

in the VET in Schools Qualification Register⁶ with industry advice that minors cannot work in the security industry

- *BSB40212 Certificate IV in Business* is aimed at a supervisory or management level that requires substantial and relevant industry experience to maximise successful completion and the qualification is also red-flagged in the VET in Schools Qualification Register with advice that industry does not support the qualification as a VET in Schools pathway.

The results for *SIS20210 Certificate II in Outdoor Recreation* confirm input from the industry raising concerns about the capacity of schools to meet industry standards.

Descriptive data for qualifications did not provide significantly different information compared with the overall results (see Table 4). The delivery arrangement rather than the actual qualification was the only factor to generate different, or additional characteristics.

Outcomes for industry areas

When data was analysed by industry area, the Aviation industry area (one qualification only, through outsourced delivery) and the Beauty industry area demonstrated 100% **compliance**. For Beauty, three RTOs delivered five instances of two qualifications at Certificate II and Certificate III levels through both auspice/partnership and outsourced delivery.

The highest levels of **non-compliance** were reported for:

- Property Services, with 69% of outcomes non-compliant, for one qualification only (security), delivered through outsourced delivery
- Sport, Fitness and Recreation, where 57% of outcomes were non-compliant across 12 instances of three different Certificate II qualifications, delivered through one or more of the four delivery arrangements
- Construction, Plumbing and Services where 51% of outcomes were non-compliant for delivery of a Certificate II by four RTOs through two delivery arrangements, and
- Business Services with 41% of outcomes non-compliant for nine instances of two qualifications delivered through all four delivery arrangements.

Number audited	Qualification code and title	VETiS Arrangement	C=Compliant NC=Non-compliant
Automotive Retail, Service and Repair Industry Area:			
2	AUR20512 Certificate II in Automotive Vehicle Servicing	SBTA	68% C
Summary: 2 RTOs; 1 VETiS arrangement; 1 qualification. 15 elements - 30 outcomes: 9 Non-compliant / 19 Compliant / 2 not audited.		68%C	
Aviation Industry Area:			
1	AVI30208 Certificate III in Aviation (Flight Operations)	Outsourced	100% C
Summary: 1 RTO; 1 VETiS arrangement; 1 qualification - fully compliant. 15 elements: 13 Compliant / 2 not audited.		100%C	
Business Services Industry Area:			
3	BSB20112 Certificate II in Business	Auspice	76% NC
2	BSB20112 Certificate II in Business	Outsourced	82% C
2	BSB20112 Certificate II in Business	RTO School	81% C
2	BSB20112 Certificate II in Business	SBTA	83% C
		62% C	
1	BSB40212 - Certificate IV in Business	Outsourced	62% NC
Summary: 9 RTOs; 4 VETiS arrangements; 2 qualifications. 150 outcomes: 54 Non-compliant / 79 Compliant / 17 not audited.		59%C	

⁶ Department of Training and Workforce Development, 2014, *VET in Schools Qualification Register Version 2.1 as at 28 February 2014*, Government of Western Australia, Perth

Additional characteristics common across auspice/partnership arrangements		Ref
Non-compliant	There was no monitoring to ensure the requirements of the strategy and/or agreement were met Learning resources did not address the Training Package There was insufficient evidence that facilities and equipment met Training Package requirements	1.3
Compliant	There was formal confirmation by the RTO of their auspice partner's capacity to deliver or formal 'approval to deliver' for auspice trainers and assessors (1.4a) There was verification of the school's capacity to deliver or formal 'approval to deliver' forms completed for trainers and assessors re vocational competencies (1.4b) There was verification of the school's capacity to deliver or formal 'approval to deliver' forms completed for trainers and assessors re industry currency (1.4c)	1.4
Non-compliant	Vocational competencies of trainers and assessors were not validated by a vocationally competent person (1.4b) Insufficient detail was provided to confirm vocational competencies of trainers and assessors (1.4b) Industry currency had not been confirmed by a vocationally competent person (1.4c)	1.4
Compliant	Assessment plans were used (1.5a, b and c)	1.5
Non-compliant	There were inadequate (or no) assessment instruments/ processes/ RPL (1.5a, b & c) Assessment was not in accordance with the agreement or the specified tools (1.5a, b & c) Criteria used to make a judgment about competency did not relate to unit of competency requirements (1.5a, b & c) There was insufficient evidence that clustered and/or group assessments addressed the units of competency (1.5a, b & c) There was no evidence that workplace requirements were addressed (1.5c)	1.5
Compliant	Monitoring was undertaken to confirm that student needs were addressed by partners (2.1)	2.1
Compliant	AQTF compliance requirements were articulated in VETiS agreements (3.3) VETiS inductions were provided by RTOs for staff and students (3.3)	3.3

