



REPORT

Evidence review report: Training Practical Solutions Consultancy Pty Ltd

RTO number:	41290
CRICOS number:	N/A
Date/s of review:	12 Oct 2020
Date report created:	13 Oct 2020

Organisation details

Organisation's legal name:	Training Practical Solutions Consultancy Pty Ltd
Trading name/s:	N/A
RTO number:	41290
CRICOS number:	N/A

Review team

Lead reviewer:	David Scott
Reviewer/s:	Nicolette Talas

Review details

Application number/s:	RECNSD0000153
Review number/s:	EVRREC0003027
Review reason/s:	Reconsideration Evidence Review
Date review evidence received:	7 Sep 2020
Date/s review conducted:	12 – 14 Oct 2020

Review findings

Review finding: Minor non-compliance

Report completed by: David Scott

Practice	Standards for RTOs	Finding
Training and Assessment	1.8*, 1.9, 1.10	Not compliant

*Indicates a non-compliant clause

Scope of review

Training Products	Mode/s of delivery/assessment*	Current enrolments
<i>MSS40316 Certificate IV in Competitive Systems and Practices</i>	Face to face	39
<i>FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing</i>	Face to face	5

*Apprenticeship, Traineeship, Face to face, Distance, Online, Workplace, Mixed, Other (specify)

About this Report

This report details findings of evidence submitted with the reconsideration application.

Training and Assessment

Training Delivery and Assessment

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.8

Finding: Not compliant

The RTO implements an assessment system that ensures that assessment (including recognition of prior learning):

- a) complies with the assessment requirements of the relevant training package or VET accredited course; and
- b) is conducted in accordance with the Principles of Assessment contained in Table 1.8-1 and the Rules of Evidence contained in Table 1.8-2.

Table 1.8.1 Principles of Assessment

Fairness	The individual learner's needs are considered in the assessment process. Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments are applied by the RTO to take into account the individual learner's needs. The RTO informs the learner about the assessment process, and provides the learner with the opportunity to challenge the result of the assessment and be reassessed if necessary.
Flexibility	Assessment is flexible to the individual learner by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• reflecting the learner's needs;• assessing competencies held by the learner no matter how or where they have been acquired; and• drawing from a range of assessment methods and using those that are appropriate to the context, the unit of competency and associated assessment requirements, and the individual.
Validity	Any assessment decision of the RTO is justified, based on the evidence of performance of the individual learner. Validity requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• assessment against the unit/s of competency and the associated assessment requirements covers the broad range of skills and knowledge that are essential to competent performance;• assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application;• assessment to be based on evidence that demonstrates that a learner could demonstrate these skills and knowledge in other similar situations; and• judgement of competence is based on evidence of learner performance that is aligned to the unit/s of competency and associated assessment requirements.
Reliability	Evidence presented for assessment is consistently interpreted and assessment results are comparable irrespective of the assessor conducting the assessment.

Table 1.8.2 Rules of Evidence

Validity	The assessor is assured that the learner has the skills, knowledge and attributes as described in the module or unit of competency and associated assessment requirements.
Sufficiency	The assessor is assured that the quality, quantity and relevance of the assessment evidence enables a judgement to be made of a learner's competency.
Authenticity	The assessor is assured that the evidence presented for assessment is the learner's own work.
Currency	The assessor is assured that the assessment evidence demonstrates current competency. This requires the assessment evidence to be from the present or the very recent past.

Outstanding non-compliance

The following analysis provides guidance on the areas of non-compliance that remain. Examples of non-compliances are provided; however, this is not an exhaustive list.

- The organisation has not addressed the non-compliance for future students. For example, but not limited to:
Authenticity - the assessment system does not confirm the authenticity of assessments submitted.
 - the organisation has not addressed the issues found with regards to the failure of its assessment systems to ensure student responses are authentic. The organisation confirmed that its assessment systems accept as satisfactory evidence, student responses that are copied from the trainer's notes. The organisation advised, 'The learners have not breach TPSC's authenticity and plagiarism requirements but TPSC will install clearer emphasis on individual work.' The organisation did not support their claim with evidence, for example, providing a copy of the respective policy and procedure in place at the time of assessment, nor where they have provided clearer emphasis of their assessment conditions.

Reliability and Sufficiency - the assessment tools do not address all unit of competency requirements.

