



REPORT

Audit report: National Food Institute Pty Ltd

RTO number:	3821
CRICOS number:	N/A
Date/s of audit:	6, 7 & 8 April 2020
Date report created:	9 April 2020

Organisation details

Organisation's legal name:	National Food Institute Pty Ltd
Trading name/s:	National Food Institute National Logistics Institute National Horticulture Institute
RTO number:	3821
CRICOS number:	N/A

Audit team

Lead auditor:	Gavin Treacy
Auditor/s:	N/A

Audit details

Application number/s:	RENVET0004846
Audit number/s:	AUDREC0010482
Audit reason/s:	Application - Renewal
Address of site/s visited:	126 Ayr St DONCASTER VIC 3108 Australia
Date/s of audit:	06 April 2020 - 08 April 2020
Organisation's contact for audit:	Ross Freeman Director rossf@nationalfoodinstitute.com.au 0412535256

Original finding at time of audit

Audit finding: Concerning non-compliance

Report completed by: Gavin Treacy

Practice	Standards for RTOs	Finding
Training and Assessment	1.1*, 1.2, 1.3*, 1.8*, 1.13*, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16*, 1.17, 1.18, 1.20	Not compliant
Marketing/Recruitment Practices	4.1	Compliant
Enrolment	5.1*, 5.2*, 5.3, 7.3	Not compliant
Support and Progression	1.7	Compliant
Completion	3.1*	Not compliant
Regulatory Compliance / Governance	2.3*, 2.4, 8.2	Not compliant

*Indicates a non-compliant clause

Background

Summary of organisation and management structure:

- The organisation was initially registered for VET on 1 May 1997. Ownership of the organisation includes:

- Ross Freeman - CEO
- David Pinnock – Director of operations
- Luciano Licastro - Director and Manager of SBAT programs
- David Charles Haberfield – Director HACCP Australia.

The leadership team also includes:

- Janine Peeters – Compliance manager
 - Barbara Reid – Manager of SBAT programs
 - Paul Bainbridge – Accountant.
- The organisation employs 23 staff. This consists of nine full time, eight part time and six casual employees. Additionally, the organisation employs 10 sole traders (trainers and assessors) and one resource writer.
 - The organisation delivers training and assessment to industry through the workplace and School Based Apprenticeship / Traineeship (SBAT) in Victoria.
 - The compliance monitoring audit was changed from a site visit to a desk audit due to COVID 19 and social distancing.

Scope of organisation's registration:

- *AHC20416 Certificate II in Horticulture*
- *BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management*
- *FBP10117 Certificate I in Food Processing*
- *FBP20117 Certificate II in Food Processing*
- *FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing*
- *SIT30916 Certificate III in Catering Operations*
- *TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations*
- *TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations*
- *TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations*
- *TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics.*

Suburb and state of all delivery sites:

- Victoria - Industry workplace
- New South Wales - Industry workplace
- Tasmania – Industry workplace.

Third party usage:

- Australia Personnel Global Pty. Ltd.
- Scotausland Pty Ltd
- Raise Management Pty Ltd
- Kava Group Australia Pty Ltd
- Completed-ed Pty Ltd
- Visual Workplace Australia.

Core clients/target groups:

- School Based Apprenticeship and Traineeship - SBAT
- Industry workplace – logistics, warehousing and food industries.

Training Revenue (Funded or fee for service):

- Fee for service
- Skills First, Victoria
- Smart and Skilled, NSW
- Skills Tasmania.

Total number of current enrolments in the organisation as at audit date:

- 759.

In preparing the audit report, consideration has been given and reference made, where relevant, to:

- Information provided by students as part of a student survey or interview.
- Information provided directly by National Food Institute Pty Ltd to ASQA.
- Existing information and records held by ASQA concerning National Food Institute Pty Ltd.
- Information provided to ASQA's auditors and documentation reviewed during the desk audit of National Food Institute Pty Ltd conducted on 06 Apr 2020.
- Other publicly available information - including but not limited to, information published on the organisation's and third-party websites.