Table 10: Additional characteristics for auspice arrangements

Common characteristics or themes from descriptive data – outsourcing outcomes by Standard

Characteristics or themes that were common to the majority of compliant and non-compliant outcomes for **outsourcing arrangements** are provided in the table following. Highlighted text indicates that these characteristics had insufficient scores to feature in the common characteristics across all delivery arrangements, but were significant for this delivery arrangement.

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documented industry consultation informed training and assessment strategies ➤ Training and assessment strategies were developed by the RTO ➤ Liaison, consultation or negotiation occurred with schools on the training and assessment strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Strategies did not meet Training Package requirements in relation to version number prerequisite units, or superseded units ➤ Assessment methods/tools were not sufficient to meet unit requirements ➤ There was insufficient evidence or no evidence of industry consultation in the development of training and assessment strategies ➤ Training and assessment strategies were not deployed or did not reflect actual practice ➤ VETiS context or student needs were not considered in the strategy
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training and assessment resources were provided by the RTO ➤ Practical industry-like environments were provided by the RTO ➤ Required facilities and equipment were provided by the RTO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Vocational/ practical environment for assessment was not addressed ➤ Non-compliances were identified for Standard 1.4 and/or 1.5

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
1.4a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All trainers and assessors held the required qualification TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment ➤ RTOs implemented a process for confirming TAE qualifications were held by trainers and assessors ➤ RTOs followed a process for verifying/ authenticating TAE qualifications 	
1.4b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Trainer profiles/matrices were used to capture relevant vocational competencies ➤ Evidence was provided of relevant vocational competencies ➤ Trainers and assessors held the actual units, qualifications or higher level qualifications in the same field as those they delivered ➤ RTOs implemented a process for verification/ authentication of vocational competencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The relevance of vocational qualifications and experience (held by trainers and assessors) in relation to the units being delivered had not been established
1.4c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Trainer profiles/matrices were used to capture industry currency ➤ RTOs implemented a process for verification/ authentication of industry currency ➤ Industry professional development was undertaken to maintain currency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Incomplete or insufficient evidence of industry currency was provided for trainers and assessors
1.4d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documented evidence of professional development records was provided ➤ RTOs used a systematic process for professional development of trainers and assessors ➤ Professional development was provided by the RTO for their trainers and assessors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was no evidence or insufficient evidence that professional development was provided for trainers and assessors
1.5a & b & c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTOs used validated assessment instruments ➤ Assessments consisted of both theory and practical ➤ Assessments were provided by the RTO ➤ A vocational/industry environment was provided for assessment ➤ There was a structured workplace assessment component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was insufficient evidence that assessment addressed (all) the requirements of unit/s of competency ➤ Performance evidence was not collected or the majority of assessment was knowledge-based ➤ No vocational/industry environment was provided for assessment
1.5d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTOs had a formal scheduled validation process ➤ There was industry input into validation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was no evidence of validation ➤ Non-compliances were incurred against 1.5a, b and/or c
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTOs implemented a process that identified student needs ➤ Regular communication/ reporting was occurring between the parties ➤ There were clear roles, responsibilities and procedures ➤ RTOs implemented a process that confirmed student needs were addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was no evidence of RTOs establishing student needs
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was communication/ liaison between RTOs and schools regarding information for students ➤ Provision of relevant information by RTOs occurred prior to enrolment ➤ VETiS information was provided at career events/ open days/ information sessions etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inaccurate, insufficient or irrelevant information was provided re NRT requirements ➤ No information was provided about, or students were unaware of, the role of RTOs/ other parties

