Data quality information — Vocational education and training, chapter 5

|  |
| --- |
| Data quality information |
| Data quality information (DQI) provides information against the seven Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data quality framework dimensions, for performance indicators in the Vocational education and training (VET) chapter.  Technical DQI has been supplied or agreed by relevant data providers. Additional Steering Committee commentary does not necessarily reflect the views of data providers. |
|  |
|  |
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## Data Collections

### National VET provider data collection

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER) and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Various | |
| Indicator | The VET provider collection is used as a key data source for the following indicators: | |
| Measure (computation) | * VET participation by target group * Student participation in VET * Student achievement in VET * VET student completions and qualifications | |
| Data source/s | *VET provider collection*, NCVER.   * The VET provider collection provides a nationally consistent framework for the collection of VET activity in Australia. It forms part of the Australian Vocational Education and Training Management Information Statistical Standard (AVETMISS). It details the information collected by training organisations regarding their training activity. In broad terms, the information collected relates to students (clients), who they are, where they study and what they study. Nationally consistent and accurate measurement of VET activity in Australia is enabled by collecting this information in a uniform way. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
| Institutional environment | The NCVER is a not-for-profit company owned by the federal, state and territory ministers responsible for training.  NCVER is a professional and independent body responsible for collecting, managing, analysing, evaluating and communicating research and statistics about VET nationally. It is Australia's principal provider of VET research and statistics.  For further information on NCVER, see http://www.ncver.edu.au/ aboutncver/who.html | |
| Relevance | The National VET Provider Collection collects information relating to students, courses, qualifications, training providers and funding in Australia’s publicly funded VET system.  The system provides training for students of all ages and backgrounds. Students have many options for training and may study individual subjects or full courses that lead to formal qualifications. Training takes place in classrooms, in the workplace, online and through other flexible delivery methods.  Providers of vocational education and training in Australia include not only technical and further education (TAFE) institutes, but also universities, secondary schools, industry organisations, private enterprises, agricultural colleges, community education providers and other government providers.  This collection does not cover the following types of training activity:   * recreation, leisure and personal enrichment * fee-for-service VET by community education and private providers * delivery undertaken at overseas campuses of Australian VET institutions * credit transfer * VET delivered in schools, where the training activity was undertaken as part of a senior secondary certificate * any activity where revenue was earned from another registered training organisation in terms of subcontracted, auspicing, partnership or similar arrangements. | |
| Timeliness | The National VET Provider Collection is submitted to NCVER on a quarterly basis and consists of data for January to March, January to June, January to September and January to December.  A summary of 2014 data was released on 30 June 2015 in Government-funded students and courses 2014. | |
| Accuracy | The National VET Provider Collection is a collection of all publicly funded training activity in Australia in a particular year. It is an administrative collection.  Publicly funded registered training organisations submit unit record data directly to state/territory training authorities, who in turn submit the data to NCVER. Prior to submissions to NCVER, data must first pass a validation process to ensure that data conforms to the AVETMISS (Refer to http://www.ncver.edu.au/avetmiss/21055.html).  Once data submissions are received by NCVER they are subjected to a comprehensive data quality checking program to ensure accurate reporting against agreed Key Performance Measures (KPMs). Some of the KPMs include:   * Percentage of unknown data * The number of training organisation identifiers that do not match the National Training Information Service (NTIS) listing * Inappropriate training organisation delivery locations * The number of qualifications/courses that do not match the NTIS listing * The number of modules/units of competency that do not match the NTIS listing * Duplicate client identification * Duplicate qualifications completed * Reporting scopes * Funding sources * Outcome identifiers. | |
| Coherence | AVETMISS provides the foundation for nationally comparable data and includes a range of data items relevant to the VET system.   * From 2007, data comply with release 6.0 of AVETMISS, whereas previous collections complied with earlier releases. * From 2012, data comply with release 6.1 of AVETMISS, whereas previous collections complied with earlier releases. * From 2014, Release 7.0 came into effect.   For further information go to <http://www.ncver.edu.au/avetmiss/21055.html>.  In 2010, the invalid enrolment audit cycle changed, with States and Territories now being audited for invalid enrolments over a three-year cycle rather than annually. For 2014 training activity, SA, WA, Tasmania, the NT, and the ACT were audited and received a new invalid enrolment rate; the invalid enrolment rates for the other States and Territories for 2014 are those calculated for 2013. | |
| Accessibility | Summary information is available free of charge in Students and Courses on NCVER’s website at: http://www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21053.html. Requests for more detailed statistical information can be made to NCVER on (08) 8230 8400 or vet\_req@ncver.edu.au  A charge will be generally made by NCVER for more complex requests for information. See NCVER’s fees and charges policy at http://www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21075.html | |
| Interpretability | To aid interpretation, information on the National VET Provider Collection, AVETMISS, and Students and Courses is available on the NCVER website.  Among other standards detailed in AVETMISS, the collection uses the:   * Australian Standard Classification of Education (ASCED) (ABS cat. no. 1272.0) to classify the level and field of education * Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO, previously ASCO) (ABS cat. no. 1220.0) to classify occupation * Access/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+) to classify remoteness. It was developed by the National Centre for Applications of Geographic Information Systems (GISCA) and is the standard ABS endorsed measure of remoteness.   Student remoteness is based on the Access/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+), which was developed by the National Centre for Social Applications of Geographic Information Systems (GISCA). ARIA+ is now the standard ABS-endorsed measure of remoteness. From 2011, Student remoteness (ARIA+) is determined from ARIA+ remoteness regions and ABS SA2 regions. Data prior to 2011 is based on ABS postal areas and ARIA+. Student remoteness (ARIA+) regions use the same ARIA+ ranges as the ABS remoteness areas and are therefore an approximation of the ABS remoteness areas. For more details of ARIA+ refer to <www.adelaide.edu.au/apmrc/ research/projects/category/about\_aria.html> | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | See performance indicator DQI |

