



REPORT

Audit report: Ingress Training Academy Pty Ltd

RTO number:	41506
CRICOS number:	03699B
Date of audit:	11 Sep 2019 - 11 Sep 2019
Date report created:	27 September 2019

Organisation details

Organisation's legal name:	Ingress Training Academy Pty Ltd
Trading name/s:	N/A
RTO number:	41506
CRICOS number:	03699B

Audit team

Lead auditor:	Stephen Murphy
Assistant:	Judith Keller

Audit details

Application number/s:	N/A
Audit number:	AUDREC0009729
Audit reason:	Compliance Monitoring
Address of site visited:	2994 Logan Rd UNDERWOOD QLD 4119 Australia
Date of audit:	11 Sep 2019 - 11 Sep 2019
Organisation's contact for audit:	Marilyn Willmot Chief Executive Officer marilyn.willmot@ingressacademy.com.au 0402306193

Original finding at time of audit

Audit finding: Concerning non-compliance

Report completed by: Stephen Murphy

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

*Indicates a non-compliant clause

Background

Summary of organisation and management structure:

Ms Marilyn Willmot, CEO, comes from a strong background within TAFE, as well as being the PEO for Hibernia Institute Pty Ltd. Marilyn brings her passion for student outcomes with her to the establishment of Ingress Training Academy. Ingress Training Academy is currently focussed on delivery to international students. Marilyn advised that there is no immediate plans to deliver to domestic students.

The organisation utilises a member of the Queensland Police Service as part of the student support team. They speak to the students about staying safe in Australia, their rights and responsibilities.

Management team:

- Marilyn Willmot – CEO
- Kevin Smalley – Compliance
- Bruna Tengaten – Campus Manager – CBD
- Holly-Anne Heathcote – Campus Manager – Underwood
- Trainers x 2
- RTO receptionist based at Underwood

Scope of organisation's registration:

- AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology
- AUR40216 Certificate IV in Automotive Mechanical Diagnosis
- AUR50216 Diploma of Automotive Technology
- BSB40215 Certificate IV in Business
- BSB50215 Diploma of Business
- BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business
- ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology
- ICT50118 Diploma of Information Technology
- ICT60215 Advanced Diploma of Network Security

Suburb and state of all delivery sites:

- 2994 Logan Road Underwood QLD 4119
- Level 9/ 116 Adelaide Street, Brisbane QLD 4000
- 269 Sussex Street, Sydney NSW 2000

Third party usage:

- Education agents only for international student recruitment.

Core clients/target groups:

- International students

Training Revenue (Funded or fee for service):

- Fee for service

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

- 28

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 Ingress Training Academy Pty Ltd to ASQA.
- Existing information and records held by ASQA concerning Ingress Training Academy Pty Ltd.

- Information provided to ASQA's auditors and documentation reviewed during the site audit of Ingress Training Academy Pty Ltd conducted on 11 Sep 2019 - 11 Sep 2019.
- 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>AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology</i>	Mixed	21
<i>AUR40216 Certificate IV in Automotive Mechanical Diagnosis</i>	Mixed	2
<i>BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business</i>	Mixed	1
<i>ICT50118 Diploma of Information Technology</i>	Mixed	2

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

Interviewees

Name	Position	Training products
Daniel Armstrong	Trainer	BSB60215 and ICT50118
Raymond Johnston	Trainer	AUR30616 and AUR40216

About this Report

This report details findings against the *Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015* (Standards for RTOs) and/or the *National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018* (National Code). If non-compliance has been identified, this report describes evidence of the non-compliance.

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

Correcting 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

Ingress Training Academy Pty Ltd did not meet the following requirements:

Standards for RTO's, 1.1, 1.8 and 4.1

Remedial action is required for the following training products:

- AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology
- AUR40216 Certificate IV in Automotive Mechanical Diagnosis
- BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business
- ICT50118 Diploma of Information Technology

The organisation is required to provide evidence that demonstrates:

Marketing and recruitment

Standards for RTOs Clause 4.1

- all information, whether disseminated directly by the organisation or on its behalf by third parties is now accurate and factual and addresses all of the requirements specified in Standards for RTOs Clause 4.1

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

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:

- demonstrate the organisation will implement an assessment system that ensures assessment:
 - complies with the assessment requirements of the relevant training products
 - will be conducted in accordance with the Principles of Assessment and Rules of evidence.