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Processes for VETiS were deployed as agreed ➤ All parties were clear on processes, roles and responsibilities for work placements ➤ There was evidence of employer and/or industry engagement ➤ A process was implemented to ensure work placements met requirements ➤ There was evidence of engagement in monitoring students on work placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Processes for VETiS were not deployed as agreed
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Progress monitoring and reporting was undertaken ➤ RTOs maintained communication/ liaison with all parties ➤ Quality management systems were implemented as intended ➤ Collection, review and action on learner feedback was occurring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training and assessment was not as required by the Training Package

Table 11: Common characteristics for outsourcing arrangements

The descriptive data for outsourcing arrangements revealed additional characteristics that although present for some other delivery arrangements, were not represented in high enough numbers to be included as common characteristics overall. These characteristics were identified for non-compliant outcomes only.

Additional characteristics common across outsourcing arrangements	
Non-compliant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment methods/tools were not sufficient to meet unit requirements (1.2) VETiS context or student needs were not considered in the strategy (1.2)

Table 12: Additional characteristics for outsourcing arrangements

Common characteristics or themes from descriptive data – RTO Schools outcomes by Standard

Characteristics or themes that were common to the majority of compliant and non-compliant outcomes for **RTO School delivery arrangements** are provided in the table following. Where the number of non-compliances was two or less, no common characteristics have been identified. Highlighted text indicates that these characteristics had insufficient scores to feature in the common characteristics across all delivery arrangements, but were significant for this delivery arrangement.

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documented industry consultation informed training and assessment strategies ➤ Training and assessment strategies were developed by the RTO School ➤ <i>There were clear responsibilities regarding strategy development and industry consultation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training and assessment resources were provided by RTO Schools ➤ Practical industry-like environments were provided by RTO Schools ➤ Required facilities and equipment were provided by RTO Schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Non-compliances were identified for Standard 1.4 and/or 1.5

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
1.4a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All trainers and assessors held the required qualification TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment ➤ RTO Schools implemented a process for confirming TAE qualifications were held by trainers and assessors ➤ RTO Schools followed a process for verifying/ authenticating TAE qualifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
1.4b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evidence was provided of relevant vocational competencies ➤ RTO Schools implemented a process for verification/ authentication of vocational competencies ➤ Trainer profiles/matrices were used to capture relevant vocational competencies ➤ Trainers and assessors held the actual units, qualifications or higher level qualifications in the same field as those they delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
1.4c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTO Schools implemented a process for verification/ authentication of industry currency ➤ Trainer profiles/matrices were used to capture industry currency ➤ Trainers and assessors currently worked in industry ➤ There was evidence that currency information was updated annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
1.4d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documented evidence of professional development records was provided ➤ RTO Schools used a systematic process for professional development of trainers and assessors ➤ Professional development was provided by RTO Schools for their trainers and assessors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
1.5a & b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTO Schools used validated assessment instruments ➤ Assessments consisted of both theory and practical ➤ Networking, validation and moderation occurred with other RTOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was insufficient evidence that assessment addressed (all) the requirements of unit/s of competency ➤ Performance evidence was not collected or the majority of assessment was knowledge-based
1.5c	<p>As for 1.5a and b, and in addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Industry and/or (local) business needs were incorporated into assessments 	As for 1.5a and b
1.5d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTO Schools had a formal scheduled validation process ➤ Validation was undertaken with other RTOs ➤ There was industry input into validation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear roles, responsibilities and procedures were articulated ➤ Regular communication/ reporting was occurring between the parties ➤ RTO Schools implemented a process that identified student needs ➤ RTO Schools implemented a process that confirmed student needs were addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for RTO Schools

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ VETiS information was provided at career events/ open days/ information sessions etc ➤ Provision of relevant information by RTO Schools occurred prior to enrolment ➤ Student interview/ course selection process was used by RTO Schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for RTO Schools
2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All parties were clear on processes, roles and responsibilities for work placements ➤ There was evidence of employer and/or industry engagement ➤ A process was implemented to ensure work placements met requirements ➤ There was evidence of engagement in monitoring students on work placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for RTO Schools
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Collection, review and action on learner feedback was occurring ➤ Management meetings were used for monitoring processes and outcomes ➤ Quality management systems were implemented as intended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for RTO Schools

Table 13: Common characteristics for RTO School arrangements

The descriptive data for RTO School arrangements revealed additional characteristics that although present for some other delivery arrangements, were not represented in high enough numbers to be included as common characteristics overall. These characteristics were identified for compliant outcomes only.

