



FORM

Quality Indicator annual summary report

Learner engagement and employer satisfaction surveys

RTO No.	RTO legal name
21132	Stirling Institute of Australia Pty Ltd

Section 1 Survey response rates

	Surveys issued (SI)	Surveys received (SR)	% response rates = SR *100 / SI
Learner engagement	210	109	51.90%
Employer satisfaction	1	1	100%

Trends of response statistics:

- which student/employer cohorts provided high/low response rates
- how did response rates compare with previous years (if applicable)

Student response rate -

For 2014 was 23.24 %
For 2015 was 20 %
For 2016 was 42.22 %
For 2017 was 22%
For 2018 was 73%
For 2019 was 56.53%
For 2020 was 51.90%

Compared to the previous year's collection, SIA experienced a slightly decrease of 4.63% in the response rate; from 56.53% in 2019 to 51.90% for 2020. SIA will continue to implement a two-strategy approach by providing students with online as well as paper-based formats.





Section 2 Survey information feedback

What were the expected or unexpected findings from the survey feedback?

Expected findings:

Stirling Institute of Australia (SIA) has four values; Team, Diversity, Accountability and Integrity. It was expected that these values were passed onto students and reflected in SIA procedures and way of doing. From the 35 questions present in the surveys the highest scores were received in the following;

LQ11 Training organisation staff respected my background and needs (average of 4.63)

This has also increased from previous year's collection demonstrating that SIA values are still strong and well implemented/followed.

In addition to this, there were two positive and expected responses for the following:

LQ13 Trainers had an excellent knowledge of the subject content (average of 4.60)

LQ27 I approached trainers if I needed help (average of 4.60).

SIA believe that these two very positive responses are mainly related to the reviewed processes in relation of onboarding new trainers (tougher screening was introduced with the creation of interview questions) and requirements around professional developments and currency for trainers and assessors. This has resulted in a more beneficial impact on the students' learning where support and guidance toward students were encouraged and expected from all trainers working at Stirling.

Unexpected findings:

LQ18 (The amount of work I had to do was reasonable) seems to remain stable when comparing this year average (4.19) to the previous year (4.17). SIA reviewed majority of its qualifications currently on scope, and reduced the amount of work required from students where this was possible and without lowering the quality or the specific units' requirements. It is possible that this data is still referring to students who were given learning resources before the review that occurred around mid-2020. This will be again evaluated using internal surveys (week 5 and 15 surveys) to ensure the level of satisfaction will increase.

LQ8 (I looked for my own resources to help me learn). The average response this year is very similar to the previous year (2020: 4.05; 2019: 4.03). This has been interpreted by SIA as a positive outcome having implemented extra learning materials for students and these may have been enough for the students and not encouraged them to look for extra resources.

What does the survey feedback tell you about your organisation's performance?

SIA received an average response rate of 4.37. This is a very positive outcome and when comparing the overall feedback of the received surveys with previous years, it is evident that Stirling Institute of Australia has listened and improved on those areas that were previously identified as not meeting the expectations.

From the open question responses, it is noticed that the general satisfaction of participants is positive, and it seems that the level of satisfaction is higher than in previous years. Vast majority of comments/compliments are related to the positive experience, the support received from trainers and the "hands-on" approach (including placement).



In addition to the quality indicators, SIA has also analysed the internal Week 15 Surveys. SIA received a total of 66 responses and the results confirm and are in line with the responses received from the quality indicator surveys.

Section 3 Improvement actions

What preventive or corrective actions have you implemented in response to the feedback?

Overall SIA received an average of 4.37 in the quality indicators and only four areas have received a slightly lower score but still above 4 (from 4.03 to 4.19). Even if this is still an acceptable response from learners, SIA is striving for continuous improvement and the corrective actions put in place are mainly relevant to the amount of work students have to do as well as the level of difficulty of training.

How will/do you monitor the effectiveness of these actions?

1. A review will be conducted quarterly to ensure the newly implemented resources are of high standards as well as meeting the students 'expectations in terms of suitable level of difficulty. To support students in their learning the session plans will be reviewed to ensure these correctly align with the required AQF levels.
 2. An ongoing analysis will be conducted on completed student feedback forms for individual units. These forms are available to students on the last page of their assessment kits.
 3. SIA will continue to monitor continuous improvements by;
 - analysing student formal surveys, generally conducted in week 5 and 15 as well as at completion of the course
 - trainer meetings
 - management meetings
- Any identified action will be discussed and recorded onto the continuous improvement register.