Audit Sample

Training Products	Mode/s of delivery/assessment*	Current enrolments
<i>BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management</i>	workplace	25
<i>TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations</i>	workplace	129
<i>TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations</i>	workplace	138
<i>TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations</i>	workplace	71
<i>TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics</i>	workplace	89
<i>FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing</i>	workplace	114

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

Interviewees

Name	Position	Training products
Ross Freeman	CEO	All
David Pinnock	Director of operations	<i>FBP10117,FBP20117,FBP30117,TLI31216,TLI31616,TLI42016 & BSB42015</i>
Janine Peeters	Compliance manager	All
Luciano Licastro	Director and Manager of SBAT programs	<i>FBP20117,AHC20416,TLI21616,TLI31616,SIT30916</i>
Barbara Reid	Manager of SBAT programs	<i>FBP20117,AHC20416,TLI21616,TLI31616,SIT30916</i>

About this Report

This report details findings against the *Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015* (Standards for RTOs). If non-compliance has been identified, this report describes evidence of the non-compliance.

Where non-compliance has been identified, the Registered Training Organisation is accountable for identifying and correcting non-compliant practices and behaviours, particularly those that have had a negative impact on learners.

Correcting a non-compliance may require:

- correcting a process or system that has led to the non-compliance, and implementing a revised process or system
- identifying the impact on learners and carrying out remedial action for current and past learners

Original action required by Organisation

National Food Institute Pty Ltd did not meet all requirements for Standards for RTO's: 1.1, 1.3, 1.8, 1.13, 1.16, 5.1, 5.2, 3.1 and 2.3.

The organisation is required to provide evidence that demonstrates:

Training and assessment

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.1

- the organisation has corrected its training and assessment practices for future students to ensure they meet the requirements of the training product, including the amount of training provided
- the organisation carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students across all scope items that were impacted by training and assessment practices that did not meet the requirements of the training product (including amount of training). Remedial action needs to cover current students and students who enrolled or completed with your organisation in the past three months.

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.3

- the organisation now has sufficient resources to comply with Standards for RTOs Clause 1.3 proportionate to the number of students enrolled at any time, the mode of delivery, location of delivery, and the strategies for training and assessment
- the organisation carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students across all scope items that were impacted by insufficient access to resources. Remedial action needs to cover current students and students who enrolled or completed with your organisation in the past three months.

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.8

- the organisation has corrected its assessment system (to comply with Clause 1.8) for future students and has systems in place to ensure it is this system that is applied. The evidence to be provided must:
 - include the full suite of assessment tools (including RPL) for each unit of competency identified as non-compliant
 - demonstrate the organisation will implement an assessment system that ensures assessment:
 - complies with the assessment requirements of the relevant training product(s)

- will be conducted in accordance with the Principles of Assessment and Rules of evidence.
- the organisation has carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students across all scope items that were assessed in a manner that did not meet the requirements of Clause 1.8. Remedial action needs to cover current students and students who were assessed by your organisation in the past six months.

Standards for RTOs Clauses 1.13 and 1.16

- the organisation now has appropriate processes to ensure it only uses trainers/assessors meet the requirements of the standards to provide training and assessment (Clause 1.13 and 1.16)
- the trainers/assessors currently used by the organisation meet the requirements of the standards (Clause 1.13 and 1.16)
- the organisation has carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students across all scope items that were trained or assessed by a trainer/assessor that did not meet the requirements of the standards. Remedial action needs to cover current students and students who enrolled or completed with your organisation in the past three months.

Enrolment

Standards for RTOs Clause 5.1 and 5.2

- the organisation now has appropriate systems that are followed to ensure new learners are enrolled into an appropriate training product, considering their existing knowledge, experience and skills that complies with Standards for RTOs Clause 5.1
- the organisation now has appropriate systems that are followed to ensure each learner is provided with accurate information to enable them to make an informed decision about undertaking training with your organisation that complies with Standards for RTOs Clause 5.2
- the organisation has carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students across all scope items that were not enrolled in appropriate training products. Remedial action needs to cover current students and students who enrolled with your organisation in the past six months.

Completion

Standards for RTOs Clause 3.1

- the organisation now has appropriate systems that are followed to ensure AQF certification documentation is only issued to a learner whom it has assessed as meeting the requirements of the training product as specified in the relevant training or VET accredited course
- the organisation has carried out remedial action to identify and address the impact the non-compliance may have caused to students across all scope items that were issued with AQF certification documentation and were not assessed as meeting the requirements of the training product as specified in the relevant training or VET accredited course. Remedial action needs to cover students issued with AQF certification in the past six months.

