



## 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](mailto: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](#).

### Submission details

1. Submission made on behalf of:  Individual  Organisation
2. Full name:
3. Organisation (if applicable):
4. Please indicate your interest in this discussion paper:   
(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  Yes  No website or otherwise be made publicly available?
  - 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?  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:

**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?**

TAFE NSW considers the primary issue with RTO delivery of Training and Assessment (TAE) qualifications to be one of quality, rather than quantity. If an RTO meets the Australian Skills Quality Authority's (ASQA) registration audit requirements, regulation is tight and effectively enforced, and the training package is robust, there should be no need to reduce or target particular RTOs to deliver TAE qualifications.

However, there needs to be active monitoring of RTOs that deliver this qualification and prompt and thorough follow up on any quality issues. Data from [Training.gov.au](http://Training.gov.au) shows:

- 751 providers offer the TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment
- 158 providers offer the TAE50111 Diploma of Vocational Education and Training
- 130 providers offer the TAE50211 Diploma of Training Design and Development

Maintaining the current number of RTOs who deliver TAE qualifications or skill sets would provide competition and provider choice, while allowing frequent compliance monitoring to be completed.

TAFE NSW notes the recent changes to the TAE, including the Addendum (January 2016) to the Case of Endorsement for the proposed *TAE40116 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment*; reviewing the assessment units to ensure they were more rigorous and robust; and maintaining the integrity of the units and qualification as a whole. This has resulted in improvements to the assessment units which, along with the assurance of ASQA maintaining RTO standards, should assist in addressing concerns.

In terms of continued development of professional practice for TAE delivery, a community of best practice to promote excellence for VET practitioners that deliver the TAE could be established; this could be included as a function of a VET professional association – see discussion questions 3-5 below).

The ability of staff to focus purely on assessment functions for at least some of VET delivery offers potential opportunities for assessment practice improvement. TAFE NSW has established an assessor role on a trial basis as a result of Enterprise Bargaining arrangements for teachers. The position is one of a number of roles that is the subject of an independent evaluation by the University of Sydney Business School's Workplace Research Centre. Whilst in the early stages of implementation, the evaluation has found that:

*“The ability of Teachers and Assessors to focus on their respective tasks was considered to enhance the overall quality of learning. Some Assessors contributed to the development and refinement of assessment materials, enhancing the quality of resources available. Interviewees also reported that having an Assessor in addition to a Teacher provided students with a greater range of feedback, which enhanced the quality of the learning experience”.*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> NSW TAFE Evaluation of New Job Roles, June 2015, p 40

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

Providing the delivery of TAE qualifications is highly regulated, has rigorous processes in place, and the training package and assessment conditions are appropriately referenced and adhered to, it is appropriate for RTOs to issue TAE qualifications to their own trainers.

TAFE NSW notes the perceived or actual conflict of interest issues where RTOs assess their own trainers and assessors. This can be managed and mitigated by having quality checks in place and transparent processes for determining and managing conflicts of interest, such as post-assessment validation, regular internal audits and moderation and assessment checks by other RTOs. TAFE Institutes are regarded in the sector as high quality, value for money providers and would want to be able to perform this function for their own staff with the appropriate controls in place.

## **Are TAE qualifications and skill sets so significant that evidence of competence should not—or cannot—be appropriately demonstrated via recognition of prior learning?**

TAFE NSW supports relevant and rigorous recognition of prior learning (RPL) for TAE qualifications. Standard 1.12 in the *Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015* (the Standards) requires RTOs to offer RPL to individual learners. ASQA's audit and registration requirements should cover RPL practices and it would not be appropriate, or necessarily improve learning outcomes, to remove the opportunity to demonstrate RPL for the TAE qualification alone. RPL generally, including for the TAE, needs to be closely monitored by RTOs and the regulator to ensure consistent quality of RPL practice is maintained.

Therefore if a student is eligible, then the RPL process must be available to them. The issue would then be the integrity of the individual RTOs RPL process and documented evidence.

If RTO integrity is a concern, a possible solution could be to introduce a tier system for RTOs delivering TAE qualifications for example:

- Tier 1 – Enables delivery and RPL. Application required which includes all resources and assessment tools for validation.
- Tier 2 – Enables delivery only. RPL has to be assessed by a Tier 1 RTO. Application process less onerous than a Tier 1 RTO.

