a range of different validation approaches in the two validation meetings held in class for improving assessment tools including reviewing assessment tasks and checklists and reviewing VU assessment policy and trailing different assessment validation templates. See examples of different validation approaches in validation templates and meeting minutes 2008-2009 | Samoan materials
• Tasks do they reflect the descriptions provided in the audit response-this may be a matter of providing more accurate instructions in the assessment materials

The report provides specific comment on assessment for each team's program.

It is suggested that the teams analyse the auditor's report, draw out the principles discussed (as above) and test these principles in the assessment materials for the remaining units of competency.

Please provide details of improvements measures to be adopted in the Action Plan. |

TAA40104 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment – Finance and library response

Reference	Extract from draft report	VU comment	VRQA response
Page 2, Continuous Improvement (element 1.1 AQTF 2007)	• The RTO is required to ensure that its processes to support the continuous improvement of training and assessment are implemented across all teams.	• <u>Do we have a consistent process across *all* teams? I think the auditors' point is the difference between CILT and the F & L team isn't it?</u> • The Course self assessment instrument and course action plan were completed throughout the 2008-09 Quality Review Process and were supplied at the audit • Continuous improvement processes were detailed at the audit. This includes: o Minutes of meetings between course	The VRQA notes inconsistency in the process employed by the teams, an example is that the Samoan program had not completed validation and the School of Finance and Library team had not completed its self-assessment and action plan. Please provide details in the Action Plan of

		coordinator and staff teaching the program	how processes to support continuous improvement of training and assessment are implemented across all teams.
		○ Regular contact with Industry both prior to course commencement, completion of course to discuss course outcomes and receive feedback (examples of questions asked contained in course information folder)	
		○ A mid course and end course evaluation is conducted for each course. An analysis is completed for the course participant evaluations and comments acted upon - e.g. facilities contacted via email re heating and cooling, conversations between facilitators and co-ordinator to discuss participant comments and acted upon. Example of minutes of meeting re participant's comments on evaluation contained in Course Information folder (continuous improvement)	
		This section should be removed	
Page 3, Recommendat ion (element 1.3 AQTF 2007)	• The RTO is required to provide evidence that there is robust training methodology in place that assists learners to develop the skills and knowledge outlined for the units of competency delivered. This methodology must be supported by comprehensive training resources. Refer also to elements 1.4 (non compliant) and 1.5 (non compliant). • The RTO is required to revise assessment for all	• The modules TAA402C and 404B are clustered with 401C and 403B. Prior to course commencement, participants receive a pre course information booklet which asks for participants to research a task that they will use to assess a person against during the course. They are also asked to access and familiarise themselves with the NTIS website. Facilitator delivers content as per session plan using activities, discussions and group discussions to develop skills which enable participants to commence their planning of an assessment. Further work is set as out of class activities. Participants bring session plan back for review to the following training session. This day is facilitator-led with slides used only as prompts to elicit relevant discussion and demonstration of concepts. Each person assesses another course participant with the rest of the class and facilitator observing this activity. Each person's assessment is discussed and feedback received as well as a self-review completed. An example of a person deemed NYC is also role played	The VRQA notes the provider's response and accepts that as evidence of the training methodology in place to assist learners to develop the skills and knowledge required for the units of competency.

	TAA40104 programs so that it meets the requirements of the Training Package	with discussion following. Each participant is involved in a validation meeting, with the requirement for a further validation to be undertaken in the workplace, recorded and returned to assessor. Extra resources which are provided to participants include the following and copies can be provided if required: • Department of Education and Training, *Designing assessment tools for quality outcomes in VET,* 2008, ISBN 978 0 7307 4274 6. • Reasonable Adjustment measures, an extract from *Training packages @ work Back 2 basics,* Edition 3, Page 31, ISBN 978-0-9803777-0-5 • TAA Toolbox (At induction participants are given information as to how to access and use the toolbox to complement their learning. Participants do use the proformas from the toolbox Also available for student use are: • Class Set of Guidelines for assessing competence in VET (2008) for research • Assessment validation notes and activity (completed in class) Participants complete a self critique of the assessment which they conduct in class. This is presented to the class and discussed with facilitator and class participants. Participants are required to have their workplace assessment critiqued and documented.	
Page 5, Student Sample (element 1.5 AQTF 2007)	• "there are no direction to the candidate"	**Student Files** • Page 44 of the Workbook records in the worksheet that the "briefing material" was provided to the candidate then candidate understanding clarified prior to assessment. Page 45 of the Workbook records that the candidate was provided with the "Instruction Sheet".	VRQA maintains the following: • There were no instructions in the assessment tool. • The unit of competency requires recommendations to be acted upon • Reasonable adjustment needs to be included in the assessment and therefore in the design of the

		Documentation was available at the audit.	assessment tool, not just in the delivery.
	• ... recommendation arising from the validation activity was not acted upon" • No reasonable adjustment and no assessment of underpinning knowledge assessment were undertaken	• The student file records the conduct of a validation process using a simulated situation. The record provided at audit includes the student's recommendation for action to complete the validation process on page 45 of Workbook. • Explanation of "reasonable adjustment" is provided during class, also on page 31 of Workbook and page 43 of Workbook - Code of Practice for Assessors. On their assessment plan and in their pre assessment candidate briefing checklist, assessor checks this with candidate. Extra notes are also given out to support discussion in class. The assessment is on based on taxation requirements, and I do not have the expertise to comment on underpinning knowledge of that area, however the assessment was undertaken by an expert in the field. The comments of the TAA assessor on page 2 of the Workbook refer to candidate demonstration of reasonable adjustment and observation of RPL assessment. Evidence was provided at audit.	Please provide details in the Action Plan as to how these issues will be addressed.
Page 7, Student Information (element 2.2 AQTF 2007)	• The RTO is required to revise pre-course information so that it is accurate.	• 2009 Course Information - City King Campus only refers to 6 day delivery. An option for 1 night per week over 12 weeks is offered in second last paragraph of page 1.	Comments noted and changes made in the report.

Summary and Systemic Issues Report

Victoria University

Introduction

Victoria University (VU) is a multi-sector institution (higher education and TAFE), offering short courses as well as qualifications in vocational education (TAFE) and higher education. There are more than 50,000 students enrolled at local campuses and international sites. The University operates primarily at campuses in the western suburbs of Melbourne (Australia), Melbourne city centre, and locations provided by partners in Asia and Europe. VU offers 706 further education, vocational education and higher education courses through five faculties and the VU College.

Audit Methodology

AQTF audit

The audit process included three distinct phrases:

1. Desk audit
2. Site visit
3. Feedback from the VRQA.

1. Desk audit

The scope of the desk audit for the re-registration included a review of:

- Achievement VU08 Annual Report
- Making VU 2016: A statement of purpose, strategic directions and priorities 2008–2016
- A comprehensive description of VU's approach to quality, including:
  - o quality system guidelines
  - o the VU AQTF self-assessment instrument
  - o course action plan template
  - o peer validation summary template
  - o a description of the AQTF quality review process
  - o key policies and procedures
- International activities, including partnerships
- National Quality Indicator pilot plan information.

This submission was reviewed, and informed the audit sample for the second stage of the audit. The scope of the audit was informed by the information provided in stage one and analysis of the level of risk by the VRQA.

2. Audit visit

The second stage of the audit consisted of a visit to the University by two VRQA appointed auditors (Chloe Dyson and Andrea Bateman). Audit visit was conducted over two days (28 and 29 October 2009), with ½ day devoted to each qualification.

The four qualifications audited were:

- TAA40104 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment
- WRR30202 Certificate III in Retail

- BSB50101A Diploma of Business
- TDT30402 Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Rail Operations).

These four qualifications covered the following areas of provision:

- Transnational provision
- Auspiced provision
- Traineeship and apprenticeship provision.

3. Third stage

The third stage consisted of a confidential audit report to the RTO Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Director TAFE, which includes an overview of the initial submission and any systemic issues identified at audit. This report is accompanied by four individual audit reports pertaining to the four qualifications.

Audit Findings

AQTF Review and Systemic Issues

Governance and strategic planning

The University Council, as the governing body, is accountable to government for the strategic direction and superintendence of the University. It is responsible for ensuring the systems and processes to direct and control the university's operations are established and working effectively. The Council has members from within and external to the University. External members are nominated on the basis of their expertise and experience in senior management in areas such as finance, commerce, law, information technology, education and corporate governance. Internal members include the Vice-Chancellor ex officio, the Chair of the Education and Research Board ex officio and others elected by the University's internal stakeholders (students and staff). Dr Anne Jones is the Deputy Vice Chancellor and Director of TAFE.

TAFE@VU incorporates:

- Faculty of Technical and Trades Innovation
- Faculty of Workforce Development
- VU College, which includes learning support, English language and preparatory programs, general education programs
- Work-based Education Research Centre, which is a research centre with the aim of VET practice being informed by research.

