

**BRIEFING NOTE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
THE TASMANIAN QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY**

SUBJECT: Workshop Techniques – Introduction 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 was to expire at the end of 2013.

At its meeting of 3 April 2013 (Agenda Item 2.4) the Authority determined that Motor Vehicle Body Works will not be redeveloped but specific mention of the techniques in this course will be included in Workshop Techniques – Introduction. The Authority also noted that:

- Contents for the course would be amended by TQA Office to include Motor Vehicle Bodyworks
- TQA Office to review assessment methodology and assessed learning outcomes
- a draft to be distributed for general comment prior to formal accreditation process.

The Office undertook the first two steps noted above and published a draft for general comment in the period 16 April to 8 May 2013. Comments were received from: Ian Glover (Claremont College); Shanli Perkins, Don College; a team from Rosny College; and Nicole Ottrey from Rosny College. 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**):

New course:	Replacing:
Workshop Techniques – Introduction TQA 1 size value 10	Workshop Techniques – Introduction TQA 1 size value 10 Motor Vehicle Bodyworks TQA 1 size value 10

The proposed course was published for comment as part of the accreditation process from 13 to 27 May, 2013. No comments were received.

The proposed course has been analysed against the TQA's Course Accreditation Criteria. See **Attachment C**. During the analysis phase an issue was identified regarding possible confusion between Criterion 1 and Criterion 2: this has been addressed by focusing Criterion 1 on tools and physical resources, and Criterion 2 on techniques and processes.

ISSUES:

1. Page #2 of the proposed course has the statement, "*It is possible for a student to study more than one of these specialisations during the course. Specialisations are not differentiated in the qualifications available in this course. No more than one qualification in this course per academic year will be listed on a student's Qualifications Certificate or contribute credit points towards the TCE's participation and achievement standard.*" This statement clarifies that the course is not a framework one. The course it proposes to replace is not a framework one. The inclusion of the clarifying statement led to some comments from providers requesting that it be removed and a framework of qualifications be included (see **Attachment A**). The position of the Office is that the course is *not* a framework one, and that specialisations will not be included in the qualification title as this would make an award in each specialisation a different and distinct qualification. This position is because the focus of the course is on 'workshop techniques' not the medium (metal, wood etc) used as the *vehicle* for learning about workshop techniques. Indeed the current course on which the replacement proposed course was based, and the proposed course note that more than one specialisation can be undertaken. The use of a framework is not supported by the course nor the learning outcomes assessed.
2. Comments received in relation to the general draft of this course (and that of Design and Production TQA 2) raised issues regarding the scope of available awards. The current expiring course Workshop Techniques – Introduction has two awards (Pass and Higher Pass). In response to stakeholder comments the course presented here for accreditation consideration has four possible awards (PA, SA, CA and EA) using algorithms for 4 criteria and two ratings (C and A). An HA award is not included as the upward pressure on a single C rating has been judged unacceptable.
3. The Quality Assurance model used in the current expiring course is an audit based scheduled by a risk-based approach. This model has been retained in the course presented here for accreditation consideration, with the addition of checking workspaces and associated facilities to the list of things usually checked at audit. This has been done to allow checking that providers are meeting the resource

requirements listed in the course document.

4. As noted in the Analysis (**Attachment C** item 9) the exposure draft of the course retained wording from the current course regarding providers meeting legislative requirements for workstations. This has been amended in the course presented here for accreditation consideration to a notation that, “Delivery of this course requires specialised workspace/s and associated facilities.”

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:

Course:	TCE Contribution: level/credit points towards participation and achievement standard for PA or higher
Workshop Techniques – Introduction TQA 1 size value 10	TQA 1, 10 credit points

PREPARED BY: Dr Mike Jenkins
Liaison and Development Officer, TQA

Date: 28 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:

Delegation Conditions	Comment
The course proposed clearly fits all the criteria for accreditation established by the Authority.	The proposed course meets the Authority’s <i>Senior Secondary Course Accreditation Criteria</i> . See Attached Reports.
Accreditation of the proposed course is consistent with Authority policy decisions, including the need to streamline the number of courses.	At its meeting of 3 April 2013 the Authority decided that this replacement course was required.

