Template for submissions to the Quality of assessment in vocational education and training – Discussion Paper

Key consultation areas
The Department of Education and Training (the department) seeks stakeholder input on the Quality of assessment in vocational education and training – Discussion Paper (the discussion paper). The paper covers the following broad themes to improve assessment in vocational education and training (VET):

Chapter 1: Foundation reforms
• ensuring the requirements for VET teachers and trainers provide the strongest platform for high-quality assessment
• ensuring those teaching VET skills are highly competent professionals with high-quality, contemporary skills in assessment.

Chapter 2: Reforms to the assessment of VET students
• assuring the quality of assessment through industry engagement with assessment review and control mechanisms as a gatekeeper before qualifications are issued
• ensuring employers have clear and realistic expectations of VET graduate capabilities which align with the assessment of students.

Chapter 3: Reforms to the regulatory framework
• improving the detection of poor quality assessment
• ensuring quick action can be taken against registered training organisations (RTOs) delivering inadequate assessment
• managing the consequences of inadequate assessment by removing invalid qualifications from the system where necessary and supporting students if this occurs.

How to provide feedback
To support the Training and Assessment Working Group to provide the Australian Government Minister for Vocational Education and Skills with recommendations on how to improve assessment, stakeholder consultations will begin with the release of the discussion paper in January 2016 and continue through to Friday 11 March 2016.

Respondents may provide feedback on some or all of the discussion paper’s themes. To assist with the compilation and analysis of the views of all stakeholders, respondents are encouraged to provide feedback via this preferred submission template, with attachments as required. Submissions in alternative formats will also be accepted.

All written submissions to the discussion paper and queries on the consultation process may be directed to the department via email at trainingpackages&VETquality@education.gov.au.
All written submissions will be made publicly available on the department’s website, unless respondents direct otherwise. See the terms and conditions for public submissions.
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1. Submission made on behalf of:  
   - [x] Individual  
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   - Justin Le Guen
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   - Black nib training services
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   - VET Practitioner
      
   (i.e. as a student, VET practitioner, RTO, third-party provider, peak body, business, industry representative, regulator or other government agency or community member)

5. Do you want your submission to be published on the department’s website or otherwise be made publicly available?  
   - [x] Yes  
   - [ ] No

   a. If yes, do you want your name and organisation (if applicable) to be published alongside your submission, OR would you like for only your submission to be available and your details kept anonymous?  
      - [x] Published  
      - [ ] Anonymous

   b. If no, please advise the department upon submission that you do not want your submission to be published or otherwise be made publicly available.
1. Discussion questions – RTO limitations:

- Is it appropriate for relatively large numbers of RTOs to deliver TAE qualifications or skill sets? Should the number be reduced to a targeted number of RTOs focusing on high-quality provision?

- Should RTOs be restricted from issuing TAE qualifications or skill sets to their own trainers and assessors?

- Are TAE qualifications and skill sets so significant that evidence of competence should not—or cannot—be appropriately demonstrated via recognition of prior learning?
  - Is recognition of prior learning for TAE qualifications or skill sets granted with sufficient rigour to ensure the quality of student assessment? Should the practice be restricted?

- Are there opportunities to improve the assessment skills of the VET workforce through changes to the delivery and assessment of TAE qualifications and skill sets?
  - Should TAE qualifications and skill sets only be delivered by VET practitioners who can demonstrate a specific period of training and/or assessing employment history in the VET sector?
  - What circumstances would support a change requiring some VET trainers and assessors to hold university-level or higher-level VET qualifications, for example, practitioners delivering and assessing TAE qualifications and skill sets?
  - Should the TAE Certificate IV and/or Diploma require a practical component? If so, how long should the practical component be?
  - Should entrants to the TAE Diploma be required to demonstrate employment history in the VET industry before being issued with the qualification? Would this condition help to improve the relevance and validity of assessment? How long would this period of time be?

COMMENT:

Delivery of the IV TAE qualifications should be limited to accredited RTO’s and have an element of mentorship by a senior trainer and assessor with minimum two years experience to help guide them in the first 3-6 months of their job role. Trainers and assessors delivering the cert IV should have 5 years experience in the vet sector in diverse roles (including training development) to ensure they have the depth of knowledge required.