Additional characteristics common across RTO School arrangements	
Compliant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were clear responsibilities for strategy development and industry consultation (1.2) There was evidence that currency information was updated annually (1.4c) Networking, validation and moderation occurred with other RTOs (1.5a and b) Industry and/or (local) business needs were incorporated into assessments (1.5c) Validation was undertaken with other RTOs (1.5d)

Table 14: Additional characteristics for RTO School arrangements

Common characteristics or themes from descriptive data – SBTA outcomes by Standard

Characteristics or themes that were common to the majority of compliant and non-compliant outcomes for **SBTA arrangements** are provided in the table following. Where the number of non-compliances was two or less, no common characteristics have been identified. Highlighted text indicates that these characteristics had insufficient scores to feature in the common characteristics across all delivery arrangements, but were significant for this delivery arrangement.

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documented industry consultation informed training and assessment strategies ➤ Training and assessment strategies were developed by the RTO ➤ There was regular contact by RTOs with schools and/or learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Strategies did not meet Training Package requirements in relation to version number prerequisite units, or superseded units

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Practical industry-like environments were provided by RTOs and schools ➤ Required facilities and equipment were provided by RTOs ➤ School and workplace capacity to deliver was validated by RTOs ➤ Learners participated in real work/ events/ activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Non-compliances were found for Standard 1.4 and/or 1.5 ➤ Delivery and/or assessment did not meet the training and assessment strategies ➤ There was no workplace check of facilities or capacity to train
1.4a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All trainers and assessors held the required qualification TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment ➤ RTOs implemented a process for confirming TAE qualifications were held by trainers and assessors ➤ RTOs followed a process for verifying/ authenticating TAE qualifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for SBTA arrangements
1.4b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Trainers and assessors held the actual units, qualifications or higher level qualifications in the same field as those they delivered ➤ Evidence was provided of relevant vocational competencies ➤ Trainer profiles/matrices were used to capture relevant vocational competencies ➤ RTOs implemented a process for verification/ authentication of vocational competencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The relevance of vocational qualifications and experience (held by trainers and assessors) in relation to the units being delivered had not been established
1.4c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Trainer profiles/matrices were used to capture industry currency ➤ Industry professional development was undertaken to maintain currency ➤ RTOs implemented a process for verification/ authentication of industry currency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
1.4d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documented evidence of professional development records was provided ➤ RTOs used a systematic process for professional development of trainers and assessors ➤ Professional development was provided by RTOs for their trainers and assessors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for SBTA arrangements
1.5a & b & c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTOs used validated assessment instruments ➤ There was a structured workplace assessment component ➤ Assessments consisted of both theory and practical ➤ Assessments were provided by RTOs or developed with their partner schools ➤ A vocational/industry environment was provided for assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was insufficient evidence that assessment addressed (all) the requirements of unit/s of competency ➤ Performance evidence was not collected or the majority of assessment was knowledge-based ➤ Assessment records were compromised – some not marked or missing or none available
1.5d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ RTOs had a formal scheduled validation process ➤ Pre- and post-assessment validation was undertaken ➤ There was industry input into validation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Validation was ad hoc rather than systematic ➤ Validation was undertaken but did not identify non-compliances ➤ Non-compliances were incurred against 1.5a, b and/or c
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Regular communication/ reporting was occurring between the parties ➤ RTOs implemented a process that identified student needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No non-compliances for SBTA arrangements

#	Characteristics of compliant outcomes	Characteristics of non-compliant outcomes
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was communication/ liaison between RTOs and schools regarding information for students ➤ VETiS information was provided at career events/ open days/ information sessions etc ➤ Provision of relevant information by RTOs occurred prior to enrolment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was evidence of employer and/or industry engagement ➤ All parties were clear on processes, roles and responsibilities for work placements ➤ A process was implemented to ensure work placements met requirements ➤ There was evidence of engagement in monitoring students on work placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There was no evidence of employer engagement
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Progress monitoring and reporting was undertaken ➤ Collection, review and action on learner feedback was occurring ➤ Quality management systems were implemented as intended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics
3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No common characteristics

Table 15: Common characteristics for SBTA arrangements

The descriptive data for SBTA arrangements revealed additional characteristics that although present for some other delivery arrangements, were not represented in high enough numbers to be included as common characteristics overall. These characteristics were identified for both compliant and non-compliant outcomes.