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.	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.
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	The recommendation is for a positive decision (ie accreditation).
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

ATTACHMENT A

COMMENTS, COMMUNICATIONS AND ACTIONS RE-DRAFT COURSE

Communications with 'X'

From Mike Jenkins, 18 April 2013

Hi 'X' and thanks for your email.

Just to clarify re"do many Workshop Tech classes in their two years at college, but will only receive one outcome is not good" - a student CAN do the course in both year 11 and year 12 and get 2 quals and 2 sets of credit points, but they cannot get these by doing the course twice in a single academic year.

The issue of listing specialisations in the TQA 1 course was discussed a lot when the course was being written, and in the last few years when some providers attempted to get the TQA to 'count' points etc for student doing the course twice in a single academic year. The position is a firm 'no'. The focus of the course is on 'workshop techniques' not the medium (metal, wood etc) used as the vehicle for learning about workshop techniques, hence the use of a framework is not supported by the course.

I published a draft of the new WT_intro course yesterday (trust you got the email from your TQA Co-ordinator). It would be great to have your comments on the bodyworks material that has been placed inside the document.

Best wishes,
Mike

On 18/04/13 7:45 AM, 'X' wrote:

Hi Mike,
thanks for the heads up, but I must say I am very disappointed in this outcome. As discussed with you, the fact that students can do many Workshop Tech classes in their two years at college, but will only receive one outcome is not good.
As a parent, I would desire that my son or daughter has the right to have their efforts at school recognised on their TCE. The loss of the Bodyworks subject as a stand alone subject, only adds to this problem. Has there been any progress on the changing of this situation, by the authority adding a simple code to each WT subject to allow a student a result for every WT subject they undertake ?

I know I speak for the majority of MDT teachers in Tasmania, when I emphasise this anomaly. I look forward to your favourable reply,
Cheers
'X'

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Tuesday, 16 April 2013 9:42 AM

Dear 'X',

Thank you so much for meeting with me. The notes I made at our meeting were included as part of a background report that the Authority considered at its last meeting.

At that meeting the Authority, "...determined that Motor Vehicle Body Works will not be redeveloped but specific mention of the techniques in this course will be included in Workshop Techniques Introduction".

I understand that this may not be the decision you were hoping for.

The TQA Office will undertake the work of actioning the decision re-including Motor Vehicle Body Works in the Workshop Techniques -Introduction course document.

We would greatly value your expert comments on the new course once this drafting has been completed.

Best wishes,

Mike

Communications with 'X'

Sent: Thursday, 9 May 2013 8:39

Thanks very much for your comments, 'X'. I have made some notes below within your original email.

With thanks,

Mike J

Date: Wednesday, 8 May 2013 4:09 PM

Hi Mike,

Course changes requested re Workshop techniques;

1. Page one add the words "WITH TEACHER ASSISTANCE" to middle rationale sentence;

Through studying this course, *students with teacher assistance*, will develop skills to make.....

The issue of teacher assistance is one of context rather than a requirement. The Course Writers Handbook p. 28 notes:

"Standards may **not** include language such as: ...

- 'with teacher assistance can...' (this is about the context of the demonstration of a learning outcome) "

http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/4DCGI/_WWW_doc/008443/RND01/CourseWritersGuideV9.pdf

-
2. Remove the words *and appraising* on page 6 under the heading learning outcomes ; (dot point 8)

The outcome is about developing confidence in appraising, and this is inferred by C3 standard element 3 where a student would need to be thinking about /'appraising' the degree to which their product matched the specifications. It also gives a 'foundation' to the appraisal required in the TQA 2 course.