### National VET financial data collection

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Various | |
| Indicator | The VET financial collection is used as a key data source for the following indicators: | |
| Measure (computation) | * Government recurrent expenditure per annual hour * Government recurrent expenditure per load pass * User cost of capital per annual hour * User cost of capital per load pass | |
| Data source/s | *VET financial collection*, NCVER.   * The VET financialcollection provides a nationally consistent standard for the collection, reporting and analysis of the public VET system information throughout Australia. It forms part of the AVETMISS. The standard has been developed and redefined over a number of years through consultations with major stakeholders. Data collections made under the standard are used as the basis for reporting the key performance measures for the VET sector, approved by Commonwealth, state and territory VET ministers. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
| Institutional environment | The NCVER is a not-for-profit company owned by the federal, state and territory ministers responsible for training.  NCVER is a professional and independent body responsible for collecting, managing, analysing, evaluating and communicating research and statistics about VET nationally. It is Australia's principal provider of VET research and statistics.  For further information on NCVER, see http://www.ncver.edu.au/ aboutncver/who.html | |
| Relevance | The scope of the financial data collection covers all transactions that affect the financial performance, financial position and financing of the public VET system. The collection focuses on vocational education and training administered or provided by the main training authority or training department within each state and territory, their public training providers and the Department of Industry.  The financial information has been extracted from accrual-based financial records. | |
| Timeliness | The National VET Finance Collection is an annual collection of data. Audited data are submitted to NCVER (via state training authorities) in July in the year following activity. | |
| Accuracy | Key financial data are audited to provide additional assurance on the quality of the reported data and consistent adoption of the requirements of the AVETMISS.  Differences exist across the accounting policies applied by state and territory governments; for example, in relation to the valuation and measurement of investments and property, and plant and equipment. Details of accounting policies for each jurisdiction are in the AVETMISS for VET financial data located at http://www.ncver.edu.au/avetmiss/21064.html  State and territory governments and the Australian Government were not required to submit detailed working papers. The data are supported by relevant working papers held by them and, where possible, reconciled to public documents such as annual reports and budget papers. | |
| Coherence | VET in schools revenue can no longer be separated from the other specific purpose program payments made by the Australian Government to the states and territories. Hence, the numerator (‘government recurrent expenditure’) includes payments received by states and territories for VET in schools programs. In 2009, those payments for VET in schools previously excluded was approximately 0.2 per cent of government recurrent expenditure for VET.  In 2007, Victoria adopted standard nominal hour values for common units of competency as the basis of calculating total annual hours of delivery, thereby achieving consistency with all other states and territories. To enable comparison over time, standard nominal hour values have been used to revise the time series back to 2002, except for Victoria, where data prior to 2007 cannot be rebased from scheduled hours to standard nominal hours.  In 2010, the invalid enrolment audit cycle changed, with states and territories now being audited for invalid enrolments over a three-year cycle rather than annually. For 2013 training activity, New South Wales, Victoria, and the Australian Capital Territory were audited and received a new invalid enrolment rate; the invalid enrolment rates for the other states and territories for 2013 are those calculated for 2012. | |
| Accessibility | Summary information is available free of charge on NCVER’s website at: http://www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21051.html.  Requests for more detailed statistical information can be made to NCVER. However, a charge will be generally made for more complex requests for information. See NCVER’s fees and charges policy at: http://www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21075.html. | |
| Interpretability | To aid interpretation, a statistical standard for the National VET Finance Collection is provided at: http://www.ncver.edu.au/avetmiss/21064.html. | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | See performance indicator DQI |

### Student Outcomes Survey

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Various | |
| Indicator | The Student Outcomes Survey is used as a key data source for the following indicators: | |
| Measure (computation) | * Student employment and further study outcomes * Student satisfaction with VET. | |
| Data source/s | *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), NCVER.   * An annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. * The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
| Institutional environment | The NCVER is a not-for-profit company owned by the federal, state and territory ministers responsible for training.  NCVER is a professional and independent body responsible for collecting, managing, analysing, evaluating and communicating research and statistics about VET nationally. It is Australia's principal provider of VET research and statistics.  For further information on NCVER, see http://www.ncver.edu.au/ aboutncver/who.html | |
| Relevance | The Student Outcomes Survey collects information on students’ employment outcomes and satisfaction with VET in Australia. Students have the option to complete the survey online, or by hard-copy questionnaire. Some students are selected to complete the survey by telephone.  Information about the level and type of training students undertake, further study patterns and reasons for not continuing with the training (where applicable) is also collected.  The scope of the survey is nationally recognised VET (Figure 1). | |
|  | Figure 1 Scope of the 2014 Student Outcomes Survey   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | | |  | Registered Training Organisations | | | | | Source of funding | | | |  | Government VET providers  — TAFE and other | Community education providers | Other registered providers | | |  |  |  |  | | |  | Government subsidised/financed | | | |  |  |  | | |  | Domestic fee-for-service | | | |  |  |  | | |  | International fee-for-service | | | |  |  |  | | |  | | | | | | | | | |  |  | | Government Funded VET: Scope of Student Outcomes Survey data reported in the Report on Government Services. | | | | | |  |  |  | Scope of the 2014 Student Outcomes Survey | | | | |   a In 2014, the scope was expanded to include students from all jurisdictions who completed their training with a community education provider. This resulted in information being collected for New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia. Prior to this only students from community education providers in New South Wales and Victoria were included. From 2014, fee-for-service activity from community education providers has been excluded from the scope of this publication. Data have been backdated to 2006. | |
|  | The survey includes:   * Publicly funded VET activity (all providers) * Domestic fee‑for‑service activity delivered by TAFE and other government VET providers. Domestic fee‑for‑service activity is *excluded* for the measures reported in the Report on Government Services.   The survey excludes:   * Recreation, leisure and personal enrichment (non-vocational programs) * Fee‑for‑service VET activity delivered by private providers * VET activity delivered at overseas campuses of Australian VET institutions * VET activity delivered in schools.   This scope has been in place since 2005. Prior to 2005, information was only collected from students undertaking Commonwealth/State funded programs through TAFE. | |
| Timeliness | The *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS) is conducted every year. The reference date is the last Friday in May of the year after the training was completed.  Results from the 2014 survey (for students who completed their training in 2013) were released on the NCVER website in December 2014. | |
| Accuracy | In odd years, the sample is designed for reporting at the national, state/territory and institute level. In even years, a smaller sample is used for reporting at the national and state/territory level only. The survey is undertaken as a stratified, randomly selected sample, with survey responses weighted to population benchmarks from the National VET Provider Collection.  Potential sources of error in survey data include failure to complete the survey or failure to answer every applicable question. Neither of these sources of error is considered, by NCVER, to have affected the quality of data. Three analyses are conducted to determine the impact of non-response and mode bias. They are performed on weighted and unweighted data and include:   * a comparison of the responding sample with the mailing list sample * a comparison of the characteristics of the responding sample with non-respondents. Information on a sample of non-respondents is collected via telephone interview * a comparison of the results obtained from mail and online completion.   Response rates to the 2014 survey are shown in table 1. | |
|  | Table 1 Response rates for graduates to the 2014 Student Outcomes Survey   |  |  | | --- | --- | | *State/Territory* | *Response rate (%)* | | New South Wales | 41.3 | | Victoria | 36.2 | | Queensland | 35.7 | | Western Australia | 41.6 | | South Australia | 33.3 | | Tasmania | 40.9 | | Australian Capital Territory | 38.6 | | Northern Territory | 44.3 | | **Australia** | **38.2** | | |
|  | For 2014, the indicator has acceptable (less than 25 per cent) relative standard errors (RSEs) for all VET graduates at the national and state/territory level. When data are disaggregated by Indigenous status, some RSEs are consistently above 25 per cent due to small sample sizes. | |
| Coherence | The majority of data items have not changed since the survey was first conducted in 1997. The scope of the survey has increased over time. Until 2000, the survey was restricted to TAFE students. From 2000, it was expanded to include students from Adult and Community Education, private and other government providers.  Two questionnaires are used to collect the data. The main questionnaire is sent to students from TAFE, other Government and private providers. A separate shorter questionnaire is sent to students from Adult and Community Education (ACE) providers. | |
| Accessibility | Results of the survey are available free of charge on NCVER’s website at: http://www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21065.html. Requests for more detailed statistical information or further information about the Student Outcomes Survey can be made to NCVER on (08) 8230 8400 or surveys\_req@ncver.edu.au  A charge will be generally made by NCVER for more complex requests for information. See NCVER’s fees and charges policy at http://www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21075.html | |
| Interpretability | To aid interpretation of the data, information on the Student Outcomes Survey is available on the NCVER website.  The survey uses the:   * ASCED (ABS cat. no. 1272.0) to classify the level and field of education * Australian and New Zealand Standard Industry Classification (ANZSIC) (ABS cat. no. 1292.0) to classify industry * ANZSCO (previously ASCO) (ABS cat. no. 1220.0) to classify occupation * Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS): Volume 5 - Remoteness Structure (ABS cat. no.1270.0.55.005) together with the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) to classify remoteness.   Other standards used include the ABS standard questions on:   * Indigenous status * Country of birth * Main Language Spoken at Home * Labour force status   Student remoteness is based on the Access/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+), which was developed by the National Centre for Social Applications of GISCA. ARIA+ is now the standard ABS-endorsed measure of remoteness. From 2012, Student remoteness (ARIA+) is determined from ARIA+ remoteness regions and ABS SA2 regions. Data prior to 2012 is based on ABS postal areas and ARIA+. Student remoteness (ARIA+) regions use the same ARIA+ ranges as the ABS remoteness areas and are therefore an approximation of the ABS remoteness areas. For more details of ARIA+ refer to <www.adelaide.edu.au/apmrc/research/ projects/category/about\_aria.html> | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | See performance indicator DQI |

### Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Various | |
| Indicator | The Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System is used as a key data source for the following indicators: | |
| Measure (computation) | * Employer engagement with VET * Employer satisfaction with VET | |
| Data source/s | *Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System* (SEUV) , NCVER.   * A biennial survey. This survey collects information about employers' use and views of the VET system and the various ways employers use the VET system to meet their skill needs. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
| Institutional environment | The NCVER is a not for-profit company owned by the federal, state and territory ministers responsible for training.  NCVER is a professional and independent body responsible for collecting, managing, analysing, evaluating and communicating research and statistics about VET nationally. It is Australia's principal provider of VET research and statistics.  For further information on NCVER, see http://www.ncver.edu.au/aboutncver/who.html | |
| Relevance | The Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System collects information on employers’ use and views of the VET system. Data are collected by computer assisted telephone interview.  Information about the various ways in which Australian employers use the VET system and unaccredited training to meet their skill needs and their satisfaction with these methods of training is also collected.  The scope of the survey is all organisations in Australia with at least one employee. For this survey, an employee is defined as “a person working in, or operating from, this organisation including full time, part time and casual employees.” An owner/operator is not classed as an employee, regardless of whether they pay themselves a wage.  The following organisations are out of scope of the survey:   * self-employed and not employing staff * private households employing staff * foreign diplomatic missions * consulates in Australia * defence force establishments * superannuation funds. | |
| Timeliness | The Survey of Employer Use and Views is conducted every second year. The survey is conducted by telephone interview between March and May and the results relate to employers’ training experiences in the 12 months preceding their interview. Results from the 2015 survey were released on the NCVER website on 26 October 2015. | |
| Accuracy | In 2015, the survey was designed to produce estimates at the state, industry and employer size levels, with the following approximate standard errors (SE):   * 2.5 per cent for state-level estimates * 5 per cent for industry-level estimates * 1.5 per cent for employer-size level estimates * 1 per cent for Australia level estimates.   Previous surveys were designed to produce estimates with the following approximate relative standard errors (RSE):less than 8 per cent for state-level estimates   * less than 16 per cent for industry-level estimates * less than 6 per cent for employer-size level estimates * less than 3 per cent for Australia level estimates.   Employers in scope of the survey were randomly selected and stratified by:   * State (each of the 8 states and territories) * Industry (19 ANZSIC divisions) * Employer size (small = 1-9 employees, medium = 10-99 employees, large = 100 or more employees).   Potential sources of error in survey data include failure to complete the survey or failure to answer every applicable question. Neither of these sources of error is considered, by NCVER, to have affected the quality of data.  In 2015, a total of 9210 interviews were achieved. Response rates to the 2015 survey are shown in table 1. | |
|  | Table 1 Response rates for employers to the 2015 Survey Employer use and views   |  |  | | --- | --- | | *State/Territory* | *Response rate (%)* | | New South Wales | 67.3 | | Victoria | 68.2 | | Queensland | 69.3 | | Western Australia | 71.7 | | South Australia | 72.5 | | Tasmania | 76.4 | | Australian Capital Territory | 74.6 | | Northern Territory | 77.4 | | **Australia** | **70.3** | | |
|  | The indicator has acceptable (less than 25 per cent) relative standard errors (RSEs). | |
| Coherence | This is the sixth time the survey has been conducted in this form. Previous surveys were conducted in 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013. | |
| Accessibility | Results of the survey are available free of charge on NCVER’s website at: www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21066.html. Requests for more detailed statistical information or further information about the Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System can be made to:  NCVER on (08) 8230 8400 or surveys\_req@ncver.edu.au  A charge will be generally made by NCVER for more complex requests for information. See NCVER’s fees and charges policy at [www.ncver.edu.au/statistic/21075.html] | |
| Interpretability | To aid interpretation of the data, information on the Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System is available on the NCVER website.  The survey uses the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industry Classification (ANZSIC) | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | See performance indicator DQI |