The presentation provided to the audit by the Deputy Vice Chancellor outlined:

- Recent achievements
- The changing profile of students
- Comparative market share over the last 2 years
- Client profile.

The VU's approach to strategic planning is outlined in its Making VU 2016: a statement of purpose. This paper outlines VU's strategic directions and priorities for 2008–2016. This eight-year plan is supported by:

Summary and Systemic Issues Report

Victoria University

- Business Unit (faculties and corporate services areas) Strategic Plans – developed on a three year timeframe. These are presented in draft form at annual Quality Improvement Review. These plans outline actions, timelines and responsibilities
- Staff Performance and Development Plan.

Staff involvement in the planning process occurs at two levels:

1. Involvement in the development of Business Unit Strategic Plans
2. Individual staff members develop a Staff Performance and Development Plan annually with their line manager. Each staff member's work priorities are linked to the University's strategic objectives.

The VU planning process includes on an annual basis:

- Review of University priorities
- Unit Strategic Plans
- Faculty/service area Quality Improvement Review.

Audit Systemic issues

Continuous improvement
(AQTF Standards 1.1, 2.1, 3.1)

The auditors found that, for some teams, stakeholder feedback provided few opportunities for improvement.

<u>Suggestion</u>

It is suggested that the RTO consider providing staff with greater guidance on assessment validation. In addition, in the procedure for moderation, sufficiency is presented as a principle of assessment, but is actually a rule of evidence. The explanations of reliability and sufficiency also require review.

<u>Suggestion</u>

It is suggested that the RTO considers reviewing the processes for collecting feedback so that data collection processes are suited to specific groups of students.

Moderation and validation of assessment

The procedures for moderation and validation of assessment provide general guidance on these activities, but while the auditors felt that staff had a good understanding of moderation processes, their understanding of validation of assessment was not strong.

Training and assessment
(AQTF 1.2, 1.3, 1.5)

Strategies for training and assessment

During the site audit auditors found that RTO staff could not clearly explain the impact of industry consultation on the development or review of strategies for training and assessment.

<u>Suggestion</u>

It is suggested that the RTO considers developing and implementing a process to consolidate the outcomes of consultation with industry and recording the impact of this consultation on strategies for training and assessment. The RTO may find that formalising these processes will facilitate the review of training and assessment.

Summary and Systemic Issues Report

Victoria University

Assessment

Audit found that assessment, including RPL, was non compliant in each of the qualifications audited. An analysis of the assessment tools indicated that assessors were not adequately interpreting the requirements of the units of competency and therefore not collecting valid evidence.

<u>Suggestion</u>

It is suggested that the RTO consider providing assessors with professional development about unpacking Training Packages for the purpose of assessment and developing robust assessment tools.

Staffing
(AQTF 1.3, 1.5)

Supervision and co-assessment

The determination of the National Quality Council (NQC) 29 March 2007 regarding trainer and assessor competence states that assessors who do not hold the TAA40104 assessment competencies or their equivalent must conduct assessments with someone who does hold these competencies. Where staff did not hold the TAA40104 – for example, in the Henan agreement for the Diploma of Business – VU had accepted teaching qualifications gained in China and other countries that patently did not provide equivalence against the TAA40104.

There is a Course Delivery and Conduct Assessment (Direct Supervision Procedures) procedure in place at VU, but it does not include requirements for co-assessment as detailed by the NQC. This procedure contains a direct supervision report, which confirms the supervising teachers' intent to supervise trainers in training and assessment, but it does not refer to co-assessment arrangements.

VU has not developed a process for recording the arrangements for co-assessment agreed between the supervising teacher and the teacher subject to co-assessment.

There is a form in place to record supervision as it occurs, but not co-assessment. The record of meetings form does not record co-assessment.

Currency of staff qualifications and vocational competence

The Staff Performance Development Planning (SPDP) process provides an excellent framework for planning and monitoring staff professional development. It provides clear guidance for the scheduling of review of staff performance against set objectives.

However, the SPDP policy and supporting documents do not provide advice on ensuring that professional development plans address NQC requirements regarding vocational currency.

Where trainers did not hold the competencies they were training and assessing equivalence was not established for these competencies.

<u>Recommendation</u>

The RTO is required to revise its processes so that all trainers and assessors meet NQC requirements for trainer and assessor competence.

Contract and Auspice arrangements
(AQTF Standards 3.1, 3.2)

The agreements examined at audit, both auspiced and joint venture agreements did not specify agreement monitoring and review processes. For example, there was no description of agreed responsibilities relating to quality assurance requirements, nor were clear plans in place for the scheduling and reviewing of these responsibilities.

There was not an agreement in place for an auspiced arrangement that had been in place since January 2009 for the TAA40104.

Recommendation

The RTO is required to revise its processes for contract management so that clear direction is provided to staff regarding how contracts are required to be established and managed.

Qualifications
(Condition of Registration 6)

The Nationally Recognised Training (NRT) logo on testamurs was in greyscale and the term, 'Victorian Qualifications Authority', instead of the 'Victorian Registration and Qualifications Authority' was used on awards.

http://www.aqf.edu.au/Publications/AQFImplementationHandbook/tabid/198/Default.aspx.

Extension to scope processes

(AQTF 3.1)

The Courses and Pathways Services (CAPS), within the portfolio of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Institutional Services) is responsible for course development, maintenance, approval, and review processes at VU. Operationally CAPS works in partnership with a range of governance committees (such as the Education and Research Board and Faculty Boards of Study) and organisational units to ensure effective management to VU's courses and pathways.

The Education and Research Board (ERB) provides academic oversight of all new qualifications and major changes to existing qualifications. The Vice-Chancellor ultimately approves all changes and new qualifications after considering recommendations made by the ERB.

The TAFE Course Approvals Panel (TCAP; a sub-committee of the ERB) initially considers all new qualification submissions and proposals for major changes to existing further education and vocational education qualifications and makes recommendations to the ERB. Faculty-level Courses Committees and Boards of Studies consider all minor qualification and unit changes and report to TCAP via their Faculty Reports.

All minor modifications within courses offered by vocational and further education faculties are also reported to ERB in the Annual Course Declaration.

The VU submission included a flowchart that explained the process. Interviewees at audit, were familiar with the process and could explain how new qualifications/courses were approved.

Strengths

The audit team identified a number of areas of good practice. These included the RTO website, which provides comprehensive information, is engaging for students, and is easy to navigate.

The on-line quality system is also an excellent resource as it provides a 'one stop shop' for staff and ensures that staff members have easy access to policies and procedures, templates and advice, wherever they are working.

The self-assessment process encourages staff to take a systematic and comprehensive approach to continuous improvement. The peer review process promotes the exchange of ideas and acts as a balance to 'group think', which often occurs when external views are not included in the self-review process.

However, the audit team believed that as the self-assessment process matures that the RTO might consider strengthening the indicators for compliance.

Staff members demonstrated that they understand the RTO's assessment moderation processes and that impetus is building toward the implementation of these processes.

Summary and Systemic Issues Report

Victoria University

Audit found that the course development plan provided a strong template for course development and that training was generally of a good quality.

The range of support services, particularly in relation to language and literacy support, was impressive.

The Transport and Distribution program conducted with Connex was an excellent example of industry engagement and the Business programs conducted in China illustrate that the RTO has excellent business development strategies that have led to an exponential growth in programs in that country.

Finally, the openness of staff and their willingness to discuss issues and options at audit contributed to, for the auditors, a very constructive and enjoyable audit.

Recommendations for rectification were made in the relevant qualification reports; however, the University's systems will need to manage this rectification.

Auditors:

Andrea Bateman

Chloe Dyson

Attachments:

AQTF Qualification Reports (4).

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

RTO DETAILS

RTO Name	Victoria University	NTIS Number	3113
Address	Ballarat Rd, Footscray		
		Website	http://www.vu.edu.au
Registration Contact	Ms Shirley Lim (on NTIS)		
Phone Number	03/9919 8593	E-mail	shirley.lim@vu.edu.au
Student Numbers			

AUDIT TEAM

Lead Auditor	Chloe Dyson	Auditor/s	Andrea Bateman
Technical Advisor/s		Observer/s	

REGISTERING BODY DETAILS

Contact Person	Jerzy Gill		
Phone Number	9637 2744	E-mail	gill.jerzy.j@edumail.vic.gov.au

AUDIT DETAILS

Type of Audit	Re-registration
Standards audited	1, 2, 3
Conditions audited	6
Audit Date/s	28-29 October, 2009
Other audit notes	The program is conducted as a joint venture with Connex, with the VU staff located at Connex. The course has 300 people enrolled, with 130 in their last year of the qualification. There are 3.5 EFT trainers, 1 administrative staff member and 1 project manager. The target group are station staff and ticket inspectors/authorised officers. Records are maintained at Connex, but are transferred to Werribee Campus.

