SUBJECT: Food and Cooking Essentials TQA 1.

PURPOSE: To seek accreditation of the proposed courses.

BACKGROUND: At its meeting of 5 December 2012 (Agenda Item 3.2) the Authority noted that accreditation for this course is to expire at the end of 2013. At its meeting of 3 April 2013 (Agenda Item 2.4) the Authority noted that:
• TQA Office to review assessment methodology and assessed learning outcomes.
• Draft to be distributed for general comment and course name discussion prior to formal accreditation process.

The Office undertook these steps, publishing a draft for general comment in the period 3 April to 17 April 2013. Comments were received from: Marilyn Hillier (DoE); Dianne Hunnibell (GYC); and Anne Menzie (St Aloyius). Some amendments to the draft were made in light of these comments (See Attachment A).

CURRENT SITUATION: The following course document is ready for accreditation consideration (Attachment B):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New course:</th>
<th>Replacing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Cooking Essentials</td>
<td>Food and Cooking Essentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQA 1 size value 10</td>
<td>TQA 1 size value 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed course was published for comment as part of the accreditation process from 18 April to 13 May, 2013. No comments were received.

The proposed course has been analysed against the TQA’s Course Accreditation Criteria. See Attachment C. Some amendments were made to the exposure draft in light of the analysis report.

ISSUES: 1. The quality assurance method in the expiring course is scheduled audit using a risk-based approach. In the proposed course this method has been changed to an ‘audit on complaint’ model. The latter method is appropriate given the minimal level of risk of qualifications associated with the
course to the integrity of the TCE and matches that of courses of a similar size/level (e.g. Introduction to Catering TQA 1, size 10).

2. The expiring course has an award structure of Pass/Higher Pass based on assessment against learning outcomes with standards at ‘competent/highly competent’ standard. Analysis has shown that the four ‘highly competent’ standards are inappropriate:

   - one is about using a broad range of preparation and cooking techniques, whereas the course document specifies five techniques will be emphasised
   - one is about the level of independence of the learner – this is concerned with the context in which learning is demonstrated, not the standard displayed and is therefore inappropriate. It also says ‘high quality’ is a characteristic, but the meaning of ‘high quality’ and its characteristics as evidenced by learners’ work are not described
   - one is about applying past learning to current experience – this is better placed with the ‘satisfactory standard’ for criterion 4
   - one is about justifying food choice – this is already included in the ‘satisfactory standard’ for criteria 1 and 2.

The proposed course has a single rating – C rating (satisfactory standard) – and awards available are Preliminary Achievement (if the standard is achieved on 3 of the 4 criteria) and Satisfactory Achievement (if the standard is achieved on all criteria). Dianne Hunnibell from GYC was the only respondent to the various drafts to suggest a return to a Pass/Higher Pass award (see Attachment A). There is a lack of resource available to develop meaningful ‘high standard’ elements. Given a lack of responses to informal invitations to undertake the task and the lack of comments received from other stakeholders on this issue, the PA/SA award structure and single C rating (satisfactory standard) standards are used in the proposed course.

3. The appropriateness of the course title Food and Cooking Essentials had been questioned. Cooking and Food Essentials has been suggested as being more appropriate. In response to comments by Ms Marilyn Hillier (See Attachment A) and after future consideration the original title has been retained.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the courses be accredited for use from 1 Jan 2014 until 31 Dec 2018.

That the courses be assigned a robustness level of 3.
That the courses be assigned the following characteristics for the TCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>TCE Contribution: level/credit points towards participation and achievement standard for PA or higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Cooking Essentials TQA 1 size value 10</td>
<td>TQA 1, 10 credit points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARED BY: Dr Mike Jenkins
Liaison and Development Officer, TQA
Date: 23 May 2013

APPROVED BY CEO: Acting under delegation from the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority to accredit senior secondary courses.

Delegation to the CEO of the power to make accreditation decisions under Section 26 is limited to those cases which meet the conditions below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation Conditions</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course proposed clearly fits all the criteria for accreditation established by the Authority.</td>
<td>The proposed course meets the Authority’s Senior Secondary Course Accreditation Criteria. See Attached Reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation of the proposed course is consistent with Authority policy decisions, including the need to streamline the number of courses.</td>
<td>At its meeting of 3 April 2013 the Authority decided that this replacement course was required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of risk to the Authority’s reputation of a decision to accredit the course is agreed in consultation with the Chair of the Authority to be low.</td>
<td>The CEO and the Chair of the Authority met on 4 June 2013. It was agreed that accreditation of these proposed courses was low risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course accreditation will only be carried out by delegation when the decision is positive (all refusals will be made by the Authority meeting) and in full compliance with Authority policy decisions</td>
<td>The recommendation is for a positive decision (ie accreditation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposals for new courses, unless previously decided by the Authority, whether or not fully compliant in all other respects, will fall outside the delegation.