Diploma level qualifications should have employment history in the VET sector. I think 3 years experience in full time employment with a RTO in training and assessment would be ideal. RPL could be offered based on sufficient experience. I believe that writing of assessments should be conducted by diploma qualified trainers and assessors rather than cert IV, most new trainers and assessors do not get an opportunity to write assessment instruments and by the time they do get a chance they have forgotten most of what they have been trained.

A focus on the diploma level would give a better outcome to quality than increasing the training requirements for the entry level qualification, it also provides a career path for professional trainers to follow.
2. Discussion questions – skills and qualifications of trainers and assessors:

- Should the TAE Certificate IV be changed to a core unit on the design and development of assessment tools? How would this improve assessment outcomes for students?
  - Should the core unit be the existing TAEASS502B Design and develop assessment tools unit of competency? Are there alternative approaches, such as developing a new unit on the design and development of assessment tools?
  - Is the TAEASS502B Design and develop assessment tools unit of competency a specialist unit that should only sit at the diploma-level on the basis the Certificate IV is currently designed for delivery to new entrants seeking to be trainers and assessors?

- In the case of making any updates to the TAE, is it appropriate to form judgements based on majority considerations? Or is it too risky to do so? Is it a better basis for decision makers to give strong weight to key stakeholders and the nature of the argument put forward?

COMMENT:

NO…. if anything remove some of the requirements most trainers only need to know the rules of evidence and the principles of assessment. Designing and developing assessment tools should be left with the diploma qualified professionals.

In the case of making updates to the TAE it would be quicker to give weight to key stakeholders and the nature of arguments provided they represented the entire sector. Private RTO’s and enterprise RTO’s should be represented not just TAFE and the unions.
3. Discussion questions – benefits and purpose of a VET professional association:

- Is there a need to establish a national professional association for Australia’s VET system?
  - Specifically, is there a clear role for Australian governments in assisting the development of professional skills of the VET workforce by funding a professional association?
- What are the barriers to establishing a national professional association? How could these be overcome?
- What would be the most useful guiding purpose of a national professional association?

COMMENT:
A national body could offer an accreditation scheme for training material i.e. a star rating for quality of material. This would be the only funding I personally would agree with, there are plenty of other professional bodies out there which training professionals would join if it was a requirement under the standards to be affiliated with a professional body.

The issue surrounding quality assessments should be directed to product developers. A professional body could help encourage best practice by use of a star rating to indicate quality against a criteria set by members and assessed by the professional body which could be funded by the government. To ensure best value for money I would keep the scope of the accreditation system to assessment instruments only, as the gatekeeper to competency the training material would follow.

Organisations such as AITD- Australian Institute of Training Developers could possibly fulfill this role or even more so the ISO’s who would have the industry expertise to valuate the instruments.
4. Discussion questions – potential activities of a VET professional association:

- What activities would be most beneficial for a national professional association to undertake? For example, would it:
  - coordinate, approve or design professional development programs
  - develop capability frameworks
  - positively promote the profession of VET trainers and assessors as an employment destination and career path to attract professionals
  - act as an advocate and voice for VET trainers and assessors
  - interact with industry to respond to their emerging needs
  - register VET practitioners?

- What advantages would there be to conducting these activities at a national level rather than through existing professional development undertaken through membership of existing groups, or that which is currently organised by RTOs?

- Are there any existing organisations that could fulfil this role?

COMMENT:
There are plenty of national bodies that do all those things i.e VELG and AITD as the two main groups I can think of other than any TAFE specific groups such as the Australian education union.

Mandatory membership to a professional group would assist the groups but without set time made available for professional development in particular with private RTO’s it would probably not be as effective.

Most private RTO’s employe their trainers based on the National Employment Standards rather than the same award which TAFE operate on, in addition the education union does not include private RTO’s which means that there is limited support for trainers and assessors to develop beyond the basics when private RTO’s
5. Discussion questions – models for a VET professional association:

- Which of the suggested models for a VET professional association would be considered most preferable and viable in the current VET environment? Model A, B or C?
- What value would a VET professional association, or associations, add to the VET sector?
- What mechanism would sustain a professional association, for example, membership fees from individuals or RTOs?
- Should VET teacher and trainer membership with a professional association be mandatory or voluntary?