Regulatory compliance and governance

Standards for RTOs Clause 2.3

- the organisation now has appropriate systems that are followed to ensure that in the future, it will notify the Regulator:

- a) of any written agreement entered into under Standards for RTOs Clause 2.3 for the delivery of services on its behalf within 30 days of that agreement being entered into or prior to the obligations under the agreement taking effect, whichever occurs first
- b) within 30 calendar day of the agreement coming to an end.

Areas of non-compliance

Training and Assessment

Training Delivery and Assessment

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.1

Original Finding: Not compliant

The RTO's training and assessment strategies and practices, including the amount of training they provide, are consistent with the requirements of training packages and VET accredited courses and enable each learner to meet the requirements for each unit of competency or module in which they are enrolled.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - training and assessment strategies (TAS)
 - industry
 - SBAT
 - schedule A (assessment methods)
 - assessment tools
 - Barbara Reid (interview).
- The documented training and assessment strategy for delivery of the above training products is not consistent with the organisation's demonstrated practice. This is a systemic issue. For example, but not limited to:
 - for *FBPOPR3001 Control contaminants and allergens in the workplace*, the student assessments are Assessment Task (AT) 1 questions, AT2 observations, AT 3 supplementary supervisor appraisal and AT 4 project/case study. However, the TAS, schedule A, assessment methods are observation, questions and answers and a third party report. These assessments are not numbered and do not reflect what is outlined in the student's assessment, assessment methods in the TAS, and schedule A assessment methods for customised training and assessment to industry workplaces.
 - for *TAEDEL404 Mentor in the workplace*, the student assessment workbook, assessments are AT 1 written questions, AT 2 observation and AT 4 Project. However, the TAS, schedule A, assessment methods are observation, questions and answers and a third party report. These assessments are not numbered and do not reflect what is outlined in the students assessment, assessment methods in the TAS, and schedule A assessment methods for customised training and assessment to industry workplaces.
- The organisation's documented training and assessment strategy contains conflicting information regarding the amount of training provided to the target student cohort. Specifically,
 - the TAS for SBAT's outlines students are released from school two days a week to participate in training and assessment within a workplace. This is 13 hours in total consisting of seven hours of paid employment and six hours of training (assessment not mentioned). During the audit, Barbara Reid mentioned that '*students are broken into small groups due to learning needs and sessions run for three hours and not six hours*'.

Therefore, the amount of training per week is three hours face to face and not six. The organisation does not follow its own TAS.

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.3

Original Finding: Not compliant

The RTO has, for all of its scope of registration, and consistent with its training and assessment strategies, sufficient:

- a) trainers and assessors to deliver the training and assessment;
- b) educational and support services to meet the needs of the learner cohort/s undertaking the training and assessment;
- c) learning resources to enable learners to meet the requirements for each unit of competency, and which are accessible to the learner regardless of location or mode of delivery; and
- d) facilities, whether physical or virtual, and equipment to accommodate and support the number of learners undertaking the training and assessment.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - trainer and assessor files.
- The organisation has not demonstrated that only persons who meet all requirements of the Standards will deliver training and/or conduct assessment. Specifically:
 - refer to Clause 1.13.

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.8

Original 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	<p>The individual learner's needs are considered in the assessment process.</p> <p>Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments are applied by the RTO to take into account the individual learner's needs.</p> <p>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.</p>
Flexibility	<p>Assessment is flexible to the individual learner by:</p> <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"> c) 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; d) assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application; e) assessment to be based on evidence that demonstrates that a learner could demonstrate these skills and knowledge in other similar situations; and f) 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.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - student assessments:
 - PL, JS, NT, GW, MV, JG, JM, SH, CS, YH, AS, SS, BS, PH, WH, DJ, SK, DB, SH, PK, MA, FS, AC, GC and LP
 - resources:
 - Work Evidence Report (WER)
 - student workbook
 - trainer and assessor workbook.
- The following analysis provides guidance on the areas of non-compliance. Examples of non-compliances are provided however, this is not an exhaustive list. It is the organisation's responsibility to review the assessment system for each unit of competency for all non-compliances identified below and provide evidence:
 - of a revised assessment system for each unit of competency listed above that addresses all requirements of Clause 1.8.