### Estimated Resident Population and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the Secretariat, in consultation with the ABS and the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Various | |
| Indicator | The population estimates are used as a key data source for the following indicators: | |
| Measure (computation) | * VET participation by target group * Student participation in VET * VET student completions and qualifications. | |
| Data source/s | Population data for all Australians are sourced from the following ABS publications. These data are referred to as estimated resident population (ERP) data:   * data for June 2005 to June 2014: *Australian Demographic Statistics, June 2014*. Cat. no. 3101.0, Canberra. * data for December 2005 to December 2014: generated 30 July 2015 using *Quarterly Population Estimates (ERP), by State/Territory, Sex and Age*, Cat. no. 1407.0, ABS.Stat Beta.   Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population data are sourced from the ABS (2014) *Estimates and Projections, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, 2001 to 2026* (cat. no. 3238.0).  There are no comparable population data for the non-Indigenous population. Population estimates of the non-Indigenous population are therefore derived by subtracting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population estimates from total population estimates. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
| Institutional environment | The ABS sources ERP data from a variety of institutional environments. Much of the data is administrative by-product data collected by other organisations for purposes other than estimating the population. Births and deaths statistics are extracted from registers administered by the various State and Territory Registrars of Births, Deaths and Marriages. Medicare Australia client address data is used to estimate interstate migration. Passenger card data and related information provided by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) is used to calculate Net Overseas Migration (NOM).  For information on the institutional environment of the ABS, including the legislative obligations of the ABS, which cover this collection, please see ABS Institutional Environment http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/4a256353001af3ed4b562bb00121564/ 10ca14cb967e5b83ca2573ae00197b65!OpenDocument | |
| Relevance | The ERP is the official measure of the population of states and territories of Australia according to a usual residence population concept. ERP is used for a range of key decisions such as resource and funding distribution and apportioning seats in the House of Representatives to each state and territory.  In preparing Indigenous population estimates, the ABS formulated assumptions on the basis of past demographic trends, in conjunction with consultation with various individuals and government department representatives at the national and state/territory level. Consultation occurred between May and July 2009, after which the assumptions were finalised. | |
| Timeliness | Preliminary ERP data is compiled and published quarterly by the ABS, and is generally made available five to six months after the end of each reference quarter. Every year, the 30 June ERP is further disaggregated by sex and single year of age, and is made available five to six months after end of the reference quarter.  Final estimates are made available every 5 years after a census and revisions are made to the previous intercensal period. ERP data are not changed once finalised. Releasing preliminary, revised and final ERP involves a balance between timeliness and accuracy.  ABS Indigenous population estimates and projections are compiled and published once in each five year period; typically three years following the most recent census. | |
| Accuracy | General population estimates (ERP):  All ERP data sources are subject to non-sampling error. Non-sampling error can arise from inaccuracies in collecting, recording and processing the data. The ABS does not have control over any non-sampling error associated with births, deaths and migration data (see institutional environment). For more information see the Demography Working Paper 1998/2 - Quarterly birth and death estimates, 1998 (cat. no. 3114.0) and Population Estimates: Concepts, Sources and Methods, 2009 (cat. no. 3228.0.55.001).  After each Census the ABS uses the Census population count to update the original series of published quarterly population estimates since the previous Census. For example, 2011 Census results were used to update quarterly population estimates between the 2006 and 2011 Census. For more information on rebasing see the feature article in the December quarter 2011 issue of Australian Demographic Statistics (cat. no. 3101.0).  Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population estimates:  The estimates of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population are based on results of the 2011 Census of Population and Housing, adjusted for net undercount as measured by the Post Enumeration Survey (PES).  The ABS conducts the PES shortly after the Census to determine how many people were missed in the Census and how many were counted more than once. For 2011, the net undercount of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population was 114 200 persons.  The extent of undercoverage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians in the 2011 Census and the relatively small sample size of the PES to adjust for that undercoverage means the estimates should be interpreted with caution. For more information see *Technical Note: Estimated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian Resident Population – Method of Calculation, Jun 2011* (cat. no. 3238.0.55.001). | |
| Coherence | General population estimates (ERP):  ERP is derived from usual residence census counts, to which is added the estimated net census undercount and Australian residents temporarily overseas at the time of the census (overseas visitors in Australia are excluded from this calculation).  An improved method for calculating Net Overseas Migration (NOM) was applied from September quarter 2006 onwards. For further information see Information Paper: Improving Net Overseas Migration Estimation, Mar 2010 (cat. no. 3412.0.55.001).  Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population estimates:  The estimates and projections presented in the source publication are not consistent with, estimates and projections based on 2006 or other Censuses. Reasons include; Census collection methodologies have changed over time; there has been unexplained growth in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population between Censuses; and the methodology and scope of the PES has changed over time. Comparison of data across issues of this publication is not advised. | |
| Accessibility | ERP and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population estimates are available in a variety of formats on the ABS website under the 3101.0, 3201.0 and 3238.0 product families and include time series spread sheets on population change, components of change. If the information is not available as a standard product, then ABS Consultancy Services can help with customised services. The National Information and Referral Service at the ABS can be contacted with inquiries about specific data requirements on 1300 135 070 or email client.services@abs.gov.au | |
| Interpretability | ERP is generally easy to interpret as the official measure of Australia's population (by state and territory) on a place of usual residence basis. However, there are still some common misconceptions. For example, a population estimate uses the term 'estimate' in a different sense than is commonly used. Generally the word estimate is used to describe a guess, or approximation. Demographers mean that they apply the demographic balancing equation by adding births, subtracting deaths and adding the net of overseas and interstate migration. Each of the components of ERP is subject to error, but ERP itself is not in any way a guess. It is what the population would be if the components are measured well.  The source publications contain notes on the assumptions and methods used to produce the population estimates. It also contains Explanatory Notes and Glossary that provide information on the data sources, terminology, classifications and other technical aspects associated with these statistics. | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | .. |

## Performance indicators

### VET participation by target group

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Output/equity |
| Indicator | VET participation by target group |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The number of government funded participants in the VET system who self‑identified that they are from a target group (i.e., Indigenous people, people from remote and very remote areas, people with disability, and people speaking a language other than English [LOTE] at home), as a proportion of the total number of people in the population in that group.  Due to certain data not being available to calculate rates for people with disability and people speaking a LOTE at home, proportions of government funded VET students are reported as proxy for these two groups.  *For Indigenous people and people from remote and very remote areas:*  Numerator/s  Government funded VET students who have self-identified on their VET enrolment form that they are from at least one of the target groups below:   * (a) Indigenous persons aged 15‑64 years * (b) from remote and very remote areas   Denominator/s  The number of persons in the Australian population from each of the target groups below:   * (a1) Indigenous persons aged 15‑64 years * (b1) from remote and very remote areas   Computation/s:  Numerator a divided by denominator a1, and separately, numerator b divided by denominator b1 (above).  Participation rates are also derived for comparative purposes for all government funded students and non-Indigenous government funded students.  *For people with disability and people speaking a LOTE at home:*  Numerator/s  Government funded VET students who have self-identified on their VET enrolment form that they are from at least one of the target groups below:  (c) with a disability  (d) speak a LOTE at home.  Denominator/s  (e) government funded VET students.  Computation/s:  Numerator c divided by the denominator e, and separately, numerator d divided by denominator e (above). |
| Data source/s | VET student data:  All student data are unpublished and are sourced from the *NCVER National VET Provider data collection*.  Population estimates:  All population data are sourced from the ABS estimates of the Estimated Resident Population and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET student data: NCVER National VET Provider data collection * Population estimates: Estimated Resident Population and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population. |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Care needs to be taken in interpreting the participation rates presented for people with disability, people speaking a LOTE at home, and Indigenous people, because the data depend on self-identification at the time of enrolment and the number of non-responses (that is, students who did not indicate whether or not they belong to these groups) varies across jurisdictions. * A VET student may be enrolled in more than one VET training program, and therefore there are more ‘course enrolments’ in the VET system than ‘students’. This distinction between student numbers and the number of course enrolments may be of importance if comparing VET data in this chapter with other VET data. |

### Student participation in VET

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Output/effectiveness. |
| Indicator | Student participation in VET |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The indicator is defined by three measures:   * the number of people aged 15–64 years participating in VET as a proportion of the population aged 15–64 years * the number of people aged 15–64 years participating in VET at certificate level III and above as a proportion of the population aged 15–64 years * the number of people aged 15–64 years participating in VET at diploma level and above as a proportion of the population aged 15–64 years.   Numerator/s  Government funded VET students who have self-identified on their VET enrolment form that they were aged 15‑64 years. A separate numerator applies as follows, for each of the three measures:   * enrolled in VET at any qualification level * enrolled at certificate level III and above * enrolled at diploma level and above.   Denominator/s  The number of persons in the Australian population aged 15‑64 years.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above), calculated separately for each of the three measures.  Comparative rates are also calculated by Indigenous status, for which Indigenous status is based on self‑identification by students on their VET enrolment form. |
| Data source/s | VET student data:  All student data are unpublished and are sourced from the *NCVER National VET Provider data collection*.  Population estimates:  All population data are sourced from the ABS estimates of the Estimated Resident Population and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET student data: NCVER National VET Provider data collection * Population estimates: Estimated Resident Population and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population. |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * A VET student may be enrolled in more than one VET training program, and therefore there are more ‘course enrolments’ in the VET system than ‘students’. This distinction between student numbers and the number of course enrolments may be of importance if comparing VET data in this chapter with other VET data. |