**COMMENT:**

Model A would be effective, cost effective and flexible enough to accommodate VET and industry’s diverse requirements any other model risk being too ridged to adapt to industry needs.

Membership should be mandatory.

Benefits - professional development and advise
6. Discussion questions – capability frameworks:

- What can be learnt or applied from the capability frameworks that have been developed or are currently being developed?
  - Is there an opportunity to make better use of these frameworks, irrespective of proposals to develop a professional association?

COMMENT:
Accreditation process of assessments and removing the CERT IV TAE role from developing assessment instruments and placing it into the hands of diploma qualified trainer/assessors and developers with industry experience as per previous comments. Should not be in the hands of entry level qualifications.
7. Discussion questions – increasing industry confidence:

- Are there alternative approaches not covered in this discussion paper on how industry can increase engagement with the conduct of assessment, but not specifically the validation?

- Are there other ways to ensure industry confidence in assessment without requiring independent validation of assessment? For example, are industry-endorsed, externally administered tests a practical alternative to ensure that VET graduates are competent?
  - What would be the benefits and drawbacks in requiring such tests? Under what circumstances would they be mandated, for example, for particular student cohorts? Should these be specified in training products?
  - Who should regulate the tests?
  - Should such a test be a pass/fail dichotomy, or would it be more important to use the test to identify gap training?
  - Is the concept of an externally administered test, such as a test required before receiving a qualification, inconsistent with the premise of a competency based VET system?
  - Should the results of tests be made public at the RTO level?

COMMENT:
Focus on the development of assessment instruments and implement an accreditation system to encourage quality. The VET industry is so focused on compliance that quality is neglected. A non regulatory approach to quality would be more beneficial like a star rating to give industry confidence in RTO’s the metric could be delivered by follow up with students and employee’s after 6 months and administered by a professional body or ASQA/NVCER
8. Discussion questions – the role of industry in assessment:

- What role should industry, for example, employers and industry organisations, play in validation of assessment? Does the varied interpretation of ‘industry’ inhibit a proper appreciation of the topic and should it be defined? If so, who would best define ‘industry’ when considering the practice of validating assessment?

- Do employers or industry groups have the skills required to fulfil this role in validating assessment? Is assessment such a specialised skill that industry and employers either do not want to get involved or should not get involved?

- Is there a need to build industry capacity and capability regarding involvement with training and assessment? If so, how might this be done?

- How can we ensure engagement with industry is appropriately targeted so it does not add undue burden and is targeted to those within industry with appropriate expertise required for validation of assessment?

COMMENT:
Industry should have placement programs where trainers and assessors can go for work experience to ensure they remain current with industry practices. Technology is changing at a rapid pace making it more difficult for trainer to maintain competency in their field or to keep up with work practices.

Work experience programs should be mandatory to ensure RTO’s release their trainers.
### Discussion questions – specific models:

- **How can independent validation be best applied to avoid a ‘one size fits all’ approach?** For example should independent validation of assessment be triggered by:
  - improving RTO practice, for example, through a principles based model and best practice guide to support the VET workforce in identifying the most appropriate technique to validate assessment
  - mandatory requirement to lift quality in specific instances, for example, where a qualification is identified as high-risk
  - funding requirement, for example, independent validation of assessment could become a requirement for RTOs seeking to access government funding.

- **Should there be an increased role for external assessment by industry, and in which situations?** For example, should it be mandatory for certain industries where there is a concern for public safety if a learner is incorrectly deemed competent?

- If independent validation of assessment is to be risk-based, then what factors should be considered in the assessment of risk, for example, public safety, RTO profile, student cohort?

- **Should high-risk student cohorts be required to undergo independent reassessment of industry-agreed sets of competencies before being issued with their qualifications?**
  - For example, particular qualifications; students undertaking qualifications with RTOs with high levels of non-compliance; or that conduct assessment wholly online or on-the-job; or in areas of public safety.

- **Would the burden be too great if independent reassessments were required for an entire student cohort, and should independent reassessment apply to a sample of students instead?** If so, how could such a sample be chosen?

- **Who would be most appropriate to oversee the reassessment of qualifications?**
  - For example, could existing regulators or other organisations (such as firms that specialise in assessing students) take on this role?

### COMMENT:

No need for independent assessments if assessment instruments are of a high quality and do what they are intended to do.