The proposed course replaces an existing one. It is not a ‘new’ course.

Cases where there is not agreement that the risk to the Authority’s reputation is low would fall outside the delegation.

n/a

Signed by Dr Reg Allen

CEO, Tasmanian Qualifications Authority
Date: 4 June 2013

Acting under delegation from the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority to accredit senior secondary courses.

Attachments:

A: Comments, communications and actions re-draft course
B: Proposed Course Document
C: Analysis of Proposed Course
Communications with 'X'

Date: Friday, 12 April 2013 12:08 PM

Dear Mike

We have just had a look over proposed new course as above. Our only suggestion is that the title remains the same ie Food and Cooking Essentials as it reflects the natural sequencing of lesson planning ie students engage in the theory of selected topics and the practical is a natural progression, following on.

FYI there is a typo under the course content section/Food and the Consumer dot point 4.2 which reads 'eating our' and should read 'eating out'.

Regards 'X'

ACTIONED

---

Communications with 'X'

Email from Mike Jenkins April 8 2013

Dear 'X', thanks for your email.

The issue is not one of the course being a TQA 1, but rather the number of criteria, their current standards, and needs vs costs of having a range of standards.

We looked very closely at whether we could have a range of awards (e.g. Pass and Higher Pass) or a full range. With only 4 criteria it would be impossible to write such an algorithm for a full range.

We looked at keeping a Higher Pass. There are issues: the current standards lack clarity/meaning (E.g. The first about range actually contradicts the course document where it lists cooking techniques to be used, the second has 'high quality' (what are its characteristics??) and independence (not an issue to be assessed, especially at level 1, and what does 'relatively high’ mean? Relative to what??), the third has been incorporated into the C standards for C4, and the last one seems to combine aspects of C1 and C2 in an unclear way).

There is also a big issue about how providers report High Pass to us (there was much confusion from some providers) and some concerns that formal assessments regarding the HP standards were not being made/recorded in systematic ways.
We could have a Higher Pass IF there were standards (e.g. If each criterion had standards for both a 'C' rating and an 'A' standard). The algorithm could then be, say, 4 A = HP. Doing this would mean that the higher standards for each of the criteria would need to be written. We do not have resources to do so, and given the nature of the course (i.e. Basic cooking at TQA 1 for size 10) cannot allocate time to the task. If someone volunteered to do so, we could look at it again, but there is a cost vs need issue.

Best wishes
Mike J

On 8/04/13 10:02 AM, 'X' wrote:

Hello Mike,
This email is in relation to the proposed changes to the TQA 1 Cooking and Food Essentials Course.

I agree that the course should be changed to a criterion based course for assessment purposes, but in its new form, it is worse off than previously. Previously students could achieved either a Pass or a Higher Pass, with the modifications, they can now only achieve a pass.

Is it possible to have a full range of achievements from PA through to EA, or isn't that possible with TQA1 courses?

If it isn't possible, then it is probably better to leave it as it was originally, that way, students could at least strive for a Higher Pass.

Regards
'X'
Communications with 'X'

Email from Mike Jenkins 18 April 2013

Thanks for your comments, I will ensure they are carefully considered in the review process. Best wishes, Mike

-----

On 17/04/13 3:45 PM, ‘X’ wrote:

Dear Mike,
I have reviewed the Cooking and Food Essentials Course document and note the following perspective;
1. Healthy Food and Lifestyles Choices content is thoroughly covered.
2. Food and the Consumer - re managing food costs. There is a national and local perspective revisiting the growing of your own food. It is hoped that this will not be fleetingly taught. If the students could have an excursion to a Stephanie Alexander Kitchen garden program or even better, actually grow at least one vegetable/ fruit and harvest the food, the connection between better eating habits and the hands on growing of food will reinforce points 1 & 2. A market to plate consideration must be adequately taught.

ACTION – growing own added as an option in section on Food and the Consumer

3. Food and Personal Safety content is thoroughly covered.
4. Food Preparation. The topic of Freezing as a component of Food Preservation needs to be added. This reinforces harvesting of food, and an introduction to one of the correct storage methods for a home grown fruit and vegetable or bulk bought market fruit/ vegetable. The skills of budgeting and independent living will be reinforced by discussing the correct procedure for freezing left over foods.