### VET student completions and qualifications

#### Qualifications completed, and annual change in qualifications completed

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Output/effectiveness. | |
| Indicator | VET student completions and qualifications | |
| Measure (computation) | This DQI material covers the measure ‘qualifications completed’ and the relevant component (underlined as follows) of the related measure ⎯ ‘annual change in qualifications completed, units of competency completed and modules completed, and annual change in Qualification equivalents.’  Definition  Qualifications completed is defined as the number of qualifications achieved/passed each year by both government funded and non-government funded VET students, where a qualification is a certification to a person on successful completion of a course in recognition of having achieved particular knowledge, skills or competencies.  Annual change in qualifications completed is defined as the percentage change of qualifications achieved/passed from year to year.  Computation/s:  A count of the number of qualifications/courses completed, submitted in the *Qualifications completed* *file* of the VET provider collection by registered training providers.  Annual change in qualifications completed is the percentage change in the number of qualifications completed from one year to the subsequent year, where the number for the prior year is the numerator and number for the subsequent year is the denominator.  Comparative data are also reported for VET target groups (residents of remote and very remote areas, people with disability, people speaking a language other than English at home and by Indigenous status), where classification by these target groups is based on self‑identification by students on their VET enrolment form. | |
| Data source/s | All data are unpublished and are derived from the NCVER National VET Provider data collection | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Qualifications completed: NCVER National VET provider data collection | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * A small proportion of ‘Qualifications Completed’ data are not reported as they are submitted by state and territories more than two years after the completion year. At the national level, it is estimated that 1.2 per cent of the data are not reported in the time frame. * Data on qualifications completed includes both government and  non-government funded VET students attending TAFE, and only government funded students from private providers. This differs to other completions data reported in the VET chapter, which are reported for government-funded students only (in keeping with the scope of the VET chapter focusing on government-funded activity). This is due to a limitation of the data that does not enable correct disaggregation of completions by funding source. * It should be noted that not all students intend to complete an entire qualification but rather only wish to complete specific modules or units of competency. The reporting of these students varies across states and territories. In some jurisdictions, students wishing to only complete a specific component of a qualification are required to formally enrol in that qualification for data collection purposes, whereas in other jurisdictions they are not. For this reason, caution should be taken when interpreting qualification completion rates across states and territories. |

#### Units of competency and modules completed, and annual change in units of competency and modules completed

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Output/effectiveness. |
| Indicator | VET student completions and qualifications |
| Measure (computation) | This DQI material covers the measure ‘units of competency completed’ and the relevant component (underlined as follows) of the related measure ⎯ ‘annual change in qualifications completed, units of competency completed and modules completed, and annual change in Qualification equivalents.’  Units of competency and modules are calculated separately and then added together for this measure. Both units of competency and modules completed are included in the Report, as well as the combined figure.  Definition  Units of competency completed is defined as the number of units of competency successfully achieved/passed each year by government funded VET students, where a unit of competency is defined as a component of a competency standard and/or a statement of a key function or role in a particular job or occupation, endorsed within a national training package.  A unit of competency is the smallest component of a VET program that can be assessed and recognised in the VET system for collection purposes.  Annual change in units of competency completed is defined as the percentage change of units of competency achieved/passed from year to year.  Modules completed is defined as the number of modules (outside training packages) successfully achieved/passed each year by government funded VET students, where a module (also called a subject) is a unit of education or training which can be completed on its own or as part of a course. Modules may also result in the attainment of one or more units of competency.  A module is a unit of training in which a student can enrol and be assessed.  Annual change in modules completed is defined as the percentage change of modules achieved/passed from year to year.  Computation/s:  Units of competencies completed is the total count of records with a flag of ‘C’ for the *unit of competency file* which are indicated as successfully completed and submitted for the VET Provider data collection by registered training providers.  Annual change in units of competency completed is the percentage change in the number of units of competency completed from one year to the subsequent year, where the number for the prior year is the numerator and number for the subsequent year is the denominator.  Modules completed is the total count of records with a flag of ‘M’ for the *unit of competency file* which are indicated as successfully completed and submitted for the VET Provider data collection by registered training providers.  Annual change in modules completed is the percentage change in the number of modules completed from one year to the subsequent year, where the number for the prior year is the numerator and number for the subsequent year is the denominator.  Comparative data are also reported for VET target groups (residents of remote and very remote areas, people with disability, people speaking a language other than English at home and by Indigenous status), where classification by these target groups is based on self‑identification by students on their VET enrolment form. |
| Data source/s | All student data are unpublished and are sourced from NCVER National VET provider data collection. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Qualifications completed: NCVER National VET provider data collection |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Units of competency completed is not directly comparable, as the mix of units is not necessarily comparable across jurisdictions or across years. * Modules completed is not directly comparable, as the mix of modules is not necessarily comparable across jurisdictions or across years. * Units of competency and modules completed (in combination) are also not directly comparable. |

#### Qualification Equivalents, and annual change in Qualification Equivalents

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Output/effectiveness. | |
| Indicator | VET student completions and qualifications | |
| Measure (computation) | This DQI material covers the measure ‘Qualification Equivalents’ and the relevant component (underlined as follows) of the related measure ⎯ ‘annual change in qualifications completed, units of competency completed and modules completed, and annual change in Qualification equivalents.’  *For Qualification Equivalents:*  Definition  Expresses skill outputs in terms of equivalent qualifications within each AQF level and Field of Education. Qualification Equivalents are based on the training activity (annual hours) associated with successful completions of modules and units of competency by government funded VET students, divided by an agreed value of training activity representing a qualification.  Numerator/s  The annual hours associated with successfully completed modules and units of competency.  Denominator/s  An agreed (nominal) value of training activity representing a qualification (where the value is the median number of hours that are required to successfully complete a qualification in that AQF level and Field of Education).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above), calculated separately for activity at all qualification levels, at certificate I or II, at certificate III or IV, and at diploma level and above.  *For annual change in Qualification Equivalents:*  Computation/s:  Annual change in Qualification Equivalents is the percentage change in Qualification Equivalents from one year to the subsequent year calculated separately for activity at certificate III or IV and at diploma level and above, where the number for the prior year is the numerator and number for the subsequent year is the denominator.  Comparative data are also reported by Indigenous status, where Indigenous status is based on self‑identification by students on their VET enrolment form. | |
| Data source/s | All student data are unpublished and are sourced from NCVER National VET provider data collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |  |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Qualifications completed: NCVER National VET provider data collection | |