**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?**

TAE qualifications should be delivered and assessed by VET practitioners who are able to demonstrate a specific period of training and/or assessment in their employment history, similar to other VET disciplines. TAFE NSW supports the inclusion of a practical component as part of TAE assessment, to ensure that trainers and assessors can demonstrate the required level of skill and knowledge and to ensure the training and assessment outcome is linked to contemporary practice. This practical component could assist new entrants to be 'work ready' at completion of the qualification and existing workers (RPL) would be able to provide evidence of current practice. For example RTOs can include *BSBCMM401A Make a Presentation* in their delivery structure. Close monitoring of online products is also important to ensure provision for practical engagement in training.

It may be appropriate for VET practitioners delivering and assessing TAE to hold a higher level VET qualification, but not necessarily a university qualification. In the VET sector, industry experience holds greater relevance than a degree level qualification. TAFE NSW notes that the new TAE training package developed by Innovation and Business Skills Australia (IBSA) is due to be considered by the Australian Industry Skills Council (AISC) in early 2016 (see response to Discussion Question 2 below). This review should reflect the views of industry, as determined through the IBSA training package review.

The Certificate IV in TAE is the minimum requirement to deliver nationally recognized training and assessment services in the VET sector and sufficient rigour should be applied to this qualification to ensure that trainers are competent in training and assessment. There is value in ensuring VET industry experience is a requirement of completing the TAE Diploma level qualification. This would provide an opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of assessment validation, delivery techniques, VET industry content and engagement with students. TAFE NSW believes this is covered sufficiently in the TAE Diploma as it currently stands via the elements, assessment and evidence requirements in place in the Training Package.

**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:**

**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?**

TAFE NSW notes that the issues raised in the discussion paper are the subject of recent national consultation processes<sup>2</sup>. Following the Australian Skills Quality Authority's (ASQA) 2015 audit findings that assessment skills in the Training and Education (TAE) Training Package require strengthening, Innovation and Business Skills Australia (IBSA) undertook stakeholder consultations regarding options for assessment units in the Certificate IV in TAE.

The feedback from the national consultation process has informed the development of the new TAE training package, which we understand will be considered by AISC in early 2016. TAFE NSW understands that a new release of the Training and Assessment (TAE) training package will include recommendations to address the questions outlined above, such as a core unit for design and development of assessment tools.

TAFE NSW notes the recent changes to the TAE including the Addendum (January 2016) to the Case of Endorsement for the proposed TAE40116 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment, as stated in the response to Question 1. The anticipated improvements to the assessment units, along with the assurance of ASQA maintaining RTO standards, should assist in addressing concerns.

These proposed changes include:

- a. TAEASS401 Plan assessment activities and processes added a new element and performance criteria, and increased the volume and frequency of assessment requirements, making this unit not equivalent to its predecessor
- b. TAEASS402 Assess competence - increased the volume and frequency of assessment requirements

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, previous work on the New Standards for Vocational Education and Training (VET) Sector in 2014 reflected in the [COAG Decision Regulation Impact Statement](#), COAG Industry and Skills Council and also previous work prepared by the former Office of the National Skills Standards Council released for public consultation on 12 March 2013.

- c. TAEASS403 Participate in assessment validation - added new performance criteria, and increased the volume and frequency of assessment requirements, making this unit not equivalent to its predecessor
- d. Added clear *volume of learning* statements that refer to hours required and length of time to all qualifications
- e. TAESS00011 Assessor Skill Set deemed not equivalent to its predecessor

The TAE Certificate IV provides the necessary skills and knowledge to undertake assessments. TAFE NSW supports enhancing the existing units of competency in the Certificate IV, rather than moving to a higher level qualification based on the *TAEASS502B Design and develop assessment tools* unit. The *TAEASS502B* unit of competency should remain in the diploma, as its focus and outcomes does not address the concerns raised about the assessment units in the TAE Certificate IV.

Practitioners should hold a qualification that is commensurate with their role. TAFE NSW supports additional learning for VET professionals involved in the design and development of assessment tools. However, consideration should also be given to the makeup of the VET workforce, which is predominantly casual. A move away from the Certificate IV in TAE for entry level to a higher level training qualification may create a barrier to attracting quality, part-time trainers and assessors, in particular in rural and regional areas.

**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?**

TAFE NSW supports a balance of considering both majority considerations through strong consultation as well as engagement with key stakeholders with weight to be distributed as appropriate. The experience of practitioners is a critical factor.

### 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:

**Is there a need to establish a national professional association for Australia’s VET system?**

**What would be the most useful guiding purpose of a national professional association?**

VET trainers and assessors are required to be 'dual professionals', having both industry currency and educational capabilities<sup>3</sup>. A professional association may enhance the profile of the VET sector and recognise VET practitioners as teaching professionals. The VET workforce needs a combination of and balance between regulation and building the professionalism of VET practitioners so that there is one coherent voice.