Additional characteristics common across SBTA arrangements		Ref
Compliant	School and workplace capacity to deliver was validated by RTOs	1.3
Non-compliant	There was no workplace check of facilities or capacity to train	1.3
	Assessment validation was ad hoc rather than systematic (1.5d)	1.5

Table 16: Additional characteristics for SBTA arrangements

Appendix F: Key Stakeholder summary of responsibilities

<p>School Curriculum and Standards Authority</p>	<p>The School Curriculum and Standards Authority is an independent statutory authority and is responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • setting standards of student achievement and for the assessment and certification of student achievement according to those standards • developing an outline of curriculum and assessment in schools that, taking account of the needs of students, sets out the knowledge, understanding, skills, values and attitudes that students are expected to acquire and guidelines for the assessment of student achievement • developing and accrediting courses for schools • maintaining a database of information relating to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the participation by students during their school years in education, training or employment as provided by the School Education Act • the achievement of students during those years • records of assessment in respect to students.
<p>Department of Education</p>	<p>The Department of Education has responsibility for providing public school education on behalf of the State Government. It also provides staff for community kindergartens and supports their operations through an annual operating grant. Under the School Education Act 1999, the Department is also responsible for registering providers of home education and for evaluating the educational program and educational progress of each home-educated child.</p>
<p>Association of Independent Schools of Western Australia</p>	<p>AISWA was established in 1962 as a non-profit organisation to support, represent and promote the interests of Independent Schools. AISWA is incorporated under the Industrial Relations Act. AISWA's constituent members include over one hundred and fifty five Independent Schools including those of two Independent School systems. Its member schools educate over 75,000 students and employ over 5,500 teaching and over 3,500 non-teaching staff.</p>
<p>Catholic Education Office of Western Australia</p>	<p>The Catholic Education system in Western Australia provides a dynamic, student centred approach to education for more than 73,000 young people in 161 schools and colleges across the state. With a focus on the development of the whole person - intellectual, spiritual, social, physical and emotional development - Catholic Education is the state's second largest education sector, educating some 18% of all school-aged children in Western Australia.</p>
<p>Department of Training and Workforce Development</p>	<p>The Department of Training and Workforce Development, in addition to its vital training role, now has a much broader responsibility which includes a focus on workforce development. Workforce development aims to build, attract and retain a skilled workforce to meet the economic needs of Western Australia, to minimise skill shortages and maximise the State's ability to respond to new opportunities. The Department will work with industry, the community and Government to build a workforce which is productive, inclusive, efficient and mobile.</p>

Attachment 1: Extract from AQTF Audit Handbook 2010

SECTION 8 TERMINOLOGY (page 49)

Non-compliance

The requirements of the *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Initial Registration* or *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Continuing Registration* have not been met, based on the evidence reviewed. There are three categories of non-compliance, each explained below.

Minor non-compliance

The requirements of the *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Initial Registration* or *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Continuing Registration* have not been met based on the evidence reviewed, but there is no or minor adverse impact on learners and/ or other consumers of goods and services produced in the training environment or the current (or future) workplace.

Significant non-compliance

The requirements of the *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Initial Registration* or *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Continuing Registration* have not been met based on the evidence reviewed, and there are indications of a significant adverse impact on learners and/ or other consumers of goods and services produced in the training environment or the current (or future) workplace.

Critical non-compliance

The requirements of the *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Initial Registration* or *AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Continuing Registration* have not been met based on the evidence reviewed and there is a critical adverse impact on learners and/ or consumers of goods and services produced in the training environment or the current (or future) workplace.

Attachment 2: Initial survey of RTOs

The following is a modified extract from the letter sent to RTOs on 20 March 2014 advising that they had been selected to participate in the SIA (with identifying names removed):

Notification of participation in the Strategic Industry Audit of VET in Schools (VETiS) delivery within Western Australia.