### Government recurrent expenditure per annual hour

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Output/efficiency. | |
| Indicator | Government recurrent expenditure per annual hour | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  Government recurrent expenditure divided by government funded annual hours.  Numerator/s  Government recurrent expenditure is calculated by adding the following AVETMISS financial statements revenue items for the government recurrent payments received by states and territories: Commonwealth National Agreement revenue, State recurrent revenue, Commonwealth Administered Programs revenue and revenue for VET expenses and liabilities of State/Territory training departments undertaken by another department or agency but required to be reported in the financial accounts of the training department. The reported government recurrent expenditure excludes capital expenditure.  Denominator/s  The total hours of delivery based on the standard nominal hour value for each subject undertaken. These represent the hours of supervised training under a traditional delivery strategy. Annual hours are adjusted to account for invalid module enrolments.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above). Measure is adjusted for course mix differences across jurisdictions. | |
| Data source/s | All data are unpublished and are derived from the NCVER National VET financial data collection and the NCVER National VET Provider data collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET financial data: NCVER National VET financial data collection . * Hours of delivery: NCVER National VET Provider data collection | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Government recurrent expenditure per annual hour needs to be interpreted carefully because low or decreasing unit costs do not necessarily reflect a lessening of quality. The factors that have the greatest impact on efficiency include: * training related factors, such as class sizes, teaching salaries, teaching hours per full time equivalent staff member and differences in the length of training programs * differences across jurisdictions, including socio-demographic composition, administrative scale, and dispersion and scale of service delivery * VET policies and practices, including the level of fees and charges paid by students. |

### Government recurrent expenditure per load pass

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Output/efficiency. |
| Indicator | Government recurrent expenditure per load pass |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  Government recurrent expenditure divided by hours of publicly funded load pass.  Numerator/s  Government recurrent expenditure is calculated by adding the following AVETMISS financial statements revenue items for the government recurrent payments received by states and territories: Commonwealth National Agreement revenue, State recurrent revenue, Commonwealth Administered Programs revenue and revenue for VET expenses and liabilities of State/Territory training departments undertaken by another department or agency but required to be reported in the financial accounts of the training department. The reported government recurrent expenditure excludes capital expenditure.  Denominator/s  Load pass is based on assessable enrolments of modules and units of competency achieved/passed and RPL, and does not include non-assessable enrolments.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above). |
| Data source/s | All data are unpublished and are derived from the NCVER National VET financial data collection and the NCVER National VET Provider data collection |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET financial data: NCVER National VET financial data collection . * Load pass: NCVER National VET Provider data collection |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Low unit costs can indicate efficient delivery of VET services per successfully completed load pass. * The factors that have the greatest impact on efficiency include: * training related factors, such as class sizes, teaching salaries, teaching hours per full time equivalent staff member, and differences in the length of training programs * differences across jurisdictions, including socio-demographic composition, administrative scale, and dispersion and scale of service delivery * VET policies and practices, including the level of fees and charges paid by students. |

### User cost of capital per annual hour

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Output/efficiency. |
| Indicator | User cost of capital per annual hour |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The user cost of capital divided by government funded annual hours.  Numerator/s  User cost of capital is 8 per cent of the value of total physical non-current assets.  Denominator/s  Annual hours are the total hours of delivery based on the standard nominal hour value for each subject undertaken. These represent the hours of supervised training under a traditional delivery strategy. Annual hours are adjusted to account for invalid module enrolments.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above). Measure is adjusted for course mix differences across jurisdictions. |
| Data source/s | All data are unpublished and are derived from the NCVER National VET financial data collection and the NCVER National VET Provider data collection |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET financial data: NCVER National VET financial data collection . * Hours of delivery: NCVER National VET Provider data collection |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes that user cost of capital per annual hour needs to be interpreted carefully because low unit costs may not necessarily reflect a lessening of quality. Differences in some input costs (for example, land values) can affect reported costs across jurisdictions without necessarily reflecting the efficiency of service delivery. The user cost of capital for land is presented separately from the cost of other assets, to allow users assessing the results to consider any differences in land values across jurisdictions. The Steering Committee has adopted a nominal user cost of capital rate of 8 per cent, although the actual rate may vary across jurisdictions. The basis for the 8 per cent capital charge is discussed in chapter 2. |

### User cost of capital per load pass

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Output/efficiency. |
| Indicator | User cost of capital per load pass |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  User cost of capital divided by hours of publicly funded load pass.  Numerator/s  User cost of capital is 8 per cent of the value of total physical non-current assets.  Denominator/s  Load pass is based on assessable enrolments of modules and units of competency achieved/passed and RPL, and does not include non-assessable enrolments.  Computation/s  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above). |
| Data source/s | All data are unpublished and are derived from the NCVER National VET financial data collection and the NCVER National VET Provider data collection |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET financial data: NCVER National VET financial data collection . * Load pass: NCVER National VET Provider data collection |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes that user cost of capital per load pass needs to be interpreted carefully because low unit costs may not necessarily reflect a lessening of quality. Differences in some input costs (for example, land values) can affect reported costs across jurisdictions without necessarily reflecting the efficiency of service delivery. The user cost of capital for land is presented separately from the cost of other assets, to allow users assessing the results to consider any differences in land values across jurisdictions. The Steering Committee has adopted a nominal user cost of capital rate of 8 per cent, although the actual rate may vary across jurisdictions. The basis for the 8 per  cent capital charge is discussed in chapter 2. |

### Student employment and further study outcomes

#### Proportion of graduates who were employed and/or continued on to further study after completing their course

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Outcomes. |
| Indicator | Student employment and further study outcomes |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The proportion of graduates who were employed and/or continued on to further study after completing their course.  Numerator/s  Number of graduates who were employed and/or enrolled in further study on the last Friday in May of the nominated year, and who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year.  Denominator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year (less those with the numerator variable not stated).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above).  ‘Graduate’ is defined as a past student who was awarded a qualification from a VET provider in Australia. |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), which is an annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. This survey is conducted by NCVER.  The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Student outcomes: Student Outcomes Survey. |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Annual data are available from the Student Outcomes Survey. The most recent available data are for 2014 (outcomes of students in 2014 who completed qualifications in 2013). * The response rate to this survey was 38.2 per cent in 2014. NCVER analysis found that the non-response was not likely to have affected the quality of the results. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the national level, but some data disaggregated by Indigenous status by State and Territory have relative standard errors greater than 25 per cent and should be used with caution. * Percentages in tables are rounded and may not sum to 100. * The size of the RSEs affects the ability to identify small year to year movements in some disaggregated measures for this indicator for some jurisdictions. |

#### Proportion of graduates employed after completing their course who were unemployed before the course

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Outcomes | |
| Indicator | Student employment and further study outcomes | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The proportion of graduates employed after completing their course who were unemployed before the course.  Numerator/s  Number of graduates employed on the last Friday in May of the nominated year who were unemployed prior to commencing their training, and who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year.  Denominator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year, who were unemployed prior to commencing their training.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above).  ‘Graduate’ is defined as a past student who was awarded a qualification from a VET provider in Australia. | |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), which is an annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. This survey is conducted by NCVER.  The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Student outcomes: Student Outcomes Survey. | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |  |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Annual data are available from the Student Outcomes Survey. The most recent available data are for 2014 (outcomes of students in 2014 who completed qualifications in 2013). * The response rate to this survey was 38.2 per cent in 2014. NCVER analysis found that the non-response was not likely to have affected the quality of the results. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the national level, but some data disaggregated by Indigenous status by State and Territory have relative standard errors greater than 25 per cent and should be used with caution. * Percentages in tables are rounded and may not sum to 100. * The size of the RSEs affects the ability to identify small year to year movements in some disaggregated measures for this indicator for some jurisdictions. | |