-
3. On page 8 under the heading **work expectations** ; The products will be made following a given plan or design *constraints*(ie task specifications or brief)

Added

-
4. Page 9 under the textile section correct the second heading to *Minor products* ; examples cushion, bag or boxer shorts

Typo corrected

-
5. On pages 11 to 13; Would like to see the words *with assistance* added to all satisfactory standard rating C headings on all 4 criteria ; *The student ,with assistance can :*
-

See above

Have a great day!]
'X'

Communications with 'X'

Email 10 May 2013

Response for 'X' regarding Workshop Techniques – Introduction

We feel that it is a positive to have moved from competency based assessment to criterion based. Given the range of achievement at level 1 we think it is appropriate to have the A and C standards for the criteria.

We are concerned about the lack of specialisations within the course to be recognised and accredited in the same year.

Page 2 of the draft document states: “It is possible for a student to study more than one of these specialisations during the course. Specialisations are not differentiated in the qualifications available in this course. No more than one qualification in this course per academic year will be listed on a student’s Qualification Certificate or contribute credit points towards the TCE’s participation and achievement standard.”

These specialisations require quite different skills to be learned and applied to very different materials and in different ways. Students studying Design and Production at Level 2 are able to have their specialisations recognised, but the Workshop Techniques syllabus does not allow for this to happen at level 1.

With the current syllabus this means students may do Textiles and Composite Materials, Wood and Metal, or Metal and Automotive at a level 1, be studying on two full lines of 150 hours each but be accredited with only 10 TCE points in total. This is an inequitable position for these students to be in. It could be said that student could choose to study different specialisations in different years. However, if they are aiming to improve and develop their skills, as we would hope, then to study two specialisations at Level 1 in year 11 to then allow them to extend themselves to study those same two specialisations at Level 2 in year 12 would be quite a realistic and an appropriate pathway for many practically oriented students. These students are disadvantaged in terms of TCE points if they cannot receive a full qualification and credit points for studying both specialisations at level 1. If a student may study more than one specialisation we believe that students should be able to receive recognition for each specialisation studied in any one academic year and that the syllabus should be amended to reflect this

'X'

Email from Mike Jenkins 13 May 2013

Dear 'X',
Thanks for your email.

The issue of listing specialisations in the TQA 1 course was discussed a lot when the original course was being written, and in the last few years when some providers tried to get the TQA to 'count' points etc for students doing the course twice in a single academic year.

The position is that the course is not a framework one, and that specialisations will not be included in the qualification title as this would make an award in each specialisation a different and distinct qualification. This position is because the focus of the course is on 'workshop techniques' not the medium (metal, wood etc) used as the vehicle for learning about workshop techniques: indeed the current course on which the replacement draft was based, and the draft course note that more than one specialisation can be undertaken. The use of a framework is not supported by the course nor the learning outcomes assessed.

The new paragraph on p.2 you quote is aimed at ensuring that any possible ambiguity is removed.

The issue you raise about the TQA 2 course is interesting. Have you seen the minutes of the last Authority meeting regarding this? (Item 2.4, see <http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/13783>). The background attachment (see http://www.tqa.tas.gov.au/4DCGI/_WWW_doc/180293/RND01/Attachment%20A) noted, "...the course places emphasis on the design process, rather than in developing and assessing skill in the use of specialised media/ materials. Continuation of a so-called qualification 'framework' that allows different qualifications to be issued in a single year in different 'specialisations' - requires further consideration." The Authority decided that, "... the issues about the 'framework' approach in Design and Production should be considered as part of its overall review of the suite of TQA level 2 courses." I understand that this review will commence in 2014.
Best wishes,

Mike J

Communications with 'X'

Hi – thanks for the clarification. I have added a point about maintenance to box 6 and a standard in the A rating of C4.

Sorry of the confusion about the outcomes numbering – numbers changed when I started making your suggested amendments.