FOCUS OF AUDIT

QUALIFICATION/UNIT OF COMPETENCE/ACCREDITED COURSE

NTIS Code	Qualification/Unit of Competence/Accredited Course (as per NTIS)	Delivery Site
TDT30402	Certificate III in Transport and Distribution (Rail Operations) and aspects of TLI30407 Certificate III in Transport & Logistics	Flinders St

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091106 AQTF TDT Report (final).doc

Page 1 of 11

INTERVIEWEE/S (Staff name and position; employer name and position; students by program, do not list by name)	
Dennis Saunders – Head of School, Industry Skills Training	Amanda Achterberg – Manager of Quality, Vocational Education and Training
Scott Minniece – Program Manager, Industry Skills Training	

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

Standard 1: The RTO provides quality training and assessment across all of its operations		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The RTO was non compliant with this standard.	Compliant	
1.1 Continuous improvement of training and assessment	Non-compliant	✓
Validation – the team considers that validation is making sure that the delivery team are providing what the client needs and that it also meets what the Training Package requires. There was a validation meeting which involved two staff members directly developing the materials; 6 people were invited and 4 came, including Connex. The developers ran through the program with the training and the assessment, like a mock class. This is a trial, not a validation per se of assessment tools.	Not audited	
Moderation – the team considers that moderation is making sure that assessors are all doing it the same way. It involves looking at training materials and checking that they are assessing in a similar way. This had been done recently and materials updated.		
There was evidence of validation undertaken; but the purpose of moderation was not made clear by the team and the strategies noted did not reflect the definitions provided by the Institute. Assessment Moderation Report does not enable the recording of who was present at the activity; given that moderation is about ensuring assessor reliability, then this would be essential.		
Outcomes of validation were not sufficiently robust to identify issues inherent in the assessment tools.		
Recommendation RTO is to ensure that validation is sufficiently robust to identify issues inherent in the assessment tools. Refer 1.5.		
1.2 Training and assessment strategies Strategy: Assessment methods nominated do not reflect those used.		
Training Plan: Assessment methods noted for the units were:		
• *THHGCS03B Deal with conflict situations* – activities, knowledge questions, on-job observations		
• *TLIJ207C Apply quality systems* – activities, knowledge questions, on-job observations.		
Assessment methods noted were not reflective of those used.		

Recommendation
RTO is to ensure that the strategies and the Training Plan provide accurate information in terms of assessment methods.

1.3 & 1.4 Staffing
With the transition of the program to the new Training Package, the delivery team has not ensured that the competencies taught have been demonstrated by the team. This is also an issue with the TDT program. There is no clear strategy in place to ensure that staff members meet currency requirements of 1.5 and requirements embedded in the Training Package.

Scott Minniece:
Certificate IV in TAA 2005, Diploma in Training and Assessment Systems, BSZ40198, Certificate III in Food Processing (2002), TDT40202 Certificate IV in Transport & Distribution (Road Transport) 2004, TLI40407 Certificate IV in Transport & Logistics (Rail Operations) 2009. CV indicates background in the industry. PD indicates soft skills, with no additional development of training and assessment skills. *No clear alignment to units in this qualification, or to those in the new Training Package.*

Rick Puchala:
Certificate IV in TAA 2006, Diploma in Training and Assessment Systems, BSZ40198, Certificate III in Transport & Distribution (Warehousing & Storage) 2006, Certificate III in Transport & Distribution (Administration) 2006, Certificate III in Transport & Distribution (Road Transport) 2001, TLI40407 Certificate IV in Transport & Logistics (Rail Operations) 2009. CV indicates background in industry. PD indicates soft skills and none related to teaching and learning. *No clear alignment to units in this qualification, or to those in the new Training Package.*

Brad Pratt:
Certificate IV in TAA 2006, BSZ40198, Certificate III in Transport & Distribution (Warehousing) 2002, Certificate IV in Transport & Logistics (Rail Operations) 2009, Certificate III in Transport & Distribution (Rail Operations). CV indicates background in industry. PD indicates soft skills and none related to teaching and learning. *No clear alignment to units in the new Training Package.*

Ann Tauman:
Certificate IV in TAA 2009, Diploma in Training and Assessment Systems, Certificate IV In Competency Based Training, Diploma of Project Management, Diploma of Business (Office Management) – no units listed 1999, selected units of TDT package and partial completion of Certificate III in Transport & Logistics (Rail Operations). CV indicates limited PD, but a background in training and assessment and 'rail' training. PD is limited noted for 2009. *No clear alignment to units in this qualification, or to those in the new Training Package.*

Stephen Boezalt:
Certificate IV in TAA 2009, BSZ40198, Bachelor of Arts (India – not determined equivalence to AQF), Diploma in Clinical Hypnosis, Certificate III in Public Transport Customer Service and Compliance, Certificate IV in Counselling & Conflict Resolution. CV indicates experience as customer service officer for Connex. No PD submitted – currency not confirmed. *No clear alignment to units in this qualification, or to those in the new Training Package.*

Brian Swanson:
Diploma of Education 1977, Bachelor of Business, Graduate Certificate of Business and partial completion of Certificate III in Transport & Logistics (Rail Operations). CV indicates experience as a trainer – not specific to rail operations. PD was limited and related to soft skills. *No clear alignment to units in this qualification, or to those in the new Training Package. Does not meet NQC requirements.*

Brian Swanson: Supervision: Provided with information pertaining to 'how to deliver and how to assess it', follow up after he delivers the training. Assessment – uses the assessment tools that are given to him. Goes through what is required etc – post assessment part of that discussion. When he does deliver it is just a follow up; where there any issues, go over it. In the meeting may bring a student sample, and that goes back to the student, but there is a summary sheet that goes on student file. There does not appear to be co-assessment strategies in place.

Recommendation
Ensure that all staff members meet NQC requirements. Ensure that there is in place an agreed approach

1.3 & 15. Assessment
Assessment tools were not well developed and the assessment information was conflicting.

THHGCS03B Dealing with conflict:
Student Assessment information indicates that the assessment methods are noted as:

- Observation (in training sessions)
- Written/oral
- Consultation with third party (team leader).

The tasks noted on the Student Assessment information were:

- Participation in and successful completion of **all** training activities

- Observations of task

- Successful completion of all knowledge questions (with answers).

The delivery team stated that the assessments were:

1. Written response – knowledge checks and scenarios to be completed in the candidates' 3rd year. An Answer Guide was provided, but in some instance no expected response was provided, e.g. 'as per individuals' personal experiences'. This is inadequate as the assessors should be provided with some indication as to what is 'expected in the response'.

2. Specific activities within the course (Roleplay Activity 3 and safety flowchart, p. 14 of Facilitator Booklet). The delivery team indicated that they say up front that these activities are assessable; however, the training booklet does not indicate that these activities are different from other activities. There is no expected response for the safety flowchart, and the checklist for the observation is limited in detail.

3. Candidates are working on the job and therefore competence is assumed for third party reference. No assessment tool developed

The assessment tool does not cover the scope of the unit and was not fully developed for all assessment methods. The assessment tool lacked validity as not all evidence was collected to determine competence over time.

TLIJ207C Apply quality systems:
Student Assessment information indicates that the assessment methods are:

1. Observation (in training sessions)

2. Written and/or oral questioning.

Assessment tasks are listed in the Student Assessment information as:

1. Participation in, and successful completion of, all training activities

2. Observations of tasks

3. Successful completion of Workplace Project and Presentation.

The delivery team indicated that the assessment was :

- Project

- Written questions (provided with answers, but in some instances these provide little advice to the assessors).

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

The project is not defined in the Assessment Booklet, but is documented in the session plan. This includes visiting 2 stations and the groups to return to Flinders St Station classroom and put together a plan/drawing reflecting changes/upgrades for Richmond Station to be a 'Fit for Purpose' station. The groups are to deliver a presentation to the class unveiling 'their' new Richmond Station 'Fit for purpose'. The delivery team stated that the team is to prepare the presentation and diagram and outline:

- Continuous improvement – still made an improvement

- Justify their improvement, benefits.

However, there is no advice to the assessors as to how to address assessment of a group and also as to the level of performance required.

Submitted in the assessment tool was an observation checklist for which there is no purpose defined – there is no task.

Recommendation
RTO is to ensure that assessments meet Training Package requirements.

Strengths

1.1 Course review processes have worked well for the delivery team.

Opportunities for Improvement

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Standard 2: The RTO adheres to principles of access and equity and maximises outcomes for its clients		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The RTO was compliant with this standard.	Compliant	✓
	Non-compliant	
	Not audited	

Strengths

2.3 There was strong engagement between the delivery team and Connex.

Opportunities for Improvement

2.2 It was noted that the sample Training Plan included inaccurate titling of units and capitalisation. As these are specific units of competency, then accuracy is required.

2.4 Although the participants are screened via Connex's processes, it is strongly suggested that student learning and support needs should also be addressed by VU processes.