Areas of non-compliance

Marketing/Recruitment Practices

Standards for RTOs Clause 4.1

Original Finding: Not compliant

Information, whether disseminated directly by the RTO or on its behalf, is both accurate and factual, and:

- a) accurately represents the services it provides and the training products on its scope of registration;
- b) includes its RTO Code;
- c) refers to another person or organisation in its marketing material only if the consent of that person or organisation has been obtained;
- d) uses the NRT Logo only in accordance with the conditions of use specified in Schedule 4;
- e) makes clear where a third party is recruiting prospective learners for the RTO on its behalf;
- f) distinguishes where it is delivering training and assessment on behalf of another RTO or where training and assessment is being delivered on its behalf by a third party;
- g) distinguishes between nationally recognised training and assessment leading to the issuance of AQF certification documentation from any other training or assessment delivered by the RTO;
- h) includes the code and title of any training product, as published on the National Register, referred to in that information;
- i) only advertises or markets a non-current training product while it remains on the RTO's scope of registration;
- j) only advertises or markets that a training product it delivers will enable learners to obtain a licensed or regulated outcome where this has been confirmed by the industry regulator in the jurisdiction in which it is being advertised;
- k) includes details about any VET FEE-HELP, government funded subsidy or other financial support arrangements associated with the RTO's provision of training and assessment; and
- l) does not guarantee that:
 - i) a learner will successfully complete a training product on its scope of registration; or
 - ii) a training product can be completed in a manner which does not meet the requirements of Clause 1.1 and 1.2; or
 - iii) a learner will obtain a particular employment outcome where this is outside the control of the RTO.

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - Organisation website, <http://www.ingressacademy.edu.au/>
 - Marketing Material.pdf
 - International Student Prospectus Australia
- The organisation's marketing material does not align with other documented information it has produced. For example, but not limited to:
 - Within the organisation's documented training and assessment strategy for both the AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology and AUR40216 Certificate IV in Automotive Mechanical Diagnosis, there is a requirement for students to undertake work placement. However, within the marketing materials there is no mention of this requirement.
 - Within the Prospectus, the organisation indicates that there is a requirement for work placement in an education and care organisation, for the following qualifications:
 - AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology
 - AUR40216 Certificate IV in Automotive Mechanical Diagnosis
 - BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business
 - ICT50118 Diploma of Information Technology

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.

BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business

ICT50118 Diploma of Information Technology

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - TAS_BSB60215_Advanced Diploma of Business – V2
 - TAS_ICT50118_Diploma of Information Technology – v2
 - Discussion with RTO representatives during the site audit on 11 September 2019.

- The documented training and assessment strategies for delivery of the above training products are not consistent with the organisation's demonstrated practice. Specifically:
 - The documented strategies for each of the above qualifications describe 'work placement components'. However, the provider's representatives confirmed at audit that there is no work placement undertaken by students as part of *BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business* and *ICT50118 Diploma of Information Technology*.
 - The documented strategies for each of the above qualifications contain inconsistent and anomalous information regarding the number of hours and breakdown of hours associated with the delivery of the qualifications.

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	The individual learner's needs are considered in the assessment process. Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments are applied by the RTO to take into account the individual learner's needs. The RTO informs the learner about the assessment process, and provides the learner with the opportunity to challenge the result of the assessment and be reassessed if necessary.
Flexibility	Assessment is flexible to the individual learner by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• reflecting the learner's needs;• assessing competencies held by the learner no matter how or where they have been acquired; and• drawing from a range of assessment methods and using those that are appropriate to the context, the unit of competency and associated assessment requirements, and the individual.

