Supplementary Questions Leisa Harrison – Essential Skills Training & Recruitment

1. Please provide the following data about your organisation:

a. The number of hours of employment of permanent qualified teachers in the last financial year

Answer: 8,863.9 hours

b. The headcount number of permanent qualified teachers

Answer: 7

c. The number of hours of employment of casual qualified teachers in the last financial year

Answer: 956.5 hours (2 casual trainer)

d. The number of hours of employment of permanent paraprofessional grades (instructors, assessors etc.) in the last financial year

Answer: NA – our trainers do all components (training, assessing etc)

e. The headcount number of permanent paraprofessionals

Answer: NA – our trainers do all components (training, assessing etc)

f. The number of hours of employment of casual paraprofessional grades (instructors, assessors etc.) in the last financial year

Answer: - our trainers do all components (training, assessing etc)

g. The number of hours of employment in the last financial year of each of the following activities:

- i. Disability adjustment
- ii. Student counselling
- iii. Outreach
- iv. Aboriginal education support
- v. Student welfare

Answer: Our trainers and assessors provide this support to students as part of the above mentioned hours

h. The number of students enrolled in each level of qualification offered by your organisation (head count and full time equivalent).

Answer: *Majority employment based* Certificate III – 336 students Certificate IV - 391 students Diploma – 35 students

i. The total amount of revenue you received in fees and other student charges

Answer: Fee for service - \$1,178,864

j. The total amount of revenue you received from government (broken down by Smart and Skilled and other programs)

Answer: New entrant trainee claims under APL - \$280,613.67 ACWVET - \$135,557

k. The total amount of revenue you received from students for courses where VET Fee help was available.

Answer: NA not VET Fee help approved

2. Do you believe that the Smart and Skilled training market is biased to larger training non-government providers? If so,

a. Please explain what features of this market create that bias and the impacts it is having on your business and the training sector.

Answer: Yes I do believe there is a bias towards the larger RTO's, I don't know why or what their reasoning would be but that was the result of the smart and skilled allocation progress. A lot of the small to medium RTO's who specialise in particular areas seems to get very little or nothing at all with smart and skilled. People seem to think it was done that way to reduce the number of RTO's (which it did by half) and I know a lot of RTO's who had to significantly reduce staff or closed their doors all together because without access to that funding they simply were not able to compete.

We have been running very successful programs bringing new workers into the community services industry over the past 3 years and not being able to access the entitled full qualifications under smart and skilled for the students has impacted our business.

We have only just recently been given allocations for traineeship in regions we can use but prior to that we were training new entrants on a fee for service basis and again it has been difficult and had a very big impact on our finances this year. As you can imagine trying to compete price wise with RTO's who have smart and skilled funding is very difficult as we have had to reduce our fees to remain competitive but we would get \$1440 for trainee and a smart and skilled funded RTO would get around \$5000 per trainee.

It you want smart and skilled to focus on quality not price you need to allow a range of RTO's to access this funding so they can remain competitive and maintain the quality of their services.

b. Do you believe that it is possible to develop a scheme to allocate student entitlements or other public funding that would not contain a bias to larger organisations? If so, please explain what the features of such a scheme would be.

Answer: I just think they need to look at how funds were allocated. If an RTO has a good record of compliance and completion there should be no reason why they should not be able to provide students with access to smart and skilled funding. It should not matter if they are big or small, there is a place for both as long as they are doing the right thing and getting the outcomes that the VET industry needs in terms of providing quality training and assessment services and skilling our workforce. Giving large allocations to only a small number of RTO's does not meet the main aims of the program-student choice, quality not price.

On another note;

We have seen a massive decline in traineeship in the community services industry and this is mainly due increase in fees and reduction in incentives. With Aged Care and Disability target areas they need to be continually bringing new staff into the industry to meet the service demand but the changes over the last 2-3 years has had a huge impact on entry level and up skilling of staff.