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Standard 3: Management systems are responsive to the needs of clients, staff and stakeholders, and the environment in which the RTO operates		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The RTO was non compliant with this standard.	Compliant	
Staff competence	Non-compliant	✓
The RTO does not have effective systems in place to confirm trainer and assessor competencies in light of the National Quality Council (NQC) requirements.	Not audited	
The delivery team acknowledge that there needs to be a plan for competency upgrade; however, this has not occurred and the delivery team have been providing the new Training Package qualification.		
There is no strategy in place for teams to confirm co-assessment arrangements, to ensure that the strategies and actions employed meet requirements.		
Recommendation The RTO is required to revise its processes so that all trainers and assessors meet NQC requirements for trainer and assessor competence.		
Testamurs Submitted was:		
• Sample qualification which included inaccurate title of Victorian Registration and Qualification Authority, greyscale NRT logo (when only black, green or green and red are permitted within the logo specifications). It included the employability skills clause when this qualification has not been updated with the employability skills inclusions.		
• Statement of Attainment which included greyscale logo NRT and did not include the second, additional clause as required by the *AQF Implementation Handbook.*		
Recommendation The Institute will need to ensure that awards meet the requirements of the AQF Implementation Handbook.		
Arrangements The Institute does not have a policy or procedure related to establishing service agreements or auspice agreements. The agreement between VU and UST:		

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

- Included outdated TDT codes

- Does not make clear the quality assurance strategies and the contract management strategies to be employed. These need to be measurable so that they are auditable/reviewed.

Recommendation
The RTO is required to revise its processes for contract management so that clear direction is provided to staff regarding how contracts are required to be established and managed, and quality assured.

At team level

- Competency of trainers and assessors was not confirmed at audit (element 1.4)

- Supervision and co-assessment strategies were not robustly defined or implemented (element 1.4)

- Awards did not meet *AQF Implementation Handbook* requirements (refer Condition 6).

- Contract monitoring and review processes were not defined and, as such, did not ensure that AQTF requirements were met.

Recommendation
The team is required to implement the RTO's revised processes relating to:

- Trainer and assessor competence

- Supervision and co-assessment strategies

- Awards

- Contract management.

Strengths

3.1 Joint venture agreement included a Management Committee which was well defined in terms of meeting processes.

Opportunities for Improvement

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

Condition 6 – Certification And Issuing Of Qualifications And Statements Of Attainment		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The RTO was non compliant with this condition.	Compliant	
Submitted was:	Non-compliant	✓
• Sample qualification which included inaccurate title of Victorian Registration and Qualification Authority, greyscale NRT logo (when only black, green or green and red are permitted within the logo specifications. It included the employability skills clause when this qualification has not been updated with the employability skills inclusions.	Not audited	
• Statement of Attainment which included greyscale logo NRT and not the second additional clause as required by the *AQF Implementation Handbook.*		
Statement of Attainment is used to accompany the certificate or for partial completion.		
A Statement of Results can be downloaded by students at any time from the VU website.		
Recommendation The RTO is required to revise its testamurs.		
Strengths		
Opportunities for improvement		

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

RTO DETAILS

RTO Name	Victoria University	NTIS Number	3113
Address	Ballarat Rd, Footscray		
		Website	http://www.vu.edu.au
Registration Contact	Ms Shirley Lim (on NTIS)		
Phone Number	03/9919 8593	E-mail	shirley.lim@vu.edu.au
Student Numbers			

AUDIT TEAM

Lead Auditor	Chloe Dyson	Auditor/s	Andrea Bateman
Technical Advisor/s		Observer/s	

REGISTERING BODY DETAILS

Contact Person	Jerzy Gill		
Phone Number	9637 2744	E-mail	gill.jerzy.j@edumail.vic.gov.au

AUDIT DETAILS

Type of Audit	Re-registration
Standards audited	1, 2, 3
Conditions audited	6
Audit Date/s	28–29 October 2009
Other audit notes	In regards to traineeships, the School has a number of auspice arrangements; from front line management to legal service, to small business. Program Manager looks after traineeships in the school. The program is delivered solely through traineeships and through auspice relationships. The focus at VU is on providing the pathway to higher level qualifications. The auspice company covers about 100 stores Australia wide. The program is in transition, and therefore some evidence pertained to the SIR30207 program. Any rectifications in this report can be addressed against the newer program. This program is delivered via an auspice arrangement, MTD Fun Foods.

FOCUS OF AUDIT

QUALIFICATION/UNIT OF COMPETENCE/ACCREDITED COURSE

NTIS Code	Qualification/Unit of Competence/Accredited Course (as per NTIS)	Delivery Site
WRR30202	Certificate III in Retail	Various

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page 1 of 10

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October, 2009

INTERVIEWEE/S (Staff name and position; employer name and position; students by program; do not list by name)	
Robert Sheen – Head of School	Robyn Harris – Director, Governance, Policy and Planning Services
Leigh Edwards – Program Manager	Kerri-Anne Wane – MTD Fun Foods

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page **2** of **10**

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

Standard 1: The RTO provides quality training and assessment across all of its operations		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was non compliant with this element.	Compliant	
1.3 & 1.4 Staffing	Non-compliant	✓
The delivery team has not developed a process to ensure that the auspice delivery team meet NQC requirements (currency and training and assessment competencies) and also meet the new requirements of the Training Package. Certificates provided by the auspiced parties were not accompanied with a list of units to be able to determine if they have the equivalent competency. Therefore, it would be difficult to ensure that the team meets requirements for all units proposed.	Not audited	
Jared Byrne:		
Certificate III in Retail Operations January 2008		
Certificate IV In Training & Assessment December 2008		
Certificate IV in Retail Management June 2008		
PD: Diploma in Retail Management (Current)		
CV indicates past experience in the industry, but there was no PD around teaching, learning and assessment.		
No evidence of alignment to WRR units or SIR units.		
Kerri Anne Wane:		
Certificate IV In Training & Assessment 2007		
Certificate IV in Retail Management – not on file		
Bachelor Science (Psychology) – not on file		
CV shows experience – Diploma of Retail Management – not completed/currently undertaking		
PD log has a focus on Dominos context, but there was limited PD around teaching, learning and assessment, e.g. one workshop AQTF (Qld).		
No evidence of alignment to WRR units or SIR units.		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page 3 of 10

The delivery team acknowledge that there needs to be a plan for competency upgrade; however, this has not occurred and the delivery team have been providing the new Training Package qualification since 1 January 2009.

Recommendation
Ensure that staff members meet NQC requirements.

1.3 & 1.5 Assessment

WRRLP5B Apply store security systems and procedures
This unit relates to the maintenance and use of store security equipment, ensuring the safety and wellbeing of customers, detection and apprehension of thieves and application of post apprehension procedures. It requires knowledge of state legal proceedings, and preparing reports for policy/security personnel.

Assessment tool includes a Competency assessment map that aligned performance criteria, required skills and knowledge and critical aspects of evidence against the items/tasks.

Assessment tool included:

- A Required Skills & Knowledge check which is a tick sheet against the required Skills & Knowledge – the level of performance is not described for each job task. This is signed by the assessor.

- Sign off against 'safety and security test' and safety and security skills check' – these are not explained, but appear to be the summary outcome of the following. Assessment appears scored as a % is included – this is not commensurate with competency based assessment.

  - Written Test – with expected answers and marked by assessor

  - Skills Check – which is a list of job tasks, but is also a mix of 'can explain' items. The level of performance is not described for each job task. This is signed by the Store Manager with comments and signature by the assessor.

- Observation Checklist – The instructions refer to a role play or real environment situation. What role play or context for assessment is not explained for the assessor. The training manager (MTD Fun Foods) stated that this is usually a walk around the workplace and could take about 20 minutes. There were no performance indicators that define the level of performance required.

- Competency Conversation – includes a range of questions to be posed to the candidate; there are expected responses.

The assessment tool is not fully developed in terms of stimulus and response. In addition, there is no clear guidance about decision-making rules.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page 4 of 10

WRRS4B Building relationships with customers
This unit involves the use of advanced sales techniques in building relationships, applying expert product knowledge, dealing with difficult customers, establishing and maintaining a customer database, and conducting a sales presentation.

Assessment tool includes a Competency assessment map that aligned performance criteria, required skills and knowledge and critical aspects of evidence against the items/tasks.

Assessment tool included:

- A Required Skills & Knowledge check which is a tick sheet against the required Skills & Knowledge; the level of performance is not described for each job task. This is signed by the assessor.

- Sign off against 'customer service test'.

- 'CSR SOC' – which is a list of job tasks and observations (e.g. clothing) and also 'can explain' items. The level of performance is described for each job task. This is signed by the Assessor with comments. The training manager indicated that the station observation checklist is undertaken over the course of an hour at busy times – this is not explained.

- Competency Conversation – includes a range of questions to be posed to the candidate; there are expected responses. .

The assessment tool is not fully developed in terms of stimulus and response. In addition, there is no clear guidance about decision-making rules. The assessment tool lacks face validity as there is no 'establishment of a customer database' and no presentations are undertaken.