ACTION – using correct freezing/thawing techniques added to Food and Personal Safety

Regards
‘X’
ATTACHMENT B: PROPOSED COURSE DOCUMENT

Please visit www.tqa.tas.gov.au/3435 to access the course document.
### TQA Senior Secondary Course Accreditation report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Food and Cooking Essentials, TQA level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Proponent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Officer(s):</td>
<td>Sallyanne Fisher, Client Service Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Date:</td>
<td>23 May 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accreditation History**  
*Food and Cooking Essentials* was accredited on 1 October 2008 for use in 2009 – 2013. A replacement course is required for commencement 1 January 2014.

**Evaluation History**

1. **Rationale**  
The proposed course has a clearly identifiable rationale which includes consideration of strategic need, demand, coherence and increasing student participation/achievement. Including appropriate consultation with stakeholders.  
The Course Description identifies the value and rationale of the course, emphasising the need to develop students’ essential food knowledge, preparation, consumer and social skills as they transition to adulthood. The course can lead to future studies in *Food, Cooking and Nutrition* (TQA level 2) and *Food and Nutrition* (TQA level 3). A replacement course is required as the current course delivered by Tasmanian providers expires 31 December 2013.  
NB. There is no Rationale section in the course document.

2. **Coherence**

2.a **General Coherence**  
The proposed course must have educational aims and learning outcomes appropriate for students in the senior secondary phase of education in Tasmania; and  
- must be at least at the equivalent of the types of competencies characteristic of AQF Cert I; and  
- has a balance of learning of both domain-specific and generic skills and knowledge  
- meets the TQA’s specifications document (if applicable).  

2.a  
- The course has educational aims and learning outcomes appropriate for senior secondary education in Tasmania. This is detailed in the Course Description, Learning Outcomes and Course Content.  
- The course identifies competencies characteristic of AQF Certificate 1. This is explained in the Course Size and Complexity.  
- The course has a combination of domain-specific and generic skills and knowledge across four study areas. There are 8 domain-specific and 2 generic skills and knowledge listed under Learning Outcomes.  
- N/a
2.b Internal Coherence

- there is clarity regarding what content is compulsory, and what (if any) is optional. Language used reflects this (eg ‘must’ or ‘will’ not ‘should’ or ‘could’).

- (if applicable) the degree of optional content (eg choice between units/topics) is limited. Options allow for some specialisation, but there is a significant ‘core’ of common content

- there is clarity regarding the sequence for delivery of content (eg there are notations to say if the order in which contents is listed in the document reflects compulsory or suggested delivery sequencing)

- there is a clear match between the stated Learning Outcomes and the Criteria/Standards, and between the Learning Outcomes, Content and Criteria/Standards.

*Note: while some Learning Outcomes may be aspirational (non-assessed, eg ‘develop a positive attitude towards…) the number of such objectives is limited. Overwhelmingly there is a clear match between the outcomes and the criteria/standards.*

2.c Coherence with other courses

- if applicable, there are clear linages between a TQA 3 course and a ‘Foundation’ course at level 2 (or other specified TQA accredited pathway courses).

*Note: a ‘Foundation’ course is not a simplified or ‘easier’ version of a TQA 3 course. It has its own distinctive features (content, standards, criteria etc) but prepares students who wish to*
3. **Overlap with other courses**

Does the proposed course duplicate, by titles or coverage

- other TQA senior secondary accredited courses?; or
- nationally accredited VET courses?

Does the course document identify where any outcomes meet the requirements of VET units of competence in Training Packages to the extent that a learner may reasonably expect an RTO to grant direct recognition (RPL, credit transfer) for those units on the basis of successful achievement in the TQA accredited course.

*The Authority does not expect to accredit a course where almost all the outcomes (content and standards for assessment) align with those for VET Training Package units of competence except where the distinct nature and value of the course can be established on other grounds.*

- No, the course does not duplicate by titles or coverage other TQA senior secondary accredited courses or nationally accredited VET courses.
- No, the course document does not identify any outcomes that meet the requirements of VET units of competence.

4. **Assessment**

- there is clarity regarding any prescribed assessment instruments and work requirements
- the standards are expressed in clear, unambiguous language (eg ‘sound understanding = C, good understanding = B’ lacks clarity. The standards must clearly describe **features/characteristics** of the evidence of student work required by the standard). Note: panel to check criteria and all standard elements against issues noted in Appendix F of the Course Writer’s Guide and make comments here
- (if applicable) the standards are comparable with ACARA/CCAFL /VET standards in regard to their level of complexity and wording