The establishment of a national association to drive workforce capability and professional practice merits further consideration. Having such an association could align RTOs to other professional industries and bodies and could provide guidelines to VET professionals in the demonstration of currency in training and assessment. It would provide the VET workforce with regular, targeted and cost effective development activities that are accessible across all jurisdictions; support research and policy development; and drive consistent quality and continuous improvement in vocational education and training. It could be a mechanism to establish a national 'community of practice'.

As quality of teaching and assessment in VET is both a federal and state priority, government has a potential role to play in contributing funding to support the establishment of a professional association, as well as activities including professional development and research.

**What are the barriers to establishing a national professional association? How could these be overcome?**

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/education-workforce-vocational/report>

Barriers could arise from not consulting widely and inclusively with the VET sector. It is important that consensus is reached among key VET stakeholders regarding the benefit and purpose of a professional association. TAFE NSW recommends that a broad range of stakeholders be consulted in the planning and establishment of the proposed professional association to ensure its purpose and activities are representative of practitioners.

Key stakeholders that should be consulted in the planning and establishment of a professional association include, but are not limited to:

- ASQA: currently plays a key role through the Standards for Registered Training Organisations 2015.
- Skills Service Organisations could support the professional development for TAE qualifications
- TAFE Directors Australia and the national network of senior TAFE Managers (AusTAFE )
- Australian Council for Private Education and Training (ACPET)
- Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM Inc.)
- Australian Institute of Training and Development (AITD).
- Innovation and Business Skills Australia (IBSA)
- VETnetwork Australia
- VELG Training
- National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER)
- Australian Human Resources Institute (AHRI)

Additional considerations and potential barriers include cost to the individual if membership is voluntary and governance arrangements.

#### **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:**

**What activities would be most beneficial for a national professional association to undertake?**

Each of the proposed activities has merit. The most beneficial activities include:

- 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
- register VET practitioners
- establishing a national community of practice

Additional activities could include:

- initial and continuing accreditation for practitioners through levels of capability
- recognition of Continuing Professional Development through different levels of membership
- evaluating the quality of VET teaching
- contributing to the development of VET standards
- registration or accreditation of other organisations currently offering professional development

**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?**

Advantages of conducting activities at the national level include:

- establishes a nationally recognised network of practitioners and access to resources
- provides consistency in professional development to support teacher currency
- provides an opportunity to develop a recruitment pool for VET professionals
- reduces duplication across existing groups and streamlines issues and standards
- delivers economies of scale

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

There is no one organisation which would satisfy the requirements of the entire sector. Organisations which should be consulted in the planning and establishment a professional association are listed under the response to Question 3.

## 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:

**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?**

Consideration should be given to a model that enables flexibility and agility of the VET workforce and represents the diversity of the sector. Of the three options presented in the discussion paper, TAFE NSW broadly supports Model B as the most streamlined model, and one which provides some independence of government.

TAFE NSW does not favour Model C in particular as it is unclear how an extension of the school teacher registration system would raise quality in the VET sector and it is not a natural fit for the sector which is more closely aligned to industry.

**What value would a VET professional association, or associations, add to the VET sector?**

As previously stated, a VET professional association may add value to the sector by raising the status and professionalism of the VET workforce, providing national professional development opportunities, promoting national consistency and supporting teacher currency.

**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?**

The most effective method to sustain an association would be through individual fees. In principle, TAFE NSW supports mandatory membership to raise the profile and credibility of the association and to ensure the integrity of the VET workforce. Low membership rates among VET practitioners would have a negative impact on the association's standing and perception of the VET profession overall.

However, concerns have been raised regarding the cost impact of mandatory membership for a primarily casual workforce, many of whom work very few hours. Flexibility could potentially be achieved through a tiered approach, consisting of different levels of accreditation within the association based on employment status and frequency (e.g. permanent/temporary; full time/casual). This would provide part time practitioners with access to accredited national professional development activities to ensure their knowledge and skills remain relevant and current. If membership is voluntary, then VET practitioners who do undertake membership should receive formal recognition - for example, Certified VET Practitioners.

## 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:

Existing State based and IBSA frameworks should be reviewed collectively with the intent of creating a consistent national framework that encompasses a holistic suite of capabilities for VET practitioners, educational managers and roles within the VET sector.

This would ensure that the focus of professional development is on nationally agreed capabilities. A consistent, national framework would provide a public statement as to the nature and scope of work of VET professionals. A consistent framework could form the basis of an accreditation program within a VET professional association.

Any workforce capability framework driven by a national professional association should consider frameworks that already exist at State and organisation and ensure that they are not in conflict. TAFE NSW is currently in the process of developing a workforce capability framework and understands that a number of other states are developing similar frameworks.