- the organisation did not provide evidence to support their conclusion that the answers provided by students to Part - C item 10 (refer original finding above) could be satisfactory despite being 'generic in nature'.
- The organisation has not planned and carried out sufficient remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused students. For example, but not limited to:
 - the organisation was required to demonstrate that it has carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students that were impacted by training and assessment practices that did not meet the requirements of the training product. Remedial action needed to cover all students who enrolled, or completed with the organisation, since 1 December 2019, who were assessed in a manner that did not meet the requirements of Standards for RTOs.

The organisation did not provide evidence of having reviewed past assessment practices from 1 December 2019, to identify and address the impact of poor assessment practices. In response, they advised, 'TPSC will carry out spot checks on learners' files so to identify areas where insufficient observations or support may have been provided but not recorded.' Sufficient evidence was not provided of its plan, which at a minimum should include the number of students the remedial action will be carried out for, action that will be taken, and timeframes associated with the completion of the plan (reference: ASQA fact sheet – Addressing non-compliances following an audit).

The organisation commented on how they have responded to the audit findings. The organisation provided no evidence to support their claims as follows:

- 'TPSC has clarified the issue with the assigned trainer and assessor for these learners.' (p.15)
- 'TPSC has clarified the issue with the assigned trainers and assessors for these learners.' (p.16)
- 'Theo Karamanidis (Nobody Denim) and Danny Jaimangal (JBS Australia) (trainers and assessors) have clarified that the response provided by:' (p.16)
- 'The comments offered by the trainer(s) and assessor(s) despite being generic in nature points out that satisfactorily evidence was achieved.' (p.17)
- 'We believe the 2019 learner cohorts have undertaken and met the expectations of the industry in which they work, and we have confirmed this through the industry consultations and from the ongoing learners' feedback collected at the completion of each assessment.' (p.19).

Analysis of evidence

The following evidence was reviewed:

- Reconsideration Application Letter
- TPSC QR Action Plan
- MSS40316 TP V5.1 June
- TMG-V6.1 template
- LAW-V6.1 template

The organisation has provided evidence to demonstrate that it has revised materials to support the collection of evidence.

However, there was no evidence provided to demonstrate that implementation had occurred for the organisations assessment system. The organisation's response detailed planned actions that are to occur at a future point.

The organisation remains non-compliant with this clause.

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.9

Finding: Compliant

The RTO implements a plan for ongoing systematic validation of assessment practices and judgements that includes for each training product on the RTO's scope of registration:

- a) when assessment validation will occur;**
- b) which training products will be the focus of the validation;**
- c) who will lead and participate in validation activities; and**
- d) how the outcomes of these activities will be documented and acted upon.**

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.10

Finding: Compliant

For the purposes of Clause 1.9, each training product is validated at least once every five years, with at least 50% of products validated within the first three years of each five year cycle, taking into account the relative risks of all of the training products on the RTO's scope of registration, including those risks identified by the VET Regulator.

Outstanding non-compliance

- The organisation has not provided evidence to demonstrate implementation of their validation plan in accord with their validation policy and procedure. The procedure clearly indicates the importance of incorporating a review of completed student assessments per '3.4-Assessment Validation - It includes reviewing a statistically valid sample of the assessments' and again per Method 2 '...validation includes reviewing a statistically valid sample of the assessments. This implies that validation is being conducted after a period of implementation of assessment and that the review is based on actual completed assessments.'
- The organisation has not demonstrated in the additional evidence submitted, that for the purposes of Clause 1.9, each training product has been validated at least once every five years, with at least 50% of products validated within the first three years of each five year cycle, taking into account the relative risks of all of the training products on the RTO's scope of registration, including those risks identified by the VET Regulator.

Analysis of evidence

The following evidence was reviewed:

- Reconsideration Application Letter
- TPSC QR Action Plan
- 191125 Team Meeting Minutes
- 200113 Team Meeting Minutes
- 200414 Team Meeting Minutes
- BRW Meeting Minutes signed
- Compliance Check Policy and Procedures
- PP Meeting Minutes signed
- RESOURCE TRACKER V5.0
- Sample Generator - MSS30316
- Validation Checklist V3.2
- Validation Policy and Procedures.
- The organisation has provided evidence to demonstrate that it has implemented a validation plan in accordance with their validation policy and procedure.
- The organisation has provided evidence to demonstrate that each training product will be validated at least once every five years, with at least 50% of products validated within the first three years of each five-year cycle. The evidence provided takes into account the relative risks of all of the training products on the RTO's scope of registration.

The organisation is compliant with these clauses.