- There are no prescribed assessment instruments or work requirements identified in the course document other than a requirement that learners undertake 80% of the design time engaged in practical learning activities.
- The Standards clearly describe the features and characteristics of the evidence of student work required to achieve a satisfactory standard.
- The Standards are comparable with VET Certificate I standards in regard to their level of complexity and wording
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity and wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • the degree of difficulty/complexity of the standards and the range of criteria are comparable with those in accredited courses in the same/similar learning area and level of complexity/size value  
Note courses used for comparison and comments |  
| • The degree of difficulty/complexity of the Standards and the range of criteria are comparable with other courses such as Introduction to Catering, TQA level 1, size 10.  
Note courses used for comparison and comments |
| 5. Labelling and terminology |  
| The names used in courses and for results (awards) are simple, plain, readily understandable by practitioners and not mislead reasonable persons.  
Are the names used for awards/title consistent with current TQA practice?  
The language used to describe the course, assessment and standards is simple, plain and readily understandable by practitioners.  
Note: panel to check document against DoE ‘Without Prejudice: Guidelines for Inclusive Language’ and note comments here |  
| • The names used in the course and for results are simple and understandable by practitioners and reasonable persons.  
• Yes, the names used for awards/title are consistent with current TQA practice. Have suggested moving the highest achievement to the top of the award list under Qualifications Available and Award requirements – this will then be consistent with the TQA course template.  
• The language used to describe the course, assessment and standards is meaningful and understandable. |
| 6. Delivery |  
| The methods of delivering the proposed course are likely to achieve the purposes, aims and learning outcomes of the course. |  
| • The methodology for course delivery is likely to achieve the purposes, aims and learning outcomes documented. |
| 7. Access |  
| Any limitations to access based on age, gender, employment, cultural, social or educational background are explicit, clearly stated and justified. |  
| • The course document does not specify any access limitations. The Resources section indicates “access to a kitchen with domestic equipment and a dining space is required”. The Work Expectations section indicates “learners will be involved in practical activities involving selecting, preparing and producing food 80% of the allocated design time”. |
| 8. Quality Assurance |  
| The assessment processes to be used to determine whether a student has achieved the learning outcomes of the course are of standard sufficient to deliver  
• a match between the standards |  
| The assessment processes are described in the Course Content and Assessment sections.  
The Quality Assurance Processes section indicates: “Process – Each provider is responsible for ensuring the integrity and validity of their assessment results against the requirements of the course, including standards, and for maintaining records and
for achievement specified in the course and the standards demonstrated by students; and

- a level of comparability of results/awards essentially the same as for all other Authority accredited courses; and

- community confidence in the integrity and meaning of results.

documentation that will demonstrate the integrity, accuracy and validity of the award decisions they make each year. Where the TQA identifies sufficient potential for concern about the integrity or validity of a provider’s award decisions it will undertake an investigation. After such an investigation is completed, the TQA may take action under Section 33 of the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority Act (2003) as it considers appropriate, including but not limited to:

- giving the school/college a direction in relation to the provision or assessment of the course (section 33 (2))
- refusing to accept results for this course from the provider (section 33 (4)).”

This method of QA is appropriate given the minimal level of risk of the course to the integrity of the TCE and matches that of courses in a similar area/size/level (e.g. Introduction to Catering TQA 1, size 10).

### 9. Resource Requirements

- What, if any, special requirements are there for providers of the course (eg special equipment, resources)
- Are these clearly described?
- What requirements are there for the TQA (eg assessment)?

- The Resources section indicates “access to a kitchen with domestic equipment and a dining space is required”.
- This is clearly described in the course document.
- The TQA is required to undertake quality assurance processes and course accreditation.

### 10. Evaluation

The proposed course must identify

- course monitoring; and

- evaluation processes.

- The course is monitored through quality assurance processes undertaken by the TQA and the course provider.
- The Course Evaluation section explains that accreditation is sequential, however, can be requested for review or amendment throughout the period of accreditation.

### 11. Size /Complexity

- Are the level of complexity and size value of the course clearly described?
- Does the ‘amount’ of content/assessment regime match the size value indicated?
- Does the nature/aim/purpose of the course, its content, learning outcomes and assessment standards match the characteristics of the learning at

- Yes, the Course Size and Complexity states this course is TQA Level 1, Size 10. A description of the complexity level is explained.
- Yes, the amount of content and assessment matches the size value indicated.
- Yes, the Course Description, Learning Outcomes, Work Expectations and Standards sections indicate that the course content matches the aim and purpose of the course.
this level of complexity? (see paragraph in course size and complexity section of the course document for these characteristics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• List the qualifications (including award types) to be conferred on successful completion of the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is this information included in the course documentation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This information is included in the Qualifications Available section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For consistency with other course documents, the highest award should be at the top of the list ie. Satisfactory Achievement at the top.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course appears to be a suitable replacement for the current course that expires 31 December 2013. Suggestions for minor amendments to the proposed course have been described.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>