## 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:

The new ASQA standards for RTOs Clauses 1.5 – 1.6 focus on engagement with industry.

As part of an RTO's compliance, they must be able to demonstrate that industry representatives have had input into:

- *the skills and knowledge you require trainers and assessors to hold, and*
- *the resources your RTO uses for training and assessment.*

This provides an initial platform for engagement with industry on assessment and training.

There is a strong need to move away from industry involvement only at the validation stage. Industry understanding and preparation to engage in the validation process is often constrained by time and perception of benefits. The implementation of a broad range of strategies that involve industry in all stages of the student journey is preferable. This will provide the reassurance and identification of any industry needs and adjustment required to ensure graduates are industry ready.

TAFE Institutes report that the most significant and meaningful engagement with industry is achieved through on the job assessment; however, securing sufficient work placements is often challenging. When employers are involved in design of the qualification delivery, they are more likely

to become involved in conducting assessments. Co-design of qualification delivery can be facilitated through work placements, industry based projects facilitated by teachers and employers, or delivery and assessment of units of competency on employers' premises.

TAFE Institutes have noted that discussions with industry regarding assessment are most valuable when the focus is on job readiness and whether delivery and assessment has produced graduates who are competent and effective in the workplace. This also informs quality improvement on what TAFE could do to make assessments more workplace relevant.

Externally administered tests are inconsistent with the premise of competency based training. Industry-endorsed, externally administered tests however may have particular value for high risk licensing qualifications where health and safety are paramount concerns. An end of qualification test to confirm skills and knowledge competencies across the entire qualification could be considered, but would need to take into account practicality and cost issues – in particular, for small cohorts.

There is an opportunity to work further in partnership with industry to develop a better shared understanding of Training Package requirements and AQF levels (see Discussion Question 10), and to promote stronger awareness of and engagement in roles and responsibilities in VET delivery and assessment, including traineeships and apprenticeships. This in turn will enhance the job readiness of graduates.

Centrally designed and set assessments would be more likely to achieve consistency in assessment. As training packages are designed and developed at the national level, there may be value in developing standardised assessment tools or rules in consultation with a broad range of industry stakeholders.

TAFE NSW also reiterates previous comments made in response to the Review of Training Packages and Accredited Courses:

A greater emphasis on ensuring quality of assessment by the regulator is appropriate.

Where a qualification includes a major on the job component, such as apprenticeships, good practice is workplace assessment in partnership between the RTO and the employer. This practice could be further encouraged.

While assessment of outcomes is often considered an end product, it is also a powerful aspect of learning that continues throughout the educational process. In this context, assessors need to have relevant skills, not only occupational expertise.

Additional assessment by industry would need to be managed as part of the standards in the qualifications, not an additional assessment process. For final assessments to be managed by an industry panel or process, the assessors would need currency in the qualification content as well as skills in assessment. Where required for safety or licensing, as is currently negotiated in specific industry areas, it is a valuable exercise.

If an additional layer of external assessment was imposed, the concern would be that qualifications would become increasingly narrow, with broader employability skills being sidelined by specific occupational concerns. With related foundation skills now being explicitly defined in all units of competency, assessors will need to address the foundation and vocational skills as part of an integrated assessment process. If done effectively, this would have the potential to improve assessment of the skills defined in qualifications and would be preferable to implementing new 'occupational standards'.

## 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:

**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?**

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

The definition of 'Industry' is broad and can include employers, small business or large organisations, associations, lobby groups, or VET practitioners who can demonstrate industry skill and currency. Each stakeholder's needs and interests differ, which can impact on the roles members play in the assessment validation process.

Industry involvement in assessment is a key component of quality frameworks including the *Smart and Skilled NSW Quality Framework*. TAFE NSW welcomes the involvement of industry in the validation of assessment including expertise from industry on how the outcomes of the assessment meet current practice and employer requirements for work readiness

Involvement from industry needs to be time and cost effective based on a summary document of what is covered across assessment tool/s that meet the requirements of the training package and produce required industry outcomes. Significantly involving industry at the point of training package development, with Skills Service Organisations is also critical to provide guidance on types and content of assessments.

TAFE NSW Institutes currently undertake targeted validation and moderation including the following strategies connected with industry:

- ensuring teaching staff have industry currency
- validation workshops with industry sectors
- industry partnerships and meetings to validate assessments

If VET practitioners are appropriately skilled and have current industry knowledge (e.g. through VET professional association Continuing Professional Development), and the validation process is correctly adhered to, the need for industry validation is reduced. TAFE NSW utilises its presence in industry to discuss the relevance of assessment with employers. Targeted engagement at the assessment stage requires less imposition on employers' time and resources. If assessment tools were developed in consultation with industry at the same time as national Training Packages, this could also strengthen the validation process. Best practice relies on industry involvement rather than validation.