RPL:
RPL assessment tool included RPL/RCC Student Assessment Guide 2009, which outlined the process, including interview with assessor, collection of evidence, supervisor/third party reference, conversation with assessor, practical demonstration with assessor.
Sample *SITMER001A Merchandise products* (note that it should be *SIRXMER001A*), which included a tick sheet against methods used to simplified performance criteria and option to record comments. This is not a robust assessment tool for RPL and the Institute should review their approach to RPL assessment using such tools.

Supervisor Notes – that explain the process – there was no assessment tool for this method i.e. Using a supervisor report.

Recommendation
Review and revise assessment tools to ensure that they meet the requirements of the Training Package.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page 5 of 10

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

1.1 It is suggested that the VU delivery team takes a quality assurance approach to contract management of this auspice arrangement. It is suggested that the VU team considers more effective quality assurance arrangements when it comes to moderation and validation.

1.3 & 1.5 The file checklist includes VU requirement to have Police Check/Working with children check – it was unclear whether VU required delivery staff to meet these requirements in terms of auspice arrangements.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page **6** of **10**

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

Standard 2: The RTO adheres to principles of access and equity and maximises outcomes for its clients		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was compliant with this standard.	Compliant	✓
	Non-compliant	
	Not audited	

Strengths

Opportunities for improvement
2.2 Induction Kit – list of units uses inappropriate use of capitalisation. It is suggested that this adjusted. Induction kit outlines that there are 25 units to be completed in the nested qualification (Certificates I and II as well) when the Certificate III only requires 9 units. It is not made clear which units are those pertaining to Certificate III. Training Plan indicates 22 units when only 9 units are required – it is not made clear that this qualification encompasses other qualifications.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page **7** of **10**

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Standard 3: Management systems are responsive to the needs of clients, staff and stakeholders, and the environment in which the RTO operates		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was non compliant with this standard.	Compliant	
3.1 Quality system	Non-compliant	✓

Auspice arrangements
The Institute does not have a policy or procedure related to establishing service agreements or auspice agreements. A sample VETiS agreement is provided on the website. Sample agreement does not make it clear the quality assurance strategies and the contract management strategies to be employed. These need to be measurable so that they are auditable/reviewed.
 	
Recommendation
The RTO is required to revise its processes for contract management so that clear direction is provided to staff regarding how contracts are required to be established and managed.
 	
Testamurs
Submitted was:
 	
   • Sample qualification which included inaccurate title of Victorian Registration and Qualification Authority, greyscale NRT logo (when only black, green or green and red are permitted within the logo specifications). It included the employability skills clause when this qualification has not been updated with the employability skills inclusions.
 	
Recommendation
The Institute will need to ensure that awards meet the requirements of the *AQF Implementation Handbook.*
 	
At team level
 	
   • Auspiced arrangements were not managed effectively (refer elements 3.2, 3.3)
 	
   • Awards did not meet *AQF Implementation Handbook* requirements (refer Condition 6).
 	
Recommendation
The team is required to implement the RTO's revised processes relating to:
	Not audited	

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page **8** of **10**

- Management of auspiced arrangements

- Awards.

3.2 Auspice arrangement
The Institute does not have a policy or procedure related to establishing service agreements or auspice agreements. A sample VETiS agreement is provided on the website.

Provided was an agreement between Victoria University and MTD Fun Foods Pty Ltd. The agreement is on an annual basis. The agreement does not make it clear the quality assurance strategies and the contract management strategies to be employed. These need to be measurable so that they are auditable/reviewed.

Agreement included:

- Inaccurate or truncated qualification titles

- Provision to develop a validation/moderation schedule.

Agreement does not include provision of services for new Training Package qualifications.

Recommendation
The delivery team is required implement the RTO's revised process for the establishment, monitoring and review of auspiced arrangements (refer element 3.1).

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page 9 of 10

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

Condition 6 – Certification And Issuing Of Qualifications And Statements Of Attainment		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was non compliant with this condition.	Compliant	
Submitted was:	Non-compliant	✓
• Sample qualification which included inaccurate title of Victorian Registration and Qualification Authority, greyscale NRT logo (when only black, green or green and red are permitted within the logo specifications. It included the employability skills clause when this qualification has not been updated with the employability skills inclusions.	Not audited	

Statement of Attainment is used to accompany the Certificate or for partial completion.

A Statement of Results can be downloaded by students at any time from the VU website.

Recommendation
The RTO is required to revise its testamurs.

Strengths

Opportunities for improvement

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091105 AQTF VU WRR Report (final).doc

Page **10** of **10**

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

RTO DETAILS

RTO Name	Victoria University	NTIS Number	3113
Address	Ballarat Rd, Footscray		
		Website	http://www.vu.edu.au
Registration Contact	Ms Shirley Lim (on NTIS)		
Phone Number	03/9919 8593	E-mail	shirley.lim@vu.edu.au
Student Numbers			

AUDIT TEAM

Lead Auditor	Chloe Dyson	Auditor/s	
Technical Advisor/s		Observer/s	

REGISTERING BODY DETAILS

Contact Person	Jerzy Gill		
Phone Number	9637 2744	E-mail	gill.jerzy.j@edumail.vic.gov.au

AUDIT DETAILS

Type of Audit	Re-registration
Standards audited	1, 2, 3
Conditions audited	6
Audit Date/s	28–29 October 2009
Other audit notes	

FOCUS OF AUDIT

QUALIFICATION/UNIT OF COMPETENCE/ACCREDITED COURSE

NTIS Code	Qualification/Unit of Competence/Accredited Course (as per NTIS)	Delivery Site
BSB50101	Diploma of Business	China, King St, Footscray

INTERVIEWEE/S (Staff name and position; employer name and position; students by program; do not list by name)

Ms Maria Kouppas – Head of School, School of Business and Hospitality	Mr George Hall – Teacher, School of Enterprise
Mr Gil Davidson – Program Manager, School of Business and Hospitality	Ms Robyn Harris – Director, Governance, Policy and Planning Services

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

Standard 1: The RTO provides quality training and assessment across all of its operations		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was not compliant in this standard.	Compliant	
Element 1.2 Strategies for training and assessment	Non-compliant	✓
Industry consultation: Aim is to provide a qualification that leads to tertiary education – a grounding to go on to further study. The team has not done a formal consultation. Instead, the delivery team used sessional staff members who are working in the Industry to ensure that industry requirements are met. However, this process is not formalised, does not apply to all units of competency and is not sufficiently broad to ensure that training and assessment meets industry requirements. The course development plan does not accurately describe actual assessment methods used.	Not audited	
Recommendation That the RTO provides evidence of the outcomes of industry consultation that is representative of the industry and of the impact of this consultation on the strategies for training and assessment. **Elements 1.3 and 1.4 Staffing** **Sessional staff** The team has advertised for sessional staff and also uses people trainers know. Program Manager, School of Business and Hospitality, looks at qualifications and experience and provides sessionals with an overview of the program and requirements of working at VU. If new staff will be teaching on-shore the Program Manager, School of Business and Hospitality, goes through the VU induction process, including validation of documents and experience. **However, as evidenced by the staff files examined at audit, this process is not carried out for staff working in China.** **Henan staff** Staff at audit stated that they believed that in China that the local teaching qualification was equivalent to the TAA40104. There is no formalisation of the equivalence, but as the education system in China is not competency based and the approach to education in China is not consultative or activity based, it is highly unlikely that the conclusion regarding equivalence is defensible. <u>Shu Chen Li</u> No record of induction on staff file checklist. No vocational experience in business. Canadian qualifications – Master of Arts in Economics and Bachelor of Arts in Economics. No equivalency established with the units taught and assessed. No record of professional development. No TAA40104 and no supervision or co-assessment arrangements in place. <u>Liu Fei</u>		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 2 of 9

No record of induction on staff file checklist. No vocational experience in business. Master of Science in Finance (Chinese qualification). No professional development record. No equivalency established with the units taught and assessed. No TAA40104 and no supervision or co-assessment arrangements in place.

VU staff

<u>Aron Lipson</u>
No record of induction on staff file checklist. Limited vocational experience in **1996**. Has completed some units from a Diploma of Business, but not the units he is delivering and assessing. BSZ40198 (VU 2002); Bachelor of Economics 1972. No evidence that he holds the units he is training and assessing and equivalence has not been established. No professional development plan or evidence of recent professional development on the trainer's file.

<u>Mike Hulks</u>
Vocational background – CV provides detail of relevant experience until **2000, but** not subsequently. No referee check on the file. BSZ40198 (VU, 2001), has completed units from Diploma of Business (Human Resources), but not the units he is delivering and assessing and equivalence has not been established. Master of Business (VU, 2003). No professional development plan or evidence of recent professional development on the trainer's file.

