

STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY - VE LQ

2020
Semester 2

College of Design and Social Context	AUSBR	Survey Population: 251 Respondents : 72 Response Rate: 28.7%
--------------------------------------	-------	--

Demographics (% of total sample size)

Commencement Year

Pre 2015	0
2015	0
2016	0
2017	0
2018	0
2019	4
2020	68

Age

Under 15	0%
15-19	33%
20-24	24%
25-34	19%
35-44	13%
45-54	6%
55-64	6%
65 or over	0%

Citizenship

Australian	86%
International Onshore	14%
International Offshore	0%

Gender

Male	21%
Female	79%

Program Type

TAFE Certificate	40%
TAFE Diploma	60%
Other	0%

LOTE

Yes	40%
No	60%

Disability

Yes	21%
No	78%

Qualification

Certificate I	0%
Certificate II	0%
Certificate III	1%
Certificate IV	38%
Certificate level unknown	0%
Diploma	53%
Advanced diploma	6%
Associate degree	0%
Degree	0%
Short course / statement of attainment	0%
VET graduate certificate / graduate dip.	0%
Other qualification / training	0%
Do not know	1%

FOE

Natural & physical sciences	0%
Information Technology	0%
Engineering & related technologies	3%
Architecture & building	1%
Agriculture, envi & related studies	0%
Health	1%
Education	0%
Management & commerce	1%
Society & culture	0%
Creative arts	69%
Food, hospitality & personal services	0%
Other	24%

Identifying as Aboriginal/TSI

No	99%
Yes, Aboriginal	1%
Yes, Torres Strait Islander	0%
Yes, both	0%

Studying for an Apprenticeship or Traineeship

Yes	4%
No	93%

Recognition/Prior Learning

Yes	17%
No	81%

Please check notes on page 3

Snapshot Scales 2020 (Old Formula)	
Trainer Quality	93.2%
Overall	87.4%

Snapshot Scales 2020 (New Formula)	
Trainer Quality	94.4%
Overall Satisfaction	84.5%


About Your Training

College of Design and Social Context

2020


1. Trainer Quality

	% AGREE			Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	No. of Students
	93.2%					
11. Training organisation staff respected my background and needs		1%	7%	57%	35%	72
13. Trainers had an excellent knowledge of the subject content		0%	3%	54%	43%	72
14. I received useful feedback on my assessments		1%	6%	65%	28%	72
23. Trainers explained things clearly		3%	8%	72%	17%	72
28. Trainers made the subject as interesting as possible		3%	7%	58%	32%	69
34. Trainers encouraged learners to ask questions		0%	1%	55%	44%	71



2. Overall Satisfaction

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		No. of Students
	87.4%					
9. Overall, I am satisfied with the training		4%	11%	59%	25%	71
10. I would recommend the training organisation to others		3%	10%	58%	29%	72
29. I would recommend the training to others		3%	7%	59%	31%	71



3. Effective Support

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	No. of Students	
	81.4%					
24. The training organisation had a range of services to support learners		3%	14%	61%	21%	70
33. The training was flexible enough to meet my needs		6%	14%	59%	21%	70

4. Clear Expectations

	% AGREE				Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	No. of Students
	85.9%						
20. It was always easy to know the standards expected		4%	18%	63%	14%	71	
22. I usually had a clear idea of what was expected of me		1%	10%	68%	21%	71	
35. Trainers made it clear right from the start what they expected from me		1%	7%	65%	27%	71	

5. Effective Assessment

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	No. of Students
	90.2%					
15. The way I was assessed was a fair test of my skills and knowledge		1%	4%	64%	31%	72
19. Assessments were based on realistic activities		3%	10%	65%	22%	72
30. The training organisation gave appropriate recognition of existing knowledge and skills		1%	10%	70%	19%	70

6. Learning Stimulation

		% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	No. of Students	
		84.5%					
17. The training was at the right level of difficulty for me			1%	11%	62%	25%	71
18. The amount of work I had to do was reasonable			4%	18%	71%	7%	72
32. I was given enough material to keep up my interest			4%	7%	63%	26%	70

7. Training Resources

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		No. of Students
	85.6%					
21. Training facilities and materials were in good condition		4%	14%	57%	24%	70
26. The training used up-to-date equipment, facilities and materials		4%	4%	68%	23%	69
31. Training resources were available when I needed them		4%	12%	62%	22%	69

8. Training Relevance

	% AGREE	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	No. of Students
	84.4%					
3. The training focused on relevant skills		0%	6%	58%	37%	71
5. The training prepared me well for work		1%	19%	64%	16%	70
7. The training had a good mix of theory and practice		4%	17%	45%	34%	71

9. Competency Development

	% AGREE					
	94.4%	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	No. of Students	
1. I developed the skills expected from this training		0%	10%	63%	27%	71
2. I identified ways to build on my current knowledge and skills		0%	1%	72%	26%	72

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.