#### Proportion of graduates who improved their employment circumstances after completing their course

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Outcomes. |
| Indicator | Student employment and further study outcomes |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The proportion of graduates who improved their employment circumstances after completing their course.  Numerator/s  Number of VET graduates with an improved employment status after training.  Denominator/s  The number of VET graduates (less those with all three numerator variables not stated).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above).  ‘Graduate’ is defined as a past student who was awarded a qualification from a VET provider in Australia. This excludes those students who left their training before completing a qualification.  Data are included by Indigenous status and remoteness.  ‘Improved employment status’ is defined as any one of the following:   * employment status changing from not employed before training (both unemployed and not in labour force) to employed after training (both full time and part time employed) * employed at a higher skill level (based on ANZSCO) after training (regardless of full time or part time employment status before and after training) * received one of the following job related benefits: set up or expanded their own business, got a promotion, increased earnings, or other job-related benefits after completing their training. |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), which is an annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. This survey is conducted by NCVER.  The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Student outcomes: Student Outcomes Survey. |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Annual data are available from the *Student Outcomes Survey*. The most recent available data are for 2014 (outcomes of students in 2014 who completed qualifications in 2013). * The response rate to this survey was 41.9 per cent in 2012. NCVER analysis found that the non-response was not likely to have affected the quality of the results. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the national level, but some data disaggregated by Indigenous status by State and Territory have relative standard errors greater than 25 per cent and should be used with caution. * Percentages in tables are rounded and may not sum to 100. * The size of the RSEs affects the ability to identify small year to year movements in some disaggregated measures for this indicator for some jurisdictions. |

#### Proportion of graduates who undertook their course for employment-related reasons and were employed after completing their course, who reported at least one job-related benefit from completing the course

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Outcomes. | |
| Indicator | Student employment and further study outcomes | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The proportion of graduates who undertook their course for employment-related reasons and were employed after completing their course, who reported at least one work-related benefit from completing the course.  Numerator/s  Number of persons who:   * (a) completed training during the year prior to the nominated year, and * (b) undertook that training for employment-related reasons, and * (c) were employed on the last Friday in May of the nominated year, and * (d) reported as having received one of the following job related benefits: set up or expanded their own business, got a promotion, increased their earnings, or other job-related benefit after completing their training.   Denominator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year (less those with the numerator variable not stated).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above).  ‘Graduate’ is defined as a past student who was awarded a qualification from a VET provider in Australia. | |
| **Data source/s** | All data are derived from the *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), which is an annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. This survey is conducted by NCVER.  The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Student outcomes: Student Outcomes Survey. | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Annual data are available from the Student Outcomes Survey. The most recent available data are for 2014 (outcomes of students in 2014 who completed qualifications in 2013). * The response rate to this survey was 38.2 per cent in 2014. NCVER analysis found that the non-response was not likely to have affected the quality of the results. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the national level, but some data disaggregated by Indigenous status by State and Territory have relative standard errors greater than 25 per cent and should be used with caution. * Percentages in tables are rounded and may not sum to 100. * The size of the RSEs affects the ability to identify small year to year movements in some disaggregated measures for this indicator for some jurisdictions. |

### Student achievement in VET

#### Load pass rate

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | | Outcomes. |
| Indicator | | Student achievement in VET |
| Measure (computation) | | Definition  The ratio of hours attributed to students who gained competencies/passed assessment in an assessable module or unit of competency to all hours of students who were assessed and either passed, failed or withdrew.  Numerator/s  Government funded recurrent hours attributed to students who gained competencies/passed assessment in an assessable module or unit of competency  Denominator/s  All Government funded recurrent hours of students who were assessed and either passed, failed or withdrew.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above), calculated separately for all VET students and VET target groups:   * students with disability * students speaking a language other than English at home * students from remote and very remote areas * Indigenous students   Achievement by VET target groups can also indicate the equity of outcomes for these groups. |
| Data source/s | | All data are unpublished and are derived from NCVER National VET Provider data collection. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET student data: NCVER National VET Provider data collection | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Load pass rate is a measure of students’ success, which has an impact on a student’s attainment of skills. High ‘load pass rates’ and ‘number of students who commenced and completed’ indicate that student achievement is high, which is desirable. The rates for target groups, relative to those for the general student population, indicate whether students from target groups are as successful as other students. * Care needs to be taken in comparing data across jurisdictions because average module durations vary across jurisdictions. |

#### Proportion of VET graduates with improved education/training status after training

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Outcomes. |
| Indicator | Student achievement in VET |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The number of VET qualifications completed by students who have completed a course at a higher education level than their previous highest education level achieved (based on AQF), as a proportion of the number of VET course enrolments.  Numerator/s  The number of VET AQF qualification completions by students who have completed a course at a higher education level than their previous highest education level  Denominator/s  The number of VET AQF course enrolments.  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above), calculated separately for all VET students and:   * students aged 20-64 years * students by Indigenous status * students by remoteness (based on students’ home postcode). * The hierarchy for highest level of education is as follows: * Advanced diploma or above * Diploma * Certificate IV * Certificate III * Certificate II/Year 12 * Certificate I * Year 11 * Year 10 * Year 9 or below * Miscellaneous education * Did not go to school   ‘Not stated’ responses have been excluded from the computation. |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the National VET Provider Collection. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET student data: NCVER National VET provider data collection |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Using enrolments as the denominator allows this indicator to assess the overall performance of the VET system, as it includes those people who started training but did not complete (and therefore did not improve their educational status). * A VET student may be enrolled in more than one VET training program, and therefore there are more ‘course enrolments’ in the VET system than ‘students’. This distinction between student numbers and the number of course enrolments may be of importance if comparing VET data in this chapter with other VET data. * Qualification completions data include both government and non-government funded VET students attending TAFE, and only government funded students from private providers. This differs to other completions data reported in the VET chapter (i.e. completed modules and units of competency), which are reported for government-funded students only (in keeping with the scope of the VET chapter focusing on government-funded activity). This is due to a limitation of the data that does not enable correct disaggregation of completions by funding source. |

#### Number of students who commenced and completed

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | Outcomes. | |
| Indicator | Student achievement in VET | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition   * 1. The number of VET students in a given year who commenced a course and eventually completed their course, expressed as an estimated proportion of all course commencing enrolments in that year   2. Estimated subject pass rates for students commencing in a particular year   Numerator/s   * 1. The number of VET AQF qualification completions by students who have commenced a course in a particular year   2. The number of hours, or full-year training equivalents (FYTEs), attributed to students who gain competencies/passed assessment in an assessable module or unit of competency by students who have commenced a course in a particular year   Denominator/s   * 1. The number of VET AQF course commencements in a given year   2. The number of hours, or full-year training equivalents (FYTEs), attributed to all students who were assessed and either passed, failed or withdrew. by students who have commenced a course in a particular year   Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above), calculated separately for (a) and (b) above, using an estimation process. | |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the National VET Provider Collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * VET student data: NCVER National VET provider data collection | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |  |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Estimated qualification completion rates need to be interpreted with caution due to data collection and methodological issues in tracking students and the qualifications they enrol in across different years of the National VET Provider Collection. Information on the matching variables (i.e. date of birth, sex, encrypted name identifier) may be missing or inaccurate in one or more years. The qualification record identifier may also in some rare cases change between enrolment and completion where a particular training package qualification has been superseded. * It should be noted that not all students intend to complete an entire qualification but rather only wish to complete specific modules or units of competency. The reporting of these students varies across states and territories. In some jurisdictions, students wishing to only complete a specific component of a qualification are required to formally enrol in that qualification for data collection purposes, whereas in other jurisdictions they are not. For this reason, caution should be taken when interpreting qualification completion rates across states and territories. | |

