Australian Government

Department of Home Affairs

AMEP
Adult Migrant English Program

Adult Migrant English Program

Quality Assurance (QA) File Verification Report

The Quality Assurance (QA) File Verification Report provides details of the review of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) 3 Accurate Assessments complied by the QA provider.

The QA provider reviews assessments completed by clients in order to confirm:

- there is sufficient evidence that the provider has assessed the client accurately and recorded improvement against the ACSF;
- the tuition and support provided is appropriate to the needs and objectives documented in the Individual Pathway Guide (IPG) and the IPG is updated following each Progressive Assessment;
- assessment tasks are appropriate and relevant to the ACSF level and reflect the accredited foundation skills curriculum being delivered.

A. File Verification Details

Provider Name	Melbourne Polytechnic	State:	VIC
Contract Region (Name and Code):		2.3 North West Melbourne	
Date of QA Audit From/To	11/11/2019 15/11/2019		
Date of Report		15/11/2019	
QA Assessor Name/s		Janet Dean and Ailsa Sinclair	

B. File Verifications Results

FILE TYPE	NUMBER REQUESTED	NUMBER RECEIVED	VERIFIED	% OUTCOME
Initial Assessment (IA)	25	25	25	100%
Progressive Assessment (PA)	5	5	5	100%
SLPET files	-	-	-	-
TOTAL*	30	30	30	100%

*Total to match the total number of File verifications in Section A.

C. FILE VERIFICATION SUMMARY

30 files from Melbourne Polytechnic CR 2.3 were selected for offsite QA audit. The following sites were included: Glenroy, Melbourne Polytechnic Broadmeadows, Kangan Broadmeadows, Meadow Heights Education Centre, Melbourne Polytechnic Buchan Street and Craigieburn Plaza. The feedback session was held on Thursday 14 November via Zoom video link, with AMEP Program Managers, Coordinators, Teachers and Assessors in attendance.

Individual Pathway Guide (IPG)

All files contained a completed IPG, which were updated following each Progressive Assessment.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Melbourne Polytechnic is to be commended for responding to recommendations in the May 2019 Onsite QA Audit Report, regarding Oral Communication and Learning at PLA and PLB.

- In a number of files with Oral Communication indicators awarded at PLA and PLB, assessors used single words or extremely short phrases to elicit responses to picture prompts at PLA and PLB ACSF levels. Assessors combined these verbal prompts with gestures and non-verbal communication. See files: CID KNBM575622, CID MHEC570168, CID MHEC575226
- Only one picture was selected, as recommended, when assessing Oral Communication at Pre-Level 1. See files: CID KNBM574961, CID MHEC575109
- To gather evidence for Learning at Pre level 1, client performance was observed throughout the IA and assessor analysis referenced how s/he interacted with the assessor and the task, e.g. attempting all tasks, following extremely simple instructions, using body language to indicate understanding. See files: CID MHEC570168, CID MHEC572871, CID MHEC575109
- Annotations on Reading and Writing tasks re clients' comprehension and engagement was referenced in support of Learning, e.g. 'followed simple instructions to write his/her name'. See files: CID MHEC570168, CID MHEC572871, CID MHEC575109

IA Kit

A number of versions of IA Kits were viewed in the transition to the use of the Streamlined IA Kit. The kits viewed included the AMEP IA Kit April 2018, the Streamlined IA Kit June 2019 Version 1 and Streamlined IA Kit September 2019 Version 2. The kit has been contextualised for the local area, e.g., Level 1 Reading, PLB Writing of sentences adapted from a model. The use of a range of versions of IA Kits was discussed at the feedback session and Melbourne Polytechnic confirmed the roll out of the Streamlined IA Kit September 2019 Version 2, for use at all sites in the Contract Region.

IAs – Good Practice

Assessor Practice

A range of referencing methods was used in the Q&A Interview, with clients' verbatim quotes highlighted in different colours or numbers. See files: CID MHEC575109, CID MHEC573031, CID MHEC571832.

Good referencing of relevant aspects of clients' performance in IAs. See files: CID MHEC575226, CID MHEC575109, CID MHEC573031.

Good annotation of support given to clients/ questions asked by clients during the IA was noted. See files: CID MHEC572870, CID MHEC57287.

Good assessor analysis in Learning and Oral Communication. See file: CID MHEC571832.

Please use the following comments to further support IA practice:

Assessor practice

Learning and Oral Communication

In some files a range of questions related to Learning were not asked and it is unclear why this occurred. Unless the client is clearly Pre-Level 1 exit competent, in order to assess to limits of competence in both Learning and Oral Communication it is important to ask the questions given in the Interview task, rephrasing them as required. Documenting the rephrased questions provides evidence to support the .08 indicator claim. Client responses provide evidence for Learning as well as the .07 indicator.

As stated in the Assessor Guide page 11:

> The questions are used to establish the client's listening and speaking skills as well as to ascertain performance features of the Learning core skill. The Interview Questions start at level 1 and progress in complexity for the .08 indicator. As you progress, if needed, rephrase or simplify questions to make the questions accessible to lower level clients. For example, Question 4 in Learning/Oral Communication is a 2.08 question, which asks, 'Did you go to school in your country? If yes, tell me about it OR would you like to tell me more about your schooling' If the client doesn't understand the question, simplify the question to level 1 complexity. E.g. 'Did you go to school?' 'Where did you go to school?' 'What did you like? Maths? Teachers?' Use non-verbal communication, or body language, as required to support communication.