- that confirms students were assessed as meeting all the requirements of the training product(s) in which they were enrolled.
- The assessment practices for the following students do not confirm the organisation conducted adequate assessment of the students that ensured they were competent against all requirements of the training product and that the assessment was conducted in accordance with the Principles of Assessment and the Rules of Evidence. For example, but not limited to:
- Validity and sufficiency – student PL, JS, NT and GW for *BSBLDR403 Lead team effectiveness* are required to apply knowledge of workplace goals, objectives and plans. They are required to develop a team work plan which includes documentation of how it was generated and how it will be monitored. This includes:
 - identify and incorporate innovation and productivity measures into a team work plan
 - communicate with team members and management to identify and establish the team purpose, roles, responsibilities, goals plans and objectives and resolve problems
 - use techniques to consult, encourage, support and provide feedback to team members
 - model team leadership behaviours and approaches and
 - liaise with management to develop the teamwork plan, resolve issues and ensure follow-up action is taken.

The organisations WER, which is used to collect evidence during a workplace visit has minimal comments written by the trainer and assessor on what was discussed with the student during the site visit. However, there is no evidence to ascertain whether the student had applied the performance benchmarks in the workplace as listed above.

- Validity and sufficiency – student PH, DJ, SK and WP for *TLIA3038 Control and order stock* was observed and assessed by the trainer and assessor against the tasks identified in the elements of the unit. The student did not demonstrate they hold all of the required skills and knowledge specified in the unit assessment requirements nor demonstrate they are capable of performing these tasks to an acceptable level. The student did not:
 - adapt differences in stock and systems
 - apply relevant legislation and workplace procedures
 - communicate and work effectively with others
 - monitor stock levels
 - read and interpret relevant instructions, procedures and labels
 - report and/or rectify identified problems, faults or malfunctions promptly and
 - select and use relevant communications and computing equipment.

In addition, the student is required to work in a real environment or a suitably resourced simulated environment and complete control and store stock procedures. However, there is no context to the performance evidence undertaken by the students.

- Validity and sufficiency - student SH and CS for *TLIC1051 Operate commercial vehicle*, the trainer and assessor made workplace visits and completed notes under the contact summary located in the WER. However, the contact summary dates do not a line with the visit outcome located in the WER. Additionally, the WER has a marking guide for the performance evidence and skill requirement which provides a selection of suggested evidence to select from. However, of the suggested evidence mentioned in the WER, no evidence was provided to substantiate the skill requirement had been sufficiently obtained.
- Authenticity, validity and sufficiency – student FS for *TLIL4036 Develop rosters* for AT Project is to design and develop a roster for 8 drivers. However, this cannot be located in the student file. The AT requires the student to attach a copy of the project for discussion with the trainer and assessor as evidence. The student was deemed competent 26 February 2020. Likewise, for student AC, GC and MA, there was no project to design and develop a roster in the student assessment file.
- Authenticity, validity and sufficiency – student SH was deemed competent in the following units of competency. *MSL973001 Perform basic tests* (7 July 2019), *MSS402040 Apply 5S procedures* (7 July 2019), *MSS402080 Undertake root cause analysis* (7 July 2019), *FDFO2004A Clean and sanitise equipment* (7 July 2019), *FDFO3003A Operate interrelated processes in a production system* (7 July 2019) and *MSMSUP303 Identify equipment faults* (7 July 2019). However, the student was unable to complete the language, literacy and numeracy test for entry into the course and required a translator to undertake the course. It cannot be determined how student SH can complete the above units and that the answers given by the student are their own and not the translator's, and that the assessor is assured that the evidence collected enables a judgement of the student's competency.

- Authenticity, validity and sufficiency – student YH and BS for *TLIJ3002 Apply quality systems AT 1*, questions one to eight, informs the student that the assessment task is an open book test requiring short answer questions. For example, question one, *explain your understanding of what a quality system means to you*. Then in a lighter font states *'must discuss/cover all of the following points. Tick appropriate key words as student answers. Trainer to fill in any other responses given in space provided. A minimum of 5 is required'*. However, as the responses are already pre filled this does not substantiate that the student has an understanding of the knowledge evidence and has been adequately assessed.
- Validity and sufficiency – student PK for *FBPOPR2001 Work effectively in the food processing industry* was deemed competent 26 February 2020. The trainer and assessor visited the student on two occasions (no date) and observed skills requirement as outlined in the WER. However, the suggested evidence located in the WER is generic and not specific and contextualised to the student workplace environment.

Trainer and assessor competency

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.13

Original Finding: Not compliant

In addition to the requirements specified in Clause 1.14 and Clause 1.15, the RTO's training and assessment is delivered only by persons who have:

- vocational competencies at least to the level being delivered and assessed;
- current industry skills directly relevant to the training and assessment being provided; and
- current knowledge and skills in vocational training and learning that informs their training and assessment.