<u>George Hall</u>
CV provides a general statement about work experience, but no dates are provided, employers are not provided, nor descriptions of duties for positions held. No reference check on the file. Diploma of Business (Accounting) (VU, 2000) units completed, but not the units he is delivering and assessing and equivalence has not been established. TSU08 Certificate IV in Workplace Training Cat 2 (VU, 1999). His commencement date at VU was not on his CV so it could not be established that equivalence with BSZ40198 was substantiated before the TAA40104 rollover date. No professional development plan or evidence of recent professional development on the trainer's file.

Summary: For the two Henan staff files examined at audit, there was not evidence that the trainers held the units of competency they were training and assessing or their equivalent, that they held vocational currency, or that they continued to develop their competence. For both staff, there was not evidence that they held the TAA40104 or its equivalent or that supervision and co-assessment arrangements were in place. The RTO does not have a system in place to determine equivalence with the TAA40104.

For the three VU staff files examined there was not evidence that the trainers held the units of competency they were training and assessing or their equivalent, that they held vocational currency, or that they continued to develop their competence. For one trainer there was not evidence that he held the TAA40104 or its equivalent.

BSBMKG501A Evaluate marketing opportunities
Assessment is two assignments (40%) and one exam (60%). Students are required to design the simulated environment – they describe a real

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 3 of 9

company, based on research into the company. This does not represent a simulated workplace as the questions provided to students about the context for assessment do not draw out sufficient information. Also, as students are asked to research a specific business as their assessment context, students do not have access to policies and procedures or marketing plan and other company documentation. There is no requirement for candidates to apply the skills and knowledge component in the unit of competency and the scope of the unit is not addressed in assessment.

It is the RTO's responsibility to develop and quality-assure the simulated environment so that it meets Training Package requirements. Under the heading, *Assessment in a simulated environment,* page 122 of the 2001 Business Services Training Package it states: In order to be valid and reliable, the simulation must closely represent what actually occurs in the workplace, and should seek to replicate an actual work setting. It is critical that the designer of the simulation is thoroughly familiar with the expression of the competency and is experienced in the current circumstances of the work. In deciding whether a simulation or an assessment environment has been adequately designed, the following questions should be asked: Are there opportunities to:

- Test the full range of equipment?

- Use up to date equipment and software?

- Reflect time pressures and deadlines?

- Show the complexity of dealing with multiple tasks?

- Involve prioritising among competing tasks?

- Deal with customers, including difficult ones?

- Work with others in a team?

- Communicate with diverse groups?

- Find, discuss and test solutions to problems?

- Explore health and safety issues?

- Answer practically oriented, applied knowledge questions?

- Show the level of written and verbal expression sufficient for, but not exceeding, the work requirements?

The delivery team has not created a simulated environment for assessment for the two units examined (BSBMKG501A and BSBFLM514A), as required by the Training Package.

BSBFLM514A Manage people

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 4 of 9

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Assessment is two assignments (40% of total) and 1 exam (60%). Assignment 1 is questions requiring the candidates to state how they would address particular issues. The questions relate to management functions and roles of managers. Assignment 2 requires students to conduct a short survey, analyse and rank issues, develop an action plan and explain this to the students surveyed. The exam is 8 questions conducted over 3 hours in exam conditions. Model answers provided. There is no requirement for candidates to apply the skills and knowledge component in the unit of competency and the scope of the unit is not addressed in assessment. A real workplace or simulated environment as required in the context statement in the unit of competency is not created for assessment purposes.

Summary
Assessment does not meet the requirements of the Training Package for the two units examined at audit because a simulated environment is not provided for assessment; the majority of assessment is an exam which does not allow for the application of skills and knowledge and is contrary to principles of competency based assessment, and the scope of the units is not addressed.

Recommendation
The RTO is required to revise all assessment for the Diploma of Business so that it meets the requirements of the Training Package.

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

Element 1.1:
The process described at audit for the development and validation of assessment was that assessment materials were developed so that the course requirements were assessed. Trainers did not seem to be aware of the need to check assessment tasks against the requirements of the units of competency and assessment tools examined at audit illustrated that this form of validation did not occur. It is strongly suggested that the team is provided with professional development on unpacking competency standards and validation of assessment.

Program Manager, School of Business and Hospitality, said that he would follow up with subject coordinator in China if there were aberrations in marking. This follow up is not documented and this is an opportunity lost as, although exam papers are changed in response to irregular processes, systemic issues are not effectively documented. It is suggested that the team more effectively document changes to assessment processes made in response to moderation.

Element 1.2:
Course self-assessment outcome: Program Manager, School of Business and Hospitality, stated that the process alerted the team to the quality processes, but it appeared at audit that he had little recall of the outcomes of the self-assessment. Given this, it would appear that the self-assessment process was not conducted as rigorously as planned by the RTO. It is suggested that staff are provided with more professional development in the RTO's self-assessment processes so that the intent of the self-assessment process (that is, that there is a thorough examination of the operations of the team) is realised.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page **5** of **9**

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

Standard 2: The RTO adheres to principles of access and equity and maximises outcomes for its clients		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The RTO was compliant in this standard.	Compliant	✓
	Non-compliant	
	Not audited	
Strengths		
Opportunities for improvement		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 6 of 9

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Standard 3: Management systems are responsive to the needs of clients, staff and stakeholders, and the environment in which the RTO operates		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The RTO was not compliant in this standard.	Compliant	
Element 3.1 Management systems	Non-compliant	✓
<u>**Staff competence (AQTF Elements 1.3 and 1.4)**</u>	Not audited	
The RTO does not have effective systems in place to confirm trainer and assessor competencies in light of the National Quality Council (NQC) requirements.		
Recommendation		
The RTO is required to revise its processes so that all trainers and assessors meet NQC requirements for trainer and assessor competence.		
<u>**Qualifications and Statement of Attainment**</u> **(AQTF Condition 6)**		
Under the AQTF, the Conditions of Registration consist of nine non-negotiable requirements that form an RTO's contractual agreement with the registering body.		
It was revealed at audit that, at system level, , the Certificates were not compliant because the NRT logo is in greyscale and the phrase 'Issued under the authority of the 'Victorian Qualifications Authority' is used on the testamur, when the 'Victorian Registration and Qualifications Authority' should be used.		
Recommendation		
The University will need to ensure that awards meet the requirements of the AQF Implementation Handbook.		
<u>**Contract management (element 3.1 – refer below)**</u>		
The agreement did not specify agreement monitoring and review processes. For example, there was no description of agreed responsibilities relating to quality-assurance requirements, nor clear plans in place for the scheduling and reviewing of these responsibilities.		
Recommendation		
The RTO is required to revise its processes for contract management so that clear direction is provided to staff regarding how contracts are required to be established and managed.		
At team level		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 7 of 9

- Competency of trainers and assessors was not confirmed at audit (element 1.4).

- Awards did not meet AQF Implementation Handbook requirements (refer condition 6).

- Contract monitoring and review processes did not ensure that AQTF requirements were met.

Recommendation

The team is required to implement the RTO's revised processes relating to:

- Trainer and assessor competence

- Awards

- Contract management.

Contract management

There are no contract management arrangements in the agreement and schedule and there is no strategy in place to systematically monitor and review the agreement. The Program Manager, School of Business and Hospitality stated that if the Henan project managers were unhappy with the performance of VU that he would hear about this; the teacher at audit provided an example of how he reported on misuse of exams and the Head of School of Business and Hospitality described how she negotiated to have a whole set of exams returned to VU as there were some questions about their misuse. However, these are examples of 'fire fighting', not a strategic approach and the auditor considers that there is insufficient guidance regarding VU's requirements and how these requirements are monitored.

Recommendation

The RTO is required to revise its processes for contract management. Refer to discussion of systemic issues, above.