In February 2014, the TAC Secretariat requested that you complete a short survey to identify your VETiS delivery arrangements for a selected group of qualifications. The survey was conducted as part of stage one of the VETiS Strategic Industry Audit (SIA) to assist in determining the sample of qualifications and RTOs to be audited.

The TAC Secretariat wishes to advise that <<RTO name>> has been selected to participate in the VETiS SIA and will be audited for the following qualification/s and delivery arrangements:

Qualification	Delivery Arrangement
<< >> Certificate II in <<>>	<<One of four>>

To assist with the conduct of the SIA, you are requested to confirm the information listed above is current and if you have any conflicts of interest with any of the following auditors **by Friday 28 March 2014** to the VETiS SIA Project Manager.

Should you have a conflict of interest, please ensure you state the nature of the conflict to assist in the allocation of auditors.

- <<List of auditors>>

Please note the following criteria when providing confirmation:

- where the delivery arrangement is auspice/partnership you have a current auspice or partnership arrangement in place for the qualification and listed school;
- where the delivery arrangement is fee-for-service/profile you are currently delivering the qualification to VETiS students;
- where the delivery arrangement is school based traineeship/apprenticeship (SBT/A) you currently deliver to students from the listed school within these arrangements;
- where the delivery arrangement is RTO School you are currently delivering the qualification to your internal students.

It is anticipated that audits will be conducted during May – June 2014 with your Registration Officer contacting you in the coming months to advise of your allocated auditor. As per normal audit processes, the auditor will liaise with you directly to organise a mutually suitable audit date. Due to tight project timeframes all audits will be completed by 30 June 2014, with any rectification audits being completed outside of this time.

Where an off-site visit to a school is required, it is the responsibility of the RTO to organise the visit time, seek permission from the principal for the auditor to attend the school premises and have staff and students available for the auditor to observe and interview.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the Manager Regulation (VET Compliance).

Attachment 3: Pre-audit evidence requested from RTOs

VET in Schools Strategic Industry Audit (VETiS SIA)

List of Evidence to be Submitted for Audit

When is my evidence due?

Evidence is to be submitted no later than **4.30pm, 11 April 2014**.

What evidence am I required to send?

While you are requested to submit evidence for two units of competency per qualification (as listed in the covering letter), the auditor will review other units at your site visit. Please ensure that evidence for all units of competency is available to the Auditor during the site visit.

For the units of competency outlined in the covering letter, you are required to submit the following evidence:

	RTO checklist
<p>Overview of RTO</p> <p>Please provide a summary of the RTO including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational Chart • A brief, general description of the operations, including a summary of delivery areas and core business, the length of time the RTO has been in operation and if the RTO receives public funding • Names of RTO staff with VETiS responsibility, including position titles and descriptions (duties/responsibilities) • Enrolment numbers against each qualification related to this audit • Evidence of compliance with Working with Children and/or any other legislation that is applicable to the training and assessment for this audit 	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>AQTF Standard 1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy for training and/or assessment for each qualification demonstrating how the requirements of the Training Package are met • Evidence of industry consultation in relation to the development of the strategy (ies) • Student/Trainer (supervision ratios) if relevant for each qualification. 	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>AQTF Standard 1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each VET in Schools delivery arrangement, details and evidence of the facilities, training materials and equipment the RTO has in place, or access to, demonstrating the capacity for the delivery and assessment of the requested qualification consistent with the requirements of the Training Package, as well as the RTO's own training and assessment strategy. • For auspice arrangements, list the sites training is being conducted. • Timetables/schedules for each qualification and delivery site 	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

When does the audit commence?

Due to the scope and size of the SIA your audit will commence from the date your evidence is received by the Training Accreditation Council (TAC) Secretariat. Once received, TAC Secretariat staff will forward your evidence directly to your assigned Auditor.

How do I submit my evidence and who do I send my evidence to?

Evidence is to be submitted electronically via email (max 5MB) to the SIA Project Officer, Angela Hollingsworth, angela.hollingsworth@des.wa.gov.au, via file sharing technology (eg., Dropbox), or electronic storage media (eg., USB drive). If evidence is submitted via electronic storage media, please send by post to: Attention Angela Hollingsworth, Training Accreditation Council Secretariat, PO Box 1766, Osborne Park 6916.