Best wishes,
Mike

From: 'X'

Date: Thursday, 9 May 2013 11:53 AM

Hi again Mike,

That was a timely response!

I have also made some further notes on your notes!

Kind regards,

'X'

Sent: Thursday, 9 May 2013 10:32 AM

To: 'X'

Subject: Re: Comments on Draft Workshop Techniques

Thanks very much, 'X'. I make some notes in your email below.

Best wishes,

Mike J

From: 'X'

Date: Thursday, 9 May 2013 10:07 AM

Hi Mike,

Here are some comments of an editing nature on the document. 'X' will send a more detailed response tomorrow.

- Refer page 2 COURSE DESCRIPTION

Through working in there area should read "their" area.

Fixed!

- Refer page 6 COURSE CONTENT

Box 2 – range of techniques used is generally quite limited in nature and may include but is not limited to:

Done!

Box 6- Organisation and maintenance.... Should include the dot point # maintenance of machinery to safe operating standard

Disagree here – it could be seen that the responsibility of undertaking actual maintenance has been shifted from the provider to the student Yes you are absolutely correct here but it would be helpful to the course provider/ teacher if students were better at reporting maintenance or hazard problems so they can be fixed in a timely fashion. Often in Textiles, this means something as simple as rethreading the overlocker or changing a needle rather than running away and dis-owning the problem but it would mean quite different things in the other specialisations.

- Refer page 9 of WORK EXPECTATIONS

Textiles should read Major and Minor product

Fixed!

The new paragraph of TASK SPECIFICATIONS needs to make clear that the brief specifications are very much guided and not more open and design orientated as in Level 2

This is already covered within the content of the course complexity statement.

- Refer page 10 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES
Should not "competencies" read "criteria"?

Fixed!

- Refer page 6 LEARNING OUTCOMES

It would be good to take the opportunity to apply “Plain English” to some of these and condense given the target group of students.

o Point 2 and 4 could be condensed to read:

Develop skills to select correct tools and equipment and appropriate techniques to construct and complete practical projects.

Agree, fixed!

o Point 3 and 6 could be condensed to read:

Develop skills to safely use nominated techniques and machinery and demonstrate safe work place practices generally.

Disagree – the two points have different foci which do not seem to be captured by the statement above. The "apply occupational health and safety procedures" can cover lots of things not directly related to techniques and machinery, such as evacuations.

This is point 7 not 6 and I agree with you fully and have not proposed removing.

o Point 5 could read: apply and complete the process of making /constructing to specified standards and time frame

Done!

Thanks,

‘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

Course:	Workshop Techniques – Introduction TQA 1
Course Proponent:	Office of the TQA
Evaluation Officer(s):	John Brooks
Evaluation Date:	27 May 2013

Accreditation History	<i>Workshop Techniques – Introduction</i> was accredited on 1 October 2008 for use from 2009 – 2013
------------------------------	---

Evaluation History	<p>On 5 December 2012 the Authority noted that this course's accreditation was due to expire at the end of 2013.</p> <p>On 3 April 2013 the Authority decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not to redevelop <i>Motor Vehicle Body Works</i> • to include specific mention of the techniques undertaken in this course within <i>Workshop Techniques – Introduction</i> • to amend the contents of <i>Workshop Techniques – Introduction</i> to include Motor Vehicle Body Works as an area within the redeveloped course.
---------------------------	---

<p>1. Rationale</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Yes. The rationale on p.1 of the course document specifies a common core of skills acquisition through the making of products, utilising a range of tools, techniques, materials and appropriate processes. The Authority weighed up considerations of need, demand and student participation/achievement in deciding to have this course redeveloped; while at the same time broadening its coverage to include techniques used in <i>Motor Vehicle Body Works</i> (which is not to be redeveloped).</p>
<p>2. Coherence</p> <p>2.a General Coherence</p> <p>The proposed course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meets the TQA’s specifications document (if applicable). <p>2.b Internal Coherence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is clarity regarding what content is compulsory, and what (if any) is optional. Language used reflects this (eg ‘must’ or ‘will’ <u>not</u> ‘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. <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>2.c Coherence with other courses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if applicable, there are clear linkages between a TQA 3 course and a ‘Foundation’ course at level 2 (or other specified TQA accredited pathway courses). 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes (clearly explained in the note mid-page 2 of the course document). The course is clearly not a framework, but has at its focus “workshop techniques”, rather than the medium being used, such as wood, plastic, glass, metal, etc.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	---