TAFE NSW Institutes are committed to ongoing formative engagement with industry throughout the training delivery and assessment process. This ensures that industry's needs are reflected in course content, student skills and knowledge is current, and industry is involved in the entire student journey.

Engagement includes:

*Communities of Practice and validation networks:* Assessment validation activities occur through TAFE NSW Communities of Practice in many industry areas. *For example*, Construction, Plumbing, Building Design, Surveying & Spatial Information Services and Real Estate Communities of Practice support a systematic approach to assessment validation for each qualification across TAFE NSW. Specifically, the Construction Assessment Validation Network (CAVN) is a long-standing TAFE NSW wide network of assessment which engages construction trades teaching staff in delivery and assessment activities that promote compliance with Standards for RTOs. Participants work with colleagues from specific construction trade areas to validate and/or post-validate assessment tools and instruments and engage with industry and other key stakeholders in this process.

*Joint assessment panels:* Industry has the opportunity to provide feedback on what they require from graduates, to understand what TAFE does, and to understand expected capabilities at different AQF levels. TAFE NSW works with industry members to modify courses and assessments to ensure they remain current and reflect industry needs. *For example*, Sydney TAFE invites industry partners onto panels to hear student presentations. The outcomes then form part of the assessment criteria

in the course. These opportunities for industry input into assessments are held for Human Resources Management, Marketing and Leadership and Management qualifications, as well as other areas.

*Work placement programs:* TAFE NSW collaborates with industry members to identify specific skills required from graduates, and to develop these skills in a practical work environment to assist students to become 'job ready'.

*Internship programs:* Industry contributes to the design of internship programs that meet Training Package requirements and ensure students are 'job ready'. *For example,* Sydney TAFE offers internship opportunities through a managed placement program where each student is aligned with individual employer needs in regards to skill level, training level and particular industry interest as well as workplace attendance patterns. The highly successful program has produced outstanding numbers of job offers as a direct result in the internship matching.

*Customised and contextualised assessment:* TAFE NSW actively consults with industry during the design, delivery and assessment stages of I programs to ensure programs are relevant to workplace requirements. This practice is beneficial in maintaining currency of teachers and assessors as well as engaging industry experts in an understanding of VET. *For example,* In conjunction with the NSW Police Force, South Western Sydney and Sydney TAFE Business Faculty have developed and contextualised learning content and assessments so sworn and unsworn staff in order for the officers to undertake the Certificate IV, Diploma or Advanced Diploma of Leadership and Management training. The fully contextualised assessments are relevant to the specific work of the officers and are validated against the ASQA compliance regulations for unit outcomes. Evaluation data shows that both the organisation and individuals highly value the relevance of these contextualised assessments.

*Customised and contextualised training and assessment in the workplace for High Risk activity:* TAFE NSW works closely with industry and employers during the design, delivery and assessment for programs involving high risk activities. These include operation of specific plant and equipment or operating in specific high risk environments (e.g. working at heights, working in confined spaces). This practice is essential for TAFE teachers and assessors to not only maintain currency but to understand the risks and variables of each particular site and circumstance. *For example,* at Barangaroo in conjunction with Lendlease and other employers, TAFE Western Sydney has developed a process that moves candidates for High Risk license assessment from a defined training compound to practicing under supervision on the working construction site where there is interaction with other plant and equipment. This has resulted in candidates from Barangaroo achieving a significantly higher success rate in independently assessed SafeWork NSW High Risk license tests compared to the state wide average. It also gives the employer confidence in the workers' ability to operate safely in the actual work environment.

Partnerships with industry leaders: TAFE NSW partners with industry leaders to provide students with a suite of learning experiences. *For example:* Luke Mangan's 'Inspired Series' offered through Sydney TAFE, which involves eight well-known Australian chefs sharing their industry knowledge with a range of students who are at different stages of their studies and the similar 'Master Class Series', offered through North Sydney Institute.

Collaboration with national licencing organisation: *For example,* a number of TAFE NSW Institute staff are members of the Australian Wool Exchange (AWEX) National RTO Trainer Network. This national network has endorsed a number of assessment activities for the assessment wool classing competencies. These industry endorsed assessment activities are used by RTO's across Australia. AWEX in collaboration with the network also run annual trainer workshops which include industry validation and trainer industry currency activities.

