

STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY - VE LQ

2017

C5333 - Dip Interior Design&Decoration	AUSCY	Survey Population: 128
DSC		Respondents : 37
320T - Architecture & Design		Response Rate: 28.9%

Demographics (% of total sample size)

Commencement Year

Pre 2012
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017

0
0
0
0
4
16
17

Age

Under 15
15-19
20-24
25-34
35-44
45-54
55-64
65 or over

0%
22%
43%
22%
11%
0%
0%
0%

Citizenship

Australian
International Onshore
International Offshore

76%
24%
0%

Gender

Male
Female

8%
89%

Program Type

TAFE Certificate
TAFE Diploma
Other

0%
100%
0%

LOTE

Yes
No

51%
46%

Disability

Yes
No

8%
86%

Qualification

Certificate I
Certificate II
Certificate III
Certificate IV
Certificate level unknown
Diploma
Advanced diploma
Associate degree
Degree
Short course / statement of attainment
VET graduate certificate / graduate dip.
Other qualification / training
Do not know

0%
0%
0%
0%
0%
95%
3%
0%
0%
0%
0%
0%
0%

FOE

Natural & physical sciences
Information Technology
Engineering & related technologies
Architecture & building
Agriculture, envi & related studies
Health
Education
Management & commerce
Society & culture
Creative arts
Food, hospitality & personal services
Other

0%
0%
0%
78%
0%
0%
5%
0%
0%
3%
0%
11%

Identifying as Aboriginal/TSI

No
Yes, Aboriginal
Yes, Torres Strait Islander
Yes, both

92%
3%
0%
0%

Studying for an Apprenticeship or Traineeship

Yes
No

19%
73%

Recognition/Prior Learning

Yes
No

22%
73%

Snapshot Scales 2017 (Old Formula)

Trainer Quality 92.1%
Overall 98.1%

Please check notes on page 3

Snapshot Scales 2017 (New Formula)

Trainer Quality 94.4%
Overall Satisfaction 100.0%


About Your Training

C5333 - Dip Interior Design&Decoration

2017


1. Trainer Quality

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		No. of Students
	92.1%					
11. Training organisation staff respected my background and needs		0%	3%	64%	33%	36
13. Trainers had an excellent knowledge of the subject content		0%	6%	44%	50%	36
14. I received useful feedback on my assessments		3%	3%	67%	28%	36
23. Trainers explained things clearly		3%	11%	69%	17%	36
28. Trainers made the subject as interesting as possible		3%	11%	47%	39%	36
34. Trainers encouraged learners to ask questions		0%	6%	61%	33%	36



2. Overall Satisfaction

Overall Satisfaction:		% AGREE		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		No. of Students
			98.1%					
9. Overall, I am satisfied with the training				0%	0%	56%	44%	36
10. I would recommend the training organisation to others				0%	3%	58%	39%	36
29. I would recommend the training to others				0%	3%	58%	39%	36



3. Effective Support

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	No. of Students	
	84.7%					
24. The training organisation had a range of services to support learners		0%	8%	69%	22%	36
33. The training was flexible enough to meet my needs		3%	19%	53%	25%	36

4. Clear Expectations

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	No. of Students
	76.9%					
20. It was always easy to know the standards expected		3%	28%	58%	11%	36
22. I usually had a clear idea of what was expected of me		3%	17%	67%	14%	36
35. Trainers made it clear right from the start what they expected from me		3%	17%	56%	25%	36

5. Effective Assessment

	% AGREE					
	96.3%	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	No. of Students	
15. The way I was assessed was a fair test of my skills and knowledge		0%	6%	58%	36%	36
19. Assessments were based on realistic activities		0%	0%	67%	33%	36
30. The training organisation gave appropriate recognition of existing knowledge and skills		0%	6%	64%	31%	36

6. Learning Stimulation

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	No. of Students
	92.5%					
17. The training was at the right level of difficulty for me		0%	6%	67%	28%	36
18. The amount of work I had to do was reasonable		0%	14%	66%	20%	35
32. I was given enough material to keep up my interest		0%	3%	69%	28%	36

7. Training Resources

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		No. of Students
	88.0%					
21. Training facilities and materials were in good condition		0%	17%	58%	25%	36
26. The training used up-to-date equipment, facilities and materials		0%	11%	64%	25%	36
31. Training resources were available when I needed them		0%	8%	69%	22%	36

8. Training Relevance

c. Training Relevance		% AGREE		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		No. of
		97.2%						Students
3. The training focused on relevant skills		0%	0%	46%	54%			35
5. The training prepared me well for work		0%	3%	66%	31%			35
7. The training had a good mix of theory and practice		0%	6%	42%	53%			36

9. Competency Development

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	No. of Students	
	100.0%					
1. I developed the skills expected from this training		0%	0%	44%	56%	36
2. I identified ways to build on my current knowledge and skills		0%	0%	47%	53%	36

Notes

The Social Research Centre (SRC) uses a new method to evaluate scales such as Trainer Quality. The original method simply added the number of responses which were "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" for all 6 GTS questions and divided this by the number of actual responses. This is the Percent Agree value for the scale. Blanks, D/A and N/A are excluded.

The new method counts students rather than responses. Firstly, students who did not answer at least 4 of the 6 questions are excluded from the calculation. Responses for the remaining students are then converted to a value between 0 and 100 (Strongly Disagree=0, Disagree=25, Neither=50, Agree=75, Strongly Agree=100). Students with an average below 55 are regarded as "Not In Agreement".

The Percent Agree value is then the number of students In Agreement expressed as a percentage of all students that were not excluded.

The new method for calculating overall satisfaction uses responses only to Q9: Overall, I am satisfied with the training.

Percentages represent the percentage of total valid responses per question, with the exception of the demographics section which represent the percentage of total responses.

Charts are rescaled on valid responses to total 100%.

The sum of the percentages may be 99% or 101% in some cases due to rounding.

Valid responses exclude N/A and blank responses.