Validity	Any assessment decision of the RTO is justified, based on the evidence of performance of the individual learner. Validity requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment against the unit/s of competency and the associated assessment requirements covers the broad range of skills and knowledge that are essential to competent performance; • assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application; • assessment to be based on evidence that demonstrates that a learner could demonstrate these skills and knowledge in other similar situations; and • judgement of competence is based on evidence of learner performance that is aligned to the unit/s of competency and associated assessment requirements.
Reliability	Evidence presented for assessment is consistently interpreted and assessment results are comparable irrespective of the assessor conducting the assessment.
Table 1.8.2 Rules of Evidence	
Validity	The assessor is assured that the learner has the skills, knowledge and attributes as described in the module or unit of competency and associated assessment requirements.
Sufficiency	The assessor is assured that the quality, quantity and relevance of the assessment evidence enables a judgement to be made of a learner's competency.
Authenticity	The assessor is assured that the evidence presented for assessment is the learner's own work.
Currency	The assessor is assured that the assessment evidence demonstrates current competency. This requires the assessment evidence to be from the present or the very recent past.

AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology

AURASA002 Follow safe working practices in an automotive workplace

AURTTK002 Use and maintain tools and equipment in an automotive workplace

BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business

BSBADV602 Develop an advertising campaign

- 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.

AUR30616 Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology

AURASA002 Follow safe working practices in an automotive workplace

AURTTK002 Use and maintain tools and equipment in an automotive workplace

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - Assessment tools for:
 - AURASA002 Follow safe working practices in an automotive workplace*
 - AURTTK002 Use and maintain tools and equipment in an automotive workplace*
 - Assessment 1 – Questioning – Written Assessment_AURASA002.docx
 - Assessment 1_ Questioning Written Assessment_AURASA002_Assessor Copy.docx
 - Assessment 2_Direct Observation Practical Demonstration of Tasks_AURASA002_Assessor Copy.docx

- Assessment 2_DirectObservation_Practical Demonstration of Tasks_AURASA002.docx
- o Completed student assessment items (and the assessment tools used):
 - AURASA002 Follow safe working practices in an automotive workplace
 - AURTTK002 Use and maintain tools and equipment in an automotive workplace
 - Student
 - HS
 - AURASA002 – Assessment 1 Questioning
 - AURTTK002 - Assessment 1 – Questioning – Written Assessment
 - Assessment 2 direct observation V2.0
- Reliability – when reviewing the completed assessments for student HS, it was noted that the student had provided responses that the assessor had marked as wrong (X). However, the assessment cover sheet indicated that the student was marked as satisfactory. At audit this was discussed with Mr. Smalley and Mr. Georgiadis, who agreed that the X would indicate the response/s as incorrect and could offer no explanation of why the assessment outcome would be deemed, satisfactory.
- Sufficiency – given the above, it is then unclear if the RTO has gathered sufficient evidence to deem the student as satisfactory against the training package requirements.
- The assessment practices for the following student do not confirm the organisation conducted adequate assessment of the student 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:
 - o Students:
 - HS:
 - As detailed above with regard to reliability and sufficiency, the RTO has not conducted adequate assessment of the student's competency against all of the requirements of the training product.

BSB60215 Advanced Diploma of Business

BSBADV602 Develop an advertising campaign

- The following evidence was reviewed:
 - o Assessment tools for:
 - BSBADV602 Develop an advertising campaign*
 - Assessment book (version 1.0, 17 December 2018):
 - Short answer questions x 16
 - Written activity
 - Observation demonstration
 - Assessor Marking Guide (version 2.0, 1 September 2018).
- The following analysis provides guidance on the areas of non-compliance. Examples of non-compliance are provided however, this is not an exhaustive list. It is the organisation's responsibility to review the assessment system for the above unit of competency for all non-compliance identified below and provide evidence:
 - o of a revised assessment system for the unit of competency listed above that addresses all requirements of Clause 1.8.
- Reliability - the assessment tools do not contain sufficient performance benchmarks for each skill and behaviour to be demonstrated; therefore, it cannot be confirmed that consistent judgements will be made across a range of students and assessors. For example, but not limited to:
 - o Whilst the Assessor Marking Guide for the above unit of competency contains model answers for the short answer assessment task, the RTO has not developed any evidence guidance for the written activity assessment task. Hence, it could not be confirmed how the

RTO will ensure that evidence presented for assessment will be consistently interpreted, and that assessment results will be comparable, irrespective of the assessor conducting assessment.