Industry validation collaboration in auspicing arrangement - For example, The Cerebral Palsy Alliance (CPA) is delivering a range of business, health and community services qualifications for their staff under the auspices of the TAFE Northern Sydney Institute – the ongoing validation and review of assessment tools continues to be undertaken within a highly collaborative relationship which has produced mutually beneficial outcomes for Northern Sydney Institute and for the CPA disability service workers.

### **Do employers or industry groups have the required skills to fulfil a role in validating assessment?**

Increasingly, Training Packages are requiring industry to sign off on student competency. However, industry members do not always have the skills, knowledge, experience or context to provide effective input into the complex tasks of assessment validation. Further, employers may be reluctant to become involved in validating assessment which, when undertaken correctly, requires a significant time commitment.

Feedback from industry partners indicates that certain aspects of the process are considered too onerous and employers do not believe in some cases that assessment validation is their core business. Industry support of and engagement with providers needs to be managed at a discipline level to ensure that validation practices are not duplicated, that input from industry is meaningful and specific, and that feedback is given based on what is practical and within scope.

Effective validation takes into account the nature of the industry and risks involved in assessment. Some industry sectors are currently involved in validation of specific and high risk units, and this process is beneficial to the relationship between industry and the VET sector. It is also particularly critical where health and safety issues are a priority. However, industry involvement in validation is not possible or practical across all qualifications including in instances where qualifications and units of competency address the needs of more than one industry.

External validation is a particular issue for RTOs in regional areas, as it is costly to arrange and collaboration is impeded by limited industry networks. Local businesses' ability to participate in

assessment validation is constrained by strength of expertise and the capacity to dedicate finite resources. Any proposal to build industry capacity and capability in training and assessment should consider the differences between RTOs of varying sizes to manage this engagement.

### **How to ensure industry engagement is targeted and does not create undue burden?**

In some cases, industry is not aware of the language and terminology in the training packages, or the value of validation. In addition to this, there is sometimes limited understanding of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and what should be expected of students at each level of competency.

The ASQA enquiry into training in Early Childhood Education and Care highlighted this, recommending that the Minister consider funding the development of resources to support industry in understanding training packages, and best practice validation and work placement experiences.

RTOs can work with Industry and employers to discuss workplace scenarios, equipment, and practices to ensure that the content of assessments is industry current and workplace real.

Using technology to gather feedback on aspects of assessments may also makes it easier for some industry members to participate in validation. Skills Service Organisations could have a role in identifying employers or industry groups to participate in validation. The learnings from the Independent Validation Assessment Pilots would also be a useful starting point to inform improved engagement with industry on this issue.

## 9. 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:

**How can independent validation be best applied to avoid a ‘one size fits all’ approach?**

**Should there be an increased role for external assessment by industry, and in which situations?**

NSW TAFE supports a principles based model and best practice guide for the independent validation of assessment that is developed and overseen by the national regulator. TAFE NSW has already developed implementation guidelines to support assessors to maintain effective and consistent practice in assessment and assessment validation.

In addition to improving RTO practices, training packages need to be more descriptive regarding industry best practice and industry's own accreditation practices. Having industry more actively involved in the training package development process would help to address the current lack of detail in some cases and aid improved assessment practice.

TAFE NSW supports independent validation of qualifications that are identified as high risk, as well as recognition of high performing RTOs, for example through a preferred provider scheme. This would encourage a higher standard of training and assessment across all qualifications, not only those that are identified as high risk.

TAFE NSW does not support linking independent validation to Commonwealth Government funding. If the aim of this review is to increase industry validation of assessments, or to mandate independent assessment for high risk qualifications, additional funding should be considered to support the higher cost to both RTOs and industry so that this important work is not affected by cost impacts.

It may be appropriate for assessment tools to be developed externally for some high risk occupations – for example, where there is a public safety issue or a Work Health Safety (WHS) issue for students. High quality RTOs could undertake re-assessment of students, in liaison with industry as the discipline experts. Alternatively, a professional body could maintain a register of independent assessors for high risk units and qualifications. In sectors such as Community and Health Services, the requirement for industry assessment could affect all qualifications and may become too burdensome. As previously stated, any analysis of the need for additional external assessment by industry members, who are generally not educators, should consider how this would be managed and funded, and the overall value of this exercise.

A risk management framework for qualifications with large student numbers, a principles based model and a best practice guide to support the VET workforce in identifying the most appropriate technique to validate assessment, would all assist in planning the validation system. Factors to inform the development of a risk management framework could include public safety, WHS of students undergoing training and contact with vulnerable client. The RTO profile and any history of non-compliance could also be considered.