<p>3. Overlap with other courses Does the proposed course duplicate, by titles or coverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other TQA senior secondary accredited courses?; or • nationally accredited VET courses? <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>No. In fact it has incorporated key elements of another course (i.e. <i>Motor Vehicle Body Works</i>) that is not to be redeveloped.</p> <p>There is an acknowledgement (see p.14 course document) that “The content statement and standards of this course have, in part, been derived from the unit CUVVSP57A: Apply techniques to produce wood objects.”</p> <p>However this course has no significant content and standards overlaps with other VET courses; nor would it provide RPL for VET units on the basis of a learner’s successful achievement in the TQA’s <i>Workshop Techniques – Introduction</i>.</p> <p>This proposed course may complement opportunities provided by training packages that some learners may choose to undertake later on (as spelt out in the aspirational Learning Outcome on page 6 of the course document - <i>develop an awareness of career and further study options</i>). However its design clearly differentiates it from Training Package qualifications that prepare people for directly entering the workforce.</p>
<p>4. Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). <i>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</i> • (if applicable) the standards are comparable with ACARA/ CCAFFL /VET standards in regard to their level of complexity and wording 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>N/A</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p><i>Note courses used for comparison and comments</i></p>	Yes
<p>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.</p> <p>Are the names used for awards/title consistent with current TQA practice?</p> <p>The language used to describe the course, assessment and standards is simple, plain and readily understandable by practitioners.</p> <p><i>Note: panel to check document against DoE 'Without Prejudice: Guidelines for Inclusive Language' and note comments here</i></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>6. Delivery The methods of delivering the proposed course are likely to achieve the purposes, aims and learning outcomes of the course.</p>	Yes
<p>7. Access Any limitations to access based on age, gender, employment, cultural, social or educational background are explicit, clearly stated and justified.</p>	N/A
<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a match between the standards for achievement specified in the course and the standards demonstrated by students; and 	Yes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>9. Resource Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)? 	<p>The course document clearly spells out that workspaces for this course “ ... must comply with current legislation for ventilation, lighting, ergonomics, access and egress as required for the selected production technology medium. Facilities for learners to wash after using equipment and materials are also required. Equipment tools and resources should match the selected medium and the processes required to make a practical product” (p.2).</p> <p>Audits should verify that provider workspaces are compliant. The course document also makes it clear that no more than one qualification in this course per academic year can be listed on a learner’s Qualifications Certificate (p.2). This may need to be monitored to ensure that providers comply when submitting results.</p>
<p>10. Evaluation</p> <p>The proposed course must identify</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • course monitoring; and • evaluation processes. 	<p>Yes (see p.14 of course document)</p> <p>Yes (see p.14 of course document)</p>
<p>11. Size /Complexity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 this level of complexity? (see paragraph in course size and complexity section of the course document for these characteristics). 	<p>Yes (TQA Level 1 Size Value 10)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes (see p.2 course document)</p>

<p>12. Qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List the qualifications (including award types) to be conferred on successful completion of the course • Is this information included in the course documentation? 	<p>Qualifications available: PA; SA; CA; EA</p> <p>Successful completion delivers 10 credit points at TQA level 1 towards the TCE</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>Overall Observations</p>	<p>This course is clearly written and offers those students who learn better by applied/situated learning courses the option to acquire, develop and improve upon workshop techniques (use of tools and processes) across diverse mediums.</p>