Writing

Please ensure the writing task reflects the client's writing. Use of phones is acceptable to check spelling but not to construct or translate sentences. See files CID MPBR575186, CID MPBR576685.

Oral Communication

Please ensure that the Q&A Interview remains an Oral Communication assessment. Questions read by the client, see file CID MPBR575186, or translated using a mobile device, see file CID MPBR575203, cannot support the .08 indicator claim.

Assessor Analysis

Assessing to limits of competence when using the Streamlined IA Kit

When using the Streamlined IA Kit it is important to address some of the performance features in the level above that being claimed. In some files seen in this QA audit, assessment to limits of competence in Learning and/or Oral Communication was not indicated. Please ensure that a cross is placed against at least one performance feature not demonstrated by the client. There is no requirement to reference evidence at the level above that being claimed.

In some files, the performance features in the level above that being claimed were addressed by ticks or crosses. However, please ensure the evidence supports the claim that the client did not demonstrate the performance feature/s being crossed. For example, in file CID GLLC572663, the client demonstrated 'Begins to provide key information relevant to an exchange' in appropriately answering questions 1 -12. This had been crossed as not demonstrated in the 2.07 analysis.

Evidence not present in file

Please ensure that evidence referred to in the analysis is present in the file. In some files, client quotes referenced in analysis could not be found in the file (e.g. CID GLLC567787, CID GLLC569752 - Learning).

PAs – Good Practice

- Good information on the context of learning that took place before the assessment was completed.
- Good task combination was observed across files.

PA tasks requiring revision:

Reading PLB 1.03, PLB 1.04 'A note' (v 2 Feb 2019) - As recommended in the QA audit report of December 2018 regarding an earlier task version, this task would be more authentic if the format was revised to that of a text message, e.g. Hi Teacher, I'm sick etc., using an image of a mobile phone screen. A phone message taken and written by administrative staff is not within the extremely familiar context required at PLB level. It was also suggested that larger, clearer and more authentic images could be chosen for 'home' and 'teacher'. These recommendations continue to apply to the version seen in this QA audit. In this version, the matching exercise in Q3 contained an error. The 'word' to match with the picture for 'home' was a mobile number. The Answer Key was inconsistent with Q3 and Q4 in the task. Please revise and correct the task so as not to affect the outcome of future QA audits.

==The tables below report Initial Assessment (IA) outcomes that have **not met** or **have partially met verification**, and **Progressive Assessment** (PA) outcomes.==

FILE DETAILS	
CID	**GLLC567664**
Site	**Glenroy**
Assessment date	**24/07/2019**
File Verified ☒	**File Not Verified** ☐
FILE VERIFICATION	

File type (tick one)	Initial Assessment ☒	Progressive Assessment ☐

IPG Checklist	YES/NO	COMMENTS
Was an IPG completed?	Yes	
Has the IPG been updated every 200 hours?	NA	
Was tuition and support provided appropriate for the needs and objectives outlined in the IPG?	NA	
IA ASSESSMENT	**YES/NO**	**COMMENTS**
Were the assessment tasks appropriate for the ACSF level?	Yes	Choose an item.

Is there sufficient evidence that the provider has assessed the client accurately against the ACSF?	Yes	Choose an item.

ACSF INDICATOR REVIEW	Verified		
Core Skill	**NO**	**PARTIAL**	**Indicator**
Writing		✓	PLB 1.05
			PLB 1.06

Comments: The client did not demonstrate PLB 1.06 exit competence. She did not use full stops accurately in sentences adapted from a model. No full stops were found in the evidence.

FILE DETAILS	
CID	**GNLC443420**
Site	**Glenroy**
Assessment date	**17/07/2019**

File Verified ☒ **File Not Verified** ☐

FILE VERIFICATION	
File type (tick one)	**Initial Assessment** ☐ **Progressive Assessment** ☒

IPG Checklist	YES/NO	COMMENTS
Was an IPG completed?	Yes	
Has the IPG been updated every 200 hours?	Yes	
Was tuition and support provided appropriate for the needs and objectives outlined in the IPG?	Yes	

PA ACSF INDICATOR REVIEW	Verified	COMMENTS
PA ASSESSMENT	**YES/NO**	
Were the assessment tasks appropriate for the ACSF level?	Yes	Choose an item.
Is there sufficient evidence that the provider has assessed the client accurately against the ACSF?	Yes	Choose an item.

Were the tasks relevant to the client's learning needs?	Yes	Choose an item.			
Core Skill	**Indicator**	**Curriculum**	**Module**	**Task**	**Name of task**
PA: Reading	PLB 1.03/ PLB 1.04	22483VIC Course in EAL	VU22589 Read and write short factual texts	Task 1	Class Timetable (v 2 Feb 2019)
	PLB 1.03/ PLB 1.04	22483VIC Course in EAL	VU22589 Read and write short factual texts	Task 2	A note (v 2 Feb 2019)
COMMENTS: The PA was verified on this occasion. Please see General Comments regarding Task 2. The Assessment Task Coversheet was completed in full with clear context notes. The task combination was appropriate. The analysis for Task 1 referred to evidence not present in the task. It stated that 'K was able to locate information about the timetable such as the time, number of days, address and the teacher'. No times, number of days or addresses were presented in the task.					