**If independent validation of assessment is to be risk-based, then what factors should be considered in the assessment of risk?**

**Should high-risk student cohorts be required to undergo independent reassessment of industry-agreed sets of competencies before being issued with their qualifications?**

**Who would be most appropriate to oversee the reassessment of qualifications?**

**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?**

TAFE NSW does not support independent reassessment of entire high risk cohorts. Training packages reflect industry set levels of competency and if delivered and assessed correctly should stand up to scrutiny. It is not viable to reassess entire cohorts of students, apart from in exceptional circumstances, as it is unlikely to improve rigour of training and assessment, would have cost impacts and add administrative complexity. Reassessment of entire cohorts would also create a significant additional burden on impacted students and employers. Taking all factors into account, the risk management framework approach suggested above is the best way forward.

The process of managing consequences, including deregistration, is the vehicle for appropriately managing RTO compliance issues and there should not be an additional burden to students.

Any solution would need to take into account when this additional evaluation method should be applied, how it would be funded, who should conduct the reassessment (including qualifications to determine competence), what the appeals mechanism would be, and how conflicts of interest would be managed.

## **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:**

The development and review of Training Packages and accredited courses reflects industry feedback regarding the skills and competencies graduates require to perform effectively in the workplace. However, some Training Packages outline graduate expectations more clearly than others. New training packages should state the specifics of the required experience, volume of learning and nature of the assessment to manage students’ and employers’ expectations.

Better communication that builds industry’s understanding of competency based training, including what it is designed for, how it is used and employers’ obligations in competency based progression, would assist in developing greater industry awareness and understanding of terminology and VET practices and outcomes. Currently, terminology such as ‘competent’ and ‘job ready’ are not clear to some employers, who continue to request students’ rankings or grades as a way to ensure they

have competent employees, even when students have been put through extensive and robust competency based assessment.

A common understanding of the VET system and outcomes is lacking. Resources, guides and publicity in these areas would be helpful to the VET sector and may help to increase confidence in VET qualifications.

One important issue for TAFE NSW and possibly other RTOs is the impact of increasingly highly specific assessment requirements (e.g. demonstrate a skill with three clients in two settings using four procedures or similar). The complexities of the assessment requirements may exclude many students and cohorts where these requirements can't be met. This trend is occurring across Training Packages to address industry concerns regarding standards, but may have unintended consequences for industry itself. The requirements may make it difficult for RTOs to be able to deliver and may mean withdrawal from that delivery, impacting on industry skill requirements.

Additional information may include:

- Clarification of the term 'competency'
- Plain English resources which outline expected outcomes in line with AQF level qualifications to avoid over-assessment.
- Clarification of 'job readiness', including what is realistic and achievable within an AQF level, and what should be the responsibility of RTOs or industry
- Clarification of expectations for high level (higher order) competencies

Skills Service Organisations may be best placed to drive this work.

## 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:

#### **Should the Standards for RTOs be revised to include strengthened and more specific rules around the conduct of and evidence to support assessment?**

Training Packages and Companion Volumes provide clear guides regarding evidence. The ASQA Standards for RTOs (which have only been in place since April 2015) are adequate, but interpretation and implementation are inconsistent. Reforms to the regulatory framework have already occurred and focus on the outcome and assessment process. The issue is not the strength of the Standards, but non-compliance by RTOs. ASQA is the appropriate regulator to oversee compliance. If the Standards and the Training Packages are adhered to, and the RTO has quality trainers and assessors, no further strengthening should be required.

#### **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?**

Retaining assessment samples for longer and samples of student assessment pieces would not add value or strengthen assessment outcomes. Retention of evidence of student assessment is already an encumbrance burdensome for RTOs and provides very little additional quality assurance. The focus should be on minimising delay between assessment and review by the regulator to identify improvements. Furthermore, assessment for competency provides only a 'snapshot' in time. It is unreasonable for industry to reassess someone post qualification.

**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?**

**Are there other mechanisms that you would like to see added to the regulatory framework to prevent poor assessment?**

Additional regulatory mechanisms are not required to prevent poor assessment. Action by ASQA to audit and respond to complaints to remove non-compliant providers would be more effective.

Whilst we have suggested a tiered system for the TAE (see Discussion Question 1), TAFE NSW does not support the concept of training-only RTOs in general. This would create a two tiered system and the potential for conflict if a student is deemed not competent. This also presents a risk to RTOs, who manage training and assessment, wearing the higher costs of assessment only pathways with limited revenue. This approach is not student-centred and adds an additional layer to an already complex regulatory framework.