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 8 of 9

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Condition 6 – Certification And Issuing Of Qualifications And Statements Of Attainment		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	**✓**
The Statement of Attainment provided at audit listed 6 units of competency and stated it related to a conferred award. The qualification is comprised of eight units thus a qualification should not have been conferred as stated.	Compliant	
	Non-compliant	✓
The NRT logo on awards is in greyscale and the Statement of Attainment does not hold the required clause. No list of units is attached to Certificate – a Statement of Attainment is issued with the Certificate. The phrase 'Issued under the authority of the 'Victorian Qualifications Authority' appears on the testamur, when the 'Victorian Registration and Qualifications Authority' should be used.	Not audited	
Recommendation The RTO is required to carry out a systematic review of Statements of Attainment provided to students to ensure that conferred awards include the required number of units of competency. Refer also to Element 3.1.		
Strengths		
Opportunities for Improvement		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091103 AQTF BSB VU Report (final).doc

Page 9 of 9

RTO: Victoria University
Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

RTO DETAILS

RTO Name	Victoria University	NTIS Number	3113
Address	Ballarat Rd, Footscray		
		Website	http://www.vu.edu.au
Registration Contact	Ms Shirley Lim (on NTIS)		
Phone Number	03/9919 8593	E-mail	shirley.lim@vu.edu.au
Student Numbers			

AUDIT TEAM

Lead Auditor	Chloe Dyson	Auditor/s	
Technical Advisor/s		Observer/s	

REGISTERING BODY DETAILS

Contact Person	Jerzy Gill		
Phone Number	9637 2744	E-mail	gill.jerzy.j@edumail.vic.gov.au

AUDIT DETAILS

Type of Audit	Re-registration
Standards audited	1, 2, 3
Conditions audited	6
Audit Date/s	28–29 October, 2009
Other audit notes	

FOCUS OF AUDIT

QUALIFICATION/UNIT OF COMPETENCE/ACCREDITED COURSE

NTIS Code	Qualification/Unit of Competence/Accredited Course (as per NTIS)	Delivery Sites
TAA40104	Certificate IV in Training and Assessment	Melbourne, workplaces, Samoa

INTERVIEWEE/S (Staff name and position, employer name and position, students by program, do not list by name)

Evelyn Ibrahim – Head of School, Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching	Robert Douglas – Course Coordinator / Trainer, Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching
Julie Hayles – Acting Head of School, School of Finance and Library	Dianne Mahoney – Course Coordinator / Teacher, School of Finance and Library
Amanda Achterberg – Manager of Quality (Vocational and Further Education	David Kay – Teacher, Samoan delivery

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page **1** of **11**

AQTF Post Initial Audit

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

AQTF 2007 AUDIT REPORT

Standard 1: The RTO provides quality training and assessment across all of its operations		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was not compliant in this standard.	Compliant	
Element 1.1 Continuous improvement of training and assessment	Non-compliant	✓
Samoan agreement A report (September 2009) was provided that spoke in general terms about the program, but although issues were identified there was no further action proposed. There was an email (19/10/09) from the partner saying that assessment validation had not yet taken place. The trainer, David Kay, stated that Jane Perry, another trainer delivering in Samoa as part of the auspiced arrangements had handwritten records of validation of assessment materials, but he did not have them at audit and they have not been provided to VU. **School of Finance and Library** The team has not completed its self-assessment and action plan. **Recommendation** The RTO is required to ensure that its processes to support the continuous improvement of training and assessment are implemented across all teams. **Element 1.2 Strategies for training and assessment** **Samoan program** Course delivery plan provided. Email from D Kay to a Samoan Government contact, but there was no response in relation to the shape of the program. List provided of people consulted with in the Inception report, but no conclusions provided regarding how consultation informed the development of the TAA40104 program. The Course Delivery plan contains little information about how training and assessment is structured. The block dates indicate training is from February 2 to May 8. There is a course inception plan, but this does not provide information about delivery and assessment methodologies. The trainer explained that a portfolio is developed for assessment purposes, but it is not clear from the portfolio instructions whether this portfolio of evidence is generated after training, a portfolio for RPL purposes or a combination of the two. **Recommendation** The RTO is required to ensure that there are clear and accurate strategies for training and assessment in place for all programs.	Not audited	

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 2 of 11

Element 1.3 Resources **School of Finance and Library** TAA session plan, marketing materials, presentation slides and course delivery materials sighted at audit. One hour is devoted to delivery of the unit *Participate in assessment validation* in the TAA session plan. There are two slides devoted to assessment validation. The definition of assessment validation used is patently inadequate and validation processes and types of validation approaches are not addressed in the slides or the session plan. There are two pages allocated to assessment validation in the learning materials. Further information is provided in these pages, but the resources are inadequate –they do not begin to address the requirements of the unit of competency. The materials for delivery of the unit *Assess competence* are also inadequate and the time allocated for delivery of this unit is three hours, which does not allow sufficient time for practice and consolidation before assessment takes place. The team stated that the TAA Toolbox is used for delivery, but there is no reference to these resources in the learning materials. **Samoan program** In relation to knowledge requirements the training and assessment materials refer to the Samoan Qualifications framework. There is a document titled 20/1/09 Sequencing and Facilitation, which is a series of notes that seem to be suggestions for planning the sessions in relation to allocating roles – less than1.5 pages – but this does not provide a clear plan of what is addressed in the program. The learner resource has been contextualised for the Samoan context and describes the Samoan education and training system, not the Australian one. The TAA40104 Training Package relates to the Australian VET system and this is not addressed in the training and assessment materials. Refer also to elements 1.4 (non compliant) and 1.5 (non compliant). **Recommendation** The RTO is required to provide evidence that there is robust training methodology in place that assists learners to develop the skills and knowledge outlined for the units of competency delivered. This methodology must be supported by comprehensive training resources. Refer also to elements 1.4 (non compliant) and 1.5 (non compliant). **Elements 1.3 and 1.4 Staffing** For the Samoan program, no evidence was provided at audit that the RTO had defined and gained agreement to the roles and responsibilities of trainers for the TAA40104 program, in relation to the Institute's policies and procedures. **Recommendation** Refer element 3.1.		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 3 of 11

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Elements 1.3 and 1.5 Assessment

School of Finance and Library

Assess competence:
Candidates are asked to select a unit that can be assessed in class in 15 minutes. This has implications for sufficiency and validity of evidence, given the scope of TAAASS402C. Candidates conduct an assessment in class and are required to conduct another assessment at the workplace providing a third party checklist for validation. An assessment plan is to be developed for both assessments. They are asked to critique the assessment. No guidance is provided for the self-critique for candidates; therefore knowledge requirements of the unit are unlikely to be met. Candidates are not required to conduct an RPL assessment as required by the unit of competency.

Participate in assessment validation:
One in-class assessment validation and action plan and 'Participate in at least one validation session and report on the experience. If there is not an opportunity to participate in one the work with a colleague or another assessor and go through mini assessment review and validation. Outline an assessment validation strategy that you could suggest to your organisation if there is not one in place.'
The unit requirement to use different validation processes is not met in the assessment materials. Also, the requirement to make improvements to assessment is not met in the assessment materials. The way in which assessment validation is described indicates a narrow understanding of the range of assessment validation. There is no requirement to apply reasonable adjustment as required by the unit.

Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching (CILT)

Assess competence:
Candidates are required to trial two assessment tools, including one RPL assessment, although this activity is completed as a role play in class and the whole RPL process is not carried out; thus insufficient evidence is collected. It is not clear from the assessment instructions whether the RPL role play is observed by the assessor. If this is the case, an observation checklist was not provided with the assessment materials. If the activity is not observed, there is no strategy to assess communication, negotiation and support as required by the unit. There is no requirement to apply reasonable adjustment as required by the unit.

Participate in assessment validation:
Candidates are required to provide documents from two validation sessions and to write an essay. The assessment instructions do not address the specific evidence requirements of the unit. Candidates are not required to participate in two validation sessions using different validation approaches, nor are they required to make improvements to assessment as a result of validation.

Samoan program
Assessment materials provided at audit consisted of two pages of dot points, with the heading 'Assessment'. The instruction states that 'To be assessed as competent in the assessment stream you must provide evidence that you can do all the things listed in the units of competence'. No tasks are described and no specific evidence requirements are provided. Instructions for candidates do not provide sufficient guidance. No

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 4 of 11

instructions for assessors were provided.

In relation to knowledge requirements it refers to the Samoan Qualifications framework. The TAA40104 Training Package refers to the Australian VET system and this is not addressed in the training and assessment materials.

Also provided was a template. For the two units examined at audit this template included a description of the unit of competency, a listing of the elements and performance criteria and a **checklist** which refers to:

- for the unit, *Assess Competence,* assessment planning template developed and submitted, explanation of the assessment plan, 'documentary evidence as per document guide' (the document guide is a list of evidence that could, not must, be provided), interview and 'other'. There is a narrow column for the assessor (it is assumed) to write in types of evidence. There is nothing in this document to elicit evidence that the specific evidence requirements of the unit are met, nor the skills and knowledge requirements of the unit. It is not designed to collect sufficient valid evidence and the evidence recording mechanism is inadequate.

- For the unit, *Participate in assessment validation,* the template is similar. The specific evidence requirements of the unit are not met, evidence requirements are unclear and there is no assessment of skills and knowledge.

RPL
In the audit folder under the heading 'Skills Recognition' there was a template with the heading, 'Australian Accredited Training and Assessment p/l'. It is not clear why VU is using the assessment materials of another RTO. These materials include a summary of a self-rating against the element of competency and a self-assessment against the performance criteria of the units of competency. This is poor practice as the RTO has not used the units of competency to develop an assessment tool that can be interpreted effectively by candidates and has disaggregated the unit so that candidates are not provided with a description of competence. There are no instructions to assessors and the instructions to candidates are incomplete.