### Student satisfaction with VET

#### Proportion of students who achieve their main reason for doing a VET course

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |  |
| Element | Outcomes. | |
| Indicator | Student satisfaction with VET | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The proportion of students who achieve their main reason for doing a VET course.  Numerator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year, and who reported that the training either helped or partially helped them achieve their main reason for undertaking that training.  Denominator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year (less those with the numerator variable not stated).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above).  ‘Graduate’ is defined as a past student who was awarded a qualification from a VET provider in Australia. | |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), which is an annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. This survey is conducted by NCVER.  The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Student outcomes: Student Outcomes Survey. | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Annual data are available from the *Student Outcomes Survey*. The most recent available data are for 2014 (outcomes of students in 2014 who completed qualifications in 2013). * The response rate to this survey was 38.2 per cent in 2014. NCVER analysis found that the non-response was not likely to have affected the quality of the results. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the national level, but some data disaggregated by Indigenous status by State and Territory have relative standard errors greater than 25 per cent and should be used with caution. * Percentages in tables are rounded and may not sum to 100. * The size of the RSEs affects the ability to identify small year to year movements in some disaggregated measures for this indicator for some jurisdictions. | |

#### Proportion of students who were satisfied with the quality of their completed VET course

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |  | | |
| Element | Outcomes. | | | | |
| Indicator | Student satisfaction with VET | | | | |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  The proportion of students who were satisfied with the quality of their completed VET course.  Numerator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year, and who reported that they were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with their training program.  Denominator/s  Number of graduates who completed their training during the year prior to the nominated year (less those with the numerator variable not stated).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above).  ‘Graduate’ is defined as a past student who was awarded a qualification from a VET provider in Australia. | | | | |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the *Student Outcomes Survey* (SOS), which is an annual survey of students who successfully complete VET in Australia. This survey is conducted by NCVER.  The sample for the survey is drawn from the National VET Provider Collection. | | | | |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | | | |  |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Student outcomes: Student Outcomes Survey. | | | | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | | |  | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Annual data are available from the *Student Outcomes Survey*. The most recent available data are for 2014 (outcomes of students in 2014 who completed qualifications in 2013). * The response rate to this survey was 38.2 per cent in 2014. NCVER analysis found that the non-response was not likely to have affected the quality of the results. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the national level, but some data disaggregated by Indigenous status by State and Territory have relative standard errors greater than 25 per cent and should be used with caution. * Percentages in tables are rounded and may not sum to 100. * The size of the RSEs affects the ability to identify small year to year movements in some disaggregated measures for this indicator for some jurisdictions. | | | |

### Employer engagement with VET

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | | |
| Element | | Outcomes. |
| Indicator | | Employer engagement with VET |
| Measure (computation) | | Definition  Employer engagement with VET.  Numerator/s  Number of employers who in the 12 months preceding the interview:   * 1. had employees undertaking apprenticeships/traineeships, or   2. arranged or provided nationally recognised training (other than apprenticeships /traineeships) for employees, or   3. had employees with formal vocational qualifications as a requirement of their job.   Denominator/s  Number of employers (less those with the numerator variable not stated).  Computation/s:  Numerator (above) divided by denominator (above), calculated separately for each of the three categories of employer stated for the numerator.  An ‘employer’ is defined as an organisation in Australia with at least one employee (in the 12 months preceding the interview). An ‘employee’ is defined as ‘a person working in, or operating from, this organisation including full-time, part-time and casual employees’. |
| Data source/s | | All data are derived from the *Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System* (SEUV), which is a biennial survey. This survey collects information about employers' use and views of the VET system and the various ways employers use the VET system to meet their skill needs. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Employer engagement: Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System | |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Biennial data are available from the Survey of Employer Use and Views (SEUV). The most recent data are for 2015. Data from 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013 are available in this report. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the State and Territory level. * Detailed explanatory notes are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Additional data from the data source are available on-line, and on request. * In 2013, improvements were made to the weighting methodology applied to responses to the Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET system (see Employer's use and views of the VET system, 2013: improved weighting methodology <http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/2675.html>). Results for the 2013 and 2015 surveys are obtained using this improved methodology, which has been applied to data from previous years to maintain the time series. For the latest data, including updated time series, please visit the NCVER website, www.ncver.edu.au>. |

### Employer satisfaction with VET

Data quality information for this indicator has been drafted by the NCVER and the Secretariat, in consultation with the VET Working Group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator definition and description | |
| Element | Outcomes. |
| Indicator | Employer satisfaction with VET |
| Measure (computation) | Definition  Employer satisfaction with the VET system.  Numerator  Employers who reported as being satisfied or very satisfied with the VET system in meeting their skill needs.  Denominator  Number of employers engaged with the VET system (less those with the numerator variable not stated)  Computation/s:  The measure is calculated separately for the number of employers who in the 12 months preceding the interview:   * had employees undertaking apprenticeships/traineeships, or * arranged or provided nationally recognised training (other than apprenticeships /traineeships) for employees, or * had employees with formal vocational qualifications as a requirement of their job.   An ‘employer’ is defined as an organisation in Australia with at least one employee (in the 12 months preceding the interview). An ‘employee’ is defined as ‘a person working in, or operating from, this organisation including full-time, part-time and casual employees’. |
| Data source/s | All data are derived from the *Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System* (SEUV), which is a biennial survey. This survey collects information about employers' use and views of the VET system and the various ways employers use the VET system to meet their skill needs. |
| Data Quality Framework Dimensions | |
|  | For a summary of data quality information against the data quality framework dimensions — Institutional environment, Relevance, Timeliness, Accuracy, Coherence, Accessibility, and Interpretability — please see the related Data collection DQI for:   * Employer engagement: Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET System |
| Data Gaps/Issues Analysis | |
| Key data gaps/ issues | The Steering Committee notes the following key data gaps/issues:   * Biennial data are available from the Survey of Employer Use and Views (SEUV). The most recent data are for 2015. Data from 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2013 are available in this report. * Data are of acceptable accuracy at the State and Territory level. * Detailed explanatory notes are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Additional data from the data source are available on-line, and on request. * In 2013, improvements were made to the weighting methodology applied to responses to the Survey of Employer Use and Views of the VET system (see Employer's use and views of the VET system, 2013: improved weighting methodology <http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/2675.html>). Results for the 2013 and 2015 surveys are obtained using this improved methodology, which has been applied to data from previous years to maintain the time series. For the latest data, including updated time series, please visit the NCVER website, www.ncver.edu.au>. |