Validation by industry should be by a panel of Subject matter experts including from VET with current industry experience in both VET and their industry.
10. Discussion questions – industry expectations and graduate capabilities:

- Is there a role for Government or industry to develop resources outlining VET graduate expectations for particular training products? If so, who should take this work forward?
  - Do higher order issues need to be resolved regarding terminology such as ‘competent’ (as assessed against the training product) and ‘job ready’ (ready to undertake all aspects of a particular job)? Is there a common understanding of VET system outcomes?

**COMMENT:**
Yes, ISO’s should be involved in resource development offering a model to template off.

Job ready should mean qualification, competent should refer to components of the qualification. Employability skills should be assessed better.
11. Discussion questions – evidence of assessment and graduate competency:

- Should the Standards for RTOs be revised to include strengthened and more specific rules around the conduct of and evidence to support assessment? Which elements that have a clear link to quality of student outcomes need to be strengthened?

- Would a more prescriptive condition of registration, such as a requirement for RTOs to retain all assessment samples for a longer period, improve the quality of assessment?

- How could the focus of regulation move to evaluating assessment outputs, such as samples of students’ assessment pieces, without incurring excessive costs or imposing excessive burden on RTOs?
  - Is ASQA the appropriate regulator to oversee this function, or are there better placed agencies such as firms that specialise in assessing students?

- Are there other mechanisms that you would like to see added to the regulatory framework to prevent poor assessment? For example, should training-only RTOs be recognised as a formal part of the regulatory framework?

COMMENT:
Quality should be promoted by a rating system, the standards and ASQA auditing should continue as is.
### 12. Discussion questions – enforcement:

- How could the focus of regulation move to evaluating assessment outputs?
- Which additional regulatory enforcement options should be considered in dealing with RTOs providing inadequate assessment? For example, should the regulator have an explicit administrative power to require a RTO to arrange and fund external reassessment, or should additional civil penalty provisions be created?
- To what extent should the characteristics of the RTO influence the response? Should the size of the RTO or the number of students involved matter?
- Given the need to balance procedural fairness with swift and effective enforcement action, what methods should be available to the regulator to manage RTOs that are repeatedly non-compliant with assessment requirements? How could such repeat offenders be defined?
- What role should regulators have in communicating their activities and findings? Does current regulatory practice provide adequate transparency and disclosure, or are there other approaches that should be taken?

**COMMENT:**

Have a public ranking system in which RTO’s can be compared. Fines for non compliance and a negative change to their public ranking as a swift and effective measure. Deregistration etc as per current procedures with regards to procedural fairness and no special consideration to size and number of students. However, consideration should be given to ranking i.e top dog for 10 years one mistake in the last 10 years?
### 13. Discussion questions – cancellation and reassessment:

- Where inadequate assessment has occurred, should the power to cancel qualifications be exercised more frequently than it has in the past? What factors should affect this decision (for example, potential impact on public safety) and how should they be balanced?

- Should a scheme for the reassessment of students be implemented? If so:
  - Are there any situations where a student should not be offered the chance to be reassessed, for example, student fraud?
  - Should there be a time period after which ASQA should not move to cancel an individual’s qualification? Noting potential public and other safety issues, should a decision to cancel consider whether or not the person involved is reliant on the qualification for their current employment?
  - Who should bear the cost of reassessment and any gap training found to be necessary? If the cost is to be recovered from the RTO, should this be pursued regardless of the RTOs financial viability?
  - Who should deliver the reassessment? Are there any circumstances in which it would be appropriate for the original RTO to undertake the reassessment?
  - What should the qualifications be for those doing the reassessment, and what industry experience and currency would they need? To what extent should ASQA, industry or employers be directly involved in the reassessment process?

- Should a tuition assurance fund be set up to further protect students in Australia’s VET sector, particularly in the context of any scheme of reassessment or cancellation of qualifications? Should membership be mandatory for all RTOs? Who should operate such a fund, and who should bear the cost of its operation?

- What linkages with income support eligibility should apply for graduates impacted by any recall of qualifications?

**COMMENT:**
Should be the same as when a licence assessment has been deemed in effective i.e. when a Linfox trainer was found to be passing people for a bribe. All the successful candidates were told they required a reassessment or forfeit their licence. The issue with qualifications they need to be checkable by industry that they are current, USI could be adapted for this purpose.