Industry experts may also be involved in the assessment judgement, working alongside the trainer and/or assessor to conduct the assessment.

Standards for RTOs Clause 1.16

Original Finding: Not compliant

The RTO ensures that all trainers and assessors undertake professional development in the fields of the knowledge and practice of vocational training, learning and assessment including competency based training and assessment.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - trainer and assessor file:
 - trainer and assessor professional development log
 - professional development activities
 - resume
 - qualification(s).
- The organisation did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the below listed trainers and assessors possess relevant industry currency:
 - Chad Gujjari
 - John Egan
 - Ralph Vogel
 - Joseph Logozzo
 - Mani Kasmani
 - Steven Neirinckx

- Lauran Brown
- Andrew Mulkearns.

Specific examples of non-compliance include, but are not limited to:

- a professional development log was provided at audit for trainers and assessors, however, the trainers and assessors were unable to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate industry currency.
- The organisation has not demonstrated, for the above training product, that it has implemented a program which ensures that all its trainers and assessors undertake professional development as required by Clause 1.16. For example, but not limited to:
 - on request, the organisation was unable to provide a professional development program.

Enrolment

Standards for RTOs Clause 5.1

*Original Finding: **Not compliant***

Prior to enrolment or the commencement of training and assessment, whichever comes first, the RTO provides advice to the prospective learner about the training product appropriate to meeting the learner's needs, taking into account the individual's existing skills and competencies.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - student administration file:
 - enrolment form
 - language, literacy and numeracy
 - enrolment policy and procedure
 - school based traineeship application form
 - individual learning plan
 - training plan
 - student files:
 - MT, RH, HH, JS, BS, AZ, MR, JL, MF, DB, SNH, SH, TM, SHo, RF and PL.
- The organisation has not demonstrated that prospective students will receive advice which takes their existing skills and competencies into consideration. For example, but not limited to:
 - student SNH undertook an Language, Literacy and Numeracy (LLN) test 14 June 2017. The LLN test was completed by the trainer and assessor and had written on each page 'verbal interview' and date. In the additional support section it had been identified that the prospective student would require a translator. In the enrolment form the prospective student is asked 'how well do you speak English', and their response was 'not well'. However, the student was enrolled into *FBP30117* without satisfactorily completing an LLN and following the organisations own Enrolment Policy and Procedure. Furthermore, the training product has 17 units of competency and the prospective student was enrolled into 25 units of competency, eight more than outlined in the training product packaging rules.
 - student MT school based application form was not completed. There was no tick for which SBAT program the candidate is applying for, career goals not completed by the student and

career pathways / traineeship manager from the school did not complete the section identifying literacy and learning needs and preferred two days of work. Similarly, no name or signature of a school contact or of the prospective student.

- The organisation has not demonstrated that it has a system in place which captures information regarding the existing skills and/or competencies of prospective students sufficient to give appropriate advice. For example, but not limited to:
 - no enrolment form was found in the student administration file for student AZ. Additionally, the LLN completed 11 April 2018, the trainer and assessor has marked question four correct, however the response is incorrect. Likewise, task five numeracy not completed, a,b,c and d are all incorrect, task six reading and numeracy questions one, two and three are also incorrect. The trainer and assessor has identified numeracy as a concern and suggests verbal assistance with numerical reasoning. The trainer and assessor considers the prospective student has the appropriate levels to meet the requirements of the course.
- Review of the organisation's demonstrated enrolment practices found that it does not provide advice as required by Clause 5.1 to prospective students prior to enrolment or the commencement of training and assessment, whichever occurs first. For example, but not limited to:
 - on the 11 September 2019 student HH undertook an LLN test. The LLN test has five questions for numeracy and the student did not have a correct answer. The trainer and assessors evaluation supports the student's entry to the course and raises learning and numeracy as areas of concern. However, the individual learning plan does not acknowledge the student requires support with their numeracy skills. The individual learning plan sited at audit has not been signed by relevant individuals, namely the school and the organisation.
 - student MF completed an LLN the 6 December 2018. However, the LLN task two question two was not answered and question three marked correct by trainer, however the response was incorrect. Likewise, task five numeracy, two out of seven questions are incorrect responses. The LLN evaluation and strategies to support the student are also left blank.