Student sample

School of Finance and Library
TAAASS402C and *TAAASS404B* **clustered.**
There were two assessments, one of which is against a NRT unit of competency. There was also a partially completed assessment plan, question and response record and assessment observation checklist and third party assessment feedback. This first assessment was done in class. Second assessment: Unsigned assessment plan; assessment checklist, which appears to be questions and practical activity around a scenario, but there are no directions to the candidate. There was a third party report. For validation of assessment there were two validation activity worksheets but the recommendation arising from the validation activity was not acted upon. RPL assessment carried out in class, but is not a summative assessment. No reasonable adjustment and no assessment of underpinning knowledge assessment were undertaken.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 5 of 11

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

CILT

Assess competence:
A complete student file was not provided at audit. Tasks are to co-assess with the trainer, a fellow student who is facilitating training and also a classroom RPL activity.

Participate in assessment validation:
Two validations in class, using the same assessment instruments and processes; therefore the specific evidence requirements are not addressed. Insufficient valid evidence was collected.

Recommendation
The RTO is required to revise assessment for all TAA40104 programs so that it meets the requirements of the Training Package.

Strengths

Opportunities for improvement

Element 1.1 It is suggested that the TAA40104 teams implement a system to more effectively record the outcome of assessment validation and its impact on the quality of assessment.

Element 1.3 **School of Finance and Library:** it is strongly suggested that the team review the technical terms used in the learning program, for example, 'nationally accredited' (for nationally recognised), assessment 'tool' and assessment 'instrument', skills recognition (defined as 'formerly known as RPL') as usage is inaccurate.

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 6 of 11

Standard 2: The RTO adheres to principles of access and equity and maximises outcomes for its clients		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was non compliant in this standard.	Compliant	
Element 2.2	Non-compliant	✓
Samoan auspiced program Participants were not provided with information before the program by the RTO.	Not audited	
CILT: TAA40104 Information Guide 2009 and Course Guide 2009 state that course duration is 14 days, not 16 days as described by staff at audit.		
School of Finance and Library: PowerPoint presentation is used at information session, including comprehensive information about the RPL process. Course flyer explaining packaging. Course Guide 2009 states that the King Street program is 14 days not 6 days as described by staff.		
Element 2.6 Complaints and appeals As there is no agreement in place for the TAA40104, processes for ensuring that students can access VU's complaints processes have not been agreed.		
Recommendation Refer element 3.1.		

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 7 of 11

RTO: Victoria University   **Audit Date:** 28–29 October 2009

Standard 3: Management systems are responsive to the needs of clients, staff and stakeholders, and the environment in which the RTO operates		
Audit conclusion	**Result**	✓
The RTO was non compliant in this standard.	Compliant	
Element 3.1 Management systems	Non-compliant	✓
Contract management	Not audited	
The Institute has not developed a robust system for contract management and quality assurance of contracts, including auspiced arrangements.		
Recommendation The RTO is required to revise its processes for contract management so that clear direction is provided to staff regarding how contracts are required to be established and managed.		
Qualifications and Statement of Attainment **(AQTF Condition 6)** Under the AQTF, the Conditions of Registration consist of nine non-negotiable requirements that form an RTO's contractual agreement with the registering body.		
It was revealed at audit that, at system level, the Statements of Attainment were not compliant as they did not include the second clause as required by the AQF Implementation Handbook, http://www.aqf.edu.au/Publications/AQFImplementationHandbook/tabid/198/Default.aspx and Certificates were not compliant because the NRT logo was in greyscale and the phrase 'Issued under the authority of the 'Victorian Qualifications Authority' is used on the testamur, when the 'Victorian Registration and Qualifications Authority' should be used.		
Recommendation The Institute will need to ensure that awards meet the requirements of the AQF Implementation Handbook.		
At team level - Auspiced arrangements were not managed effectively (refer element 3.2, 3.3) - Awards did not meet AQF Implementation Handbook requirements (refer condition 6).		
Recommendation The team is required to implement the RTO's revised processes relating to: - Management of auspiced arrangements - Awards.		

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 8 of 11

Element 3.2 Agreements
Auspiced arrangements are in place for the organisation, for David Kay, Training and Development Services (DKTD) for DKTD to conduct TAA40104 training on behalf of Victoria University. However, this agreement **has not been formalised.** Inception report was developed by DKTD after the first proposal was developed. A final proposal (undated) was provided at audit and is **not an agreement.**

DKTD is not an RTO.

There is a Services agreement with David Kay, Training and Development Services (DKTD), where the service provider is VU, not DKTD. This relates to the Diploma of Government (Project Management), which is delivered by VU staff.

VU has had preliminary talks with David Kay about responsibilities, but a plan with timelines and responsibilities has not yet been developed. VU has been provided with some attendance records. The plan as described at audit is to meet on a six-monthly basis: the first meeting occurred in March 2009. Training commenced January 2009.

David Kay stated that he provided the induction materials for the TAA40104, but the delivery team does not have a copy of these materials.

Training and Assessment materials:
David Kay stated that VU has seen the materials. David Kay stated that the Samoan Government funds an independent review, including an evaluation of outcomes for students and satisfaction levels, but the review report is not provided to VU.

David Kay stated that he collected feedback from participants – report provided, but refer element 1.1 – the outcomes were not documented. Validation meetings have been held according to David Kay. He said that Jane Perry, the trainer, has handwritten records of validation of materials, but he did not have them at audit and they have not been provided to VU.

Project management:
Leigh Edwards was the Samoan project contact at VU: the trainer David Kay stated that he was contact with Ms Edwards through Skype and email and that he assumed that 'they will tell us what to do if we're not doing the right thing'. Leigh Edwards is Program Manager, School of Enterprise, but the Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching has recently taken over the management of the TAA40104 component of the program.

Auspiced arrangements are in place for the organisation, David Kay Training and Development Services (DKTD), to conduct TAA40104 training on behalf of Victoria University. However this agreement **has not been formalised.** Inception report was developed by DKTD after the first proposal was developed. A final proposal (undated) was provided at audit and is **not an agreement.**

DKTD is not an RTO.

Presented at audit was a Services agreement with David Kay Training and Development Services DKTD, where the service provider is VU, not DKTD. This relates to the Diploma of Government (Project Management), which is delivered by VU staff.

VU has had preliminary talks with David Kay about responsibilities but a plan with timelines and responsibilities has not yet been developed. VU has

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page **9** of **11**

been provided with some attendance records.

Training commenced January 2009. The plan as described at audit is to meet on a six monthly basis: the first meeting occurred in March 2009.

Dave Kay stated that he provided the induction materials for the TAA40104 but the delivery team does not have a copy of these materials.

Training and Assessment materials: David Kay stated that VU has seen the materials.

Continuous improvement: David Kay stated that the Samoan Government funds an independent review including an evaluation of outcomes for students and satisfaction levels but the review report is not provided to VU.

David Kay stated that he collected feedback from participants-report provided but see 1.1-the outcomes were not documented. Validation meetings have been held according to David Kay. He said that Jane Perry the trainer has handwritten records of validation of materials but he did not have them at audit and they have not been provided to VU.

Project management: Leigh Edwards was the Samoan project contact at VU: the trainer, David Kay, stated that he was in contact with Ms Edwards through Skype and email and that he assumed that 'they will tell us what to do if we're not doing the right thing'. Leigh Edwards is Program Manager, School of Enterprise, but the Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching has recently taken over the management of the TAA40104 component of the program.

Recommendation
The RTO is required implement the RTO's revised process for the establishment, monitoring and review of auspiced arrangements (refer element 3.1).

Element 3.3 Records
The trainer, David Kay, stated that he would not send all assessment portfolios to VU, but will provide a sample. When asked about how he would provide assessment results to VU he stated that 'there will be a VU form'. He stated that he currently uses a record sheet of his own. However, the Course Coordinator, School of Finance and Library, stated that she and an administrative officer will be responsible for entering results, based on results provided by the partner. The intention is to randomly check files to ensure student results are reported accurately. This assumes that complete files are provided by the partner to VU. In addition, the partner had not provided records of continuous improvement activities, their outcomes and changes made in response to feedback to VU. It is the auditor's view that there has been insufficient planning and agreement between VU and the partner in relation to record keeping requirements.

Recommendation
The RTO is required to ensure that record keeping requirements are addressed in the revised processes for managing auspiced agreements (refer element 3.1).

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page 10 of 11

RTO: Victoria University

Audit Date: 28–29 October 2009

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

Condition 6 – Certification And Issuing Of Qualifications And Statements Of Attainment

Audit conclusion	Result	✓
The NRT logo on awards is in greyscale and the Statement of Attainment does not hold the required clause. No list of units is attached to the Certificate – a Statement of Attainment is issued with the certificate.	Compliant	
	Non-compliant	✓
The phrase 'Issued under the authority of the 'Victorian Qualifications Authority' appears on the testamur, when the 'Victorian Registration and Qualifications Authority' should be used.	Not audited	

Recommendation
The RTO is required to revise its awards (refer element 3.1).

Strengths

Opportunities for Improvement

S:\Quality Assurance\VET\TAFE\TAFE Reregistration Audits 2009 - 2010\Victoria University\091104 AQTF TAA VU Audit Report (final).doc

Page **11** of **11**