Increased reporting could assist in strengthening the regulatory framework, particularly in relation to the area of mutual obligation. RTOs are obliged to recognise competencies or qualifications of other RTOs but can find that there are gaps in actual competence against standards. This impacts on providers as they have to fill the gaps left whilst building new skills and this can effect costs incurred and learning outcomes, such as completions. Where these skills have been recently assessed by another RTO as competent, an opportunity to provide evidence based feedback to the regulator about areas where assessment practices may be poor would be valuable. A streamlined approach to reporting, such as a hotline, would be valuable.

## **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:**

Inadequate assessment and its consequences need to be clearly defined in the Standards. Outlining assessment best practice does not necessarily make explicit what constitutes 'inadequate assessment'. This is critical if the focus of regulation is to move to evaluating assessment outputs.

A greater regulatory focus on assessment outputs could involve ASQA requesting a sample of assessment outputs during an audit and based on findings, enforce rectification or RTO supervision and monitoring.

Greater support for professional development, meaningful user guides, and 'help desk' support from the national regulator would avoid confusion around 'benchmarks of compliance' and minimise the need for stronger enforcement.

TAFE NSW recognises the need for procedural fairness and efforts to enforce the Standards and training package requirements and views the current enforcement mechanisms as adequate. However, as a quality provider TAFE NSW is frustrated by speed of the regulatory process in sanctioning and enforcing poor practice. Apart from the clear impacts on students and industry, "RTOs delivering high quality training programs face unfair competition from those RTOs offering cheaper and unrealistically short training programs" as noted in the key findings of the [ASQA Strategic Review on Aged and Community Care Training](#)<sup>4</sup>.

Regulatory enforcement options for RTOs providing inadequate assessment could take a risk based approach depending on the risk associated with the qualification and the risk associated with a specific RTO based on previous history. An additional method to manage regular non-compliance could include the creation of a preferred provider scheme with ratings.

Sanctions should be put in place including removal of qualifications from RTOs scope; it may be that in some cases, individual penalties are required to ensure that responsibility and consequence is understood

---

<sup>4</sup> ASQA Report, Training for Aged and Community Care in Australia, September 2013, page xi (<http://www.asqa.gov.au/about/strategic-reviews/aged-and-community-care-training,-2013.html>).

The RTO size or number of students does impact on exposure to risk of non-compliance as the larger the scope of delivery, the higher the potential risk of non-compliance and greater the potential impact on students, employers and industry. However, the standards should be maintained in each case, regardless of the size of the RTO.

The regulator's role is to communicate breaches, findings and outcomes to assist RTOs to improve practices.

### 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:

It is essential that students, employers and industry are assured of the integrity of the VET system. TAFE NSW supports the cancellation of qualifications for non-compliance with assessment requirements. RTOs need to be accountable for performance and existing regulatory powers should be utilised as necessary. The current opportunity for engagement with ASQA during this process is appreciated. However any cancellation of a qualification should be conducted quickly and fairly with clear supporting evidence, if there are serious concerns and especially if cancellation is in the interests of public safety.

It is the role of government to respond to failures in the market. Support mechanisms for affected students, as well as the employment impact, should be considered as part of any decision to cancel a qualification. Consideration should be given to whether the RTO that delivered the cancelled qualifications should be required to refund all student fees and compensate for damages.

TAFE NSW supports a scheme for reassessment of affected students. Students and employers should be consulted regarding the appropriate form of reassessment and it should take place within a reasonable time after initial completion.

It is not appropriate for reassessment to be carried out by the RTO which has received an infringement notice. However, the original RTO should bear any associated costs. Reassessment should be carried out by another RTO providing there is no conflict of interest or, in the case of public safety qualifications, in partnership with industry.

If the qualification was obtained through fraud or poor assessment then punitive action should occur against the parties at fault and rectification and reassessment cost borne by the RTO responsible or the Authority that administers it. Student fraud should negate any opportunity for reassessment.

Qualifications of those undertaking the reassessment should be considered on a case by case basis. Generally, those undertaking reassessment should be able to demonstrate TAE qualifications, as well as current industry skills and knowledge. ASQA should provide oversight to manage the quality of reassessment and any associated issues.

The Tuition Assurance Scheme (TAS) provides a critical protection mechanism for vulnerable students. The TAS would need to be underwritten by an insurer that could assess the risk posed by the RTO. The Scheme should be funded by government and should not be passed on to students (i.e. in the form of a levy). More stringent regulation around the licencing and regulation of RTOs will alleviate the need to access the tuition assurance fund.

A student's eligibility for income support should not be impacted by the cancellation of a qualification. Income eligibility should not be affected except where there is evidence of deliberate fraud by the student. Eligibility should take into account the impact of qualification recall on a student's ability to find employment in that industry.