Standards for RTOs Clause 5.2

Original Finding: *Not compliant*

Prior to enrolment or the commencement of training and assessment, whichever comes first, the RTO provides, in print or through referral to an electronic copy, current and accurate information that enables the learner to make informed decisions about undertaking training with the RTO and at a minimum includes the following content:

- a) the code, title and currency of the training product to which the learner is to be enrolled, as published on the National Register;
- b) the training and assessment, and related educational and support services the RTO will provide to the learner including the:
 - i) estimated duration;
 - ii) expected locations at which it will be provided;
 - iii) expected modes of delivery;
 - iv) name and contact details of any third party that will provide training and/or assessment, and related educational and support services to the learner on the RTO's behalf; and
 - v) any work placement arrangements.
- c) the RTO's obligations to the learner, including that the RTO is responsible for the quality of the training and assessment in compliance with these Standards, and for the issuance of the AQF certification documentation.
- d) the learner's rights, including:
 - i) details of the RTO's complaints and appeals process required by Standard 6; and
 - ii) if the RTO, or a third party delivering training and assessment on its behalf, closes or ceases to deliver any part of the training product that the learner is enrolled in;
- e) the learner's obligations:

- i) in relation to the repayment of any debt to be incurred under the VET FEE-HELP scheme arising from the provision of services;**
- ii) any requirements the RTO requires the learner to meet to enter and successfully complete their chosen training product; and**
- iii) any materials and equipment that the learner must provide; and**
- f) information on the implications for the learner of government training entitlements and subsidy arrangements in relation to the delivery of the services.**

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - student administration file:
 - enrolment form
 - language, literacy and numeracy
 - enrolment policy and procedure
 - school based traineeship application form
 - individual learning plan
 - training plan
 - course flyer
 - student files:
 - MT, RH, HH, JS, BS, AZ, MR, JL, MF, DB, SNH, SH, TM, SHO, RF and PL.

Review of the organisation's pre-enrolment documentation found that it contains inaccurate information for prospective students regarding its courses. For example, but not limited to:

- student RH on the 20 June 2019 completed an enrolment with the organisation. On review, the student is enrolled into 19 units of competency. This is reflected in the student's training plan. The enrolment form, client enrolment and policy acceptance declaration states to a prospective student '*they have received a course flyer with information relating to the course, including unit selection*'. However, the course flyer has 16 units, 3 core and 13 elective units and states '*elective units may vary according to individual workplace arrangements*'. However, it cannot be determined where the student has been informed and advised of the additional three units. Also, the student has declared in the enrolment process that they have learning difficulty.
- student SNH for *FBP30117* was enrolled in 25 units, however, the training product packaging rules are 17 units of competency. The student did complete an enrolment form, client enrolment and policy acceptance declaration. However, it cannot be determined where the student has been informed and advised of the additional eight units.

Completion

Standards for RTOs Clause 3.1

Original Finding: *Not compliant*

The RTO issues AQF certification documentation only to a learner whom it has assessed as meeting the requirements of the training product as specified in the relevant training package or VET accredited course.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - student assessments:
 - PL, JS, NT, GW, PH, DJ, SK, WP, SH, CS FS, AC, GC, MA, SH, YH, BS and PK.
- The organisation has not demonstrated that its assessment system complies with the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence (refer to non-compliance identified with Clause 1.8) with respect to students who were assessed as meeting the requirements of the training product and were issued with AQF certification documentation.
- The organisation has issued AQF certification documentation to students who have not met all requirements as specified in the relevant training package. For example, but not limited to:
 - refer to Clause 1.8.

Regulatory Compliance / Governance

Third Parties (including education agents)

Standards for RTOs Clause 2.3

Original Finding: *Not compliant*

The RTO ensures that where services are provided on its behalf by a third party the provision of those services is the subject of a written agreement.

BSB42015 Certificate IV in Leadership and Management

TLI21616 Certificate II in Warehousing Operations

TLI31216 Certificate III in Driving Operations

TLI31616 Certificate III in Warehousing Operations

TLI42016 Certificate IV in Logistics

FBP30117 Certificate III in Food Processing

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - Agreements:
 - Completed-ed Pty Ltd
 - Visual Workplace Australia.

- Review of the organisation's operations confirmed that it has entered into third party arrangements without ensuring ASQA has not been informed of all written agreements entered into within 30 calendar days. Specifically:
 - Completed-ed Pty Ltd
 - Visual Workplace Australia.