



# final report

Project code: A.MIN.0076  
Prepared by: Clive Richardson  
MINTRAC  
Date submitted: June 2009

PUBLISHED BY  
Meat & Livestock Australia Limited  
Locked Bag 991  
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

## **Validity of the competency assessments undertaken in the Australian Meat Industry**

Meat & Livestock Australia acknowledges the matching funds provided by the Australian Government and contributions from the Australian Meat Processor Corporation to support the research and development detailed in this publication.

This publication is published by Meat & Livestock Australia Limited ABN 39 081 678 364 (MLA). Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However MLA cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in the publication. You should make your own enquiries before making decisions concerning your interests. Reproduction in whole or in part of this publication is prohibited without prior written consent of MLA.

---

## Executive summary

The red meat processing industry has over the last fifteen years invested many millions of dollars into the development of one of the world's most sophisticated meat industry training and assessment programs. This has been a timely investment since industry today is required to provide evidence to customers and regulators that its personnel are not only trained but also assessed as competent. Therefore it has been important for MINTRAC to revisit the effectiveness of the assessment process that the industry relies on to establish worker competency.

The purpose of this research project was to evaluate the effectiveness of the red meat industry's competency assessment process as determined by the responses of the major stakeholders in the evaluation process. The major stakeholders identified were company training and QA managers, the Registered Training Organisations and the trainees themselves.

MINTRAC used electronic and hard copy survey forms to gather data from

- Training and QA managers from 55 of the largest export and domestic processing companies
- 25 largest Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) delivering to the meat processing sector
- 200 trainees from around Australia.

The survey sought to utilise five measures of the validity of the meat industry's competency assessment process. These measures were

- acceptance by training regulators of the assessment system
- acceptance by the RTOs delivering in the industry
- the uptake of the assessment system by industry
- level of employer and employee confidence in the system
- the extent to which assessment tools are customised to site and species to ensure total relevance.

The results of the survey demonstrated that there was a high rate of both uptake and confidence in the assessment process. The State Training Authorities have accepted both the assessment tools and the process in countless RTO audits around Australia. All twenty-two of the RTOs who responded to the survey used the industry-developed national assessment tools. These tools have been customised in more than 90% of plants and are reviewed frequently.

Industry uptake of the accredited training and assessment system was also encouraging with 90% of the companies reporting that their employees were enrolled in at least the *Certificate II in Meat Processing (Abattoirs)* and using the national assessment tools and processes. However the situation is somewhat different with inhouse and non-accredited training where assessment processes are not regulated by the State Training Authorities. In this situation while 70% of QA managers reported they used the same assessment process only 55% of all employers used the same assessment materials. This inconsistency between accredited and non-accredited assessment suggests that there may be a weakness in the industry's overall approach to assessing competency. This difference in the assessment process and tools may create both doubt and confusion in the minds of auditors and reviewers. The various categories of respondents had slightly different levels of confidence in the assessment process and tools. The average levels of confidence for group are detailed below where 1 is a low level of confidence and 10 the highest level of confidence.

- Employer RTOs rated the tools and process at 8.75
- Private and TAFE RTOs rated the tools and process at 8.9.
- Trainees rated the assessment process at 8.37
- QA Managers had an average level of confidence at 7.8
- Company and HR training managers rated the process and tools at 8.6.

The survey also addressed the issue of the currency of competency assessments. The currency of personnel competency has been the focus of interest for an increasing number of the industry's customers. Forty five percent of the respondents to the survey indicated that they were involved in some reassessment process to prove the currency of their workers competency. These companies were using a range of assessment tools to gather the evidence of currency required by their customers. Only four of the 22 RTOs were involved in these reassessment activities. When asked to indicate how long assessments should remain current the majority of respondents suggested currency should last in excess of 5 years. Furthermore over 30% suggested that if the skill set was being used consistently then currency should be acknowledged indefinitely unless a problem arose. The analogy with a drivers licence was used on a number of occasions.

### ***Recommendations***

Overall the survey is an endorsement of the time and investment the industry has put into the creation of a national system for competency assessment in the meat industry. The levels of acceptance, uptake and confidence in the process and tools are very high. However the analysis of the survey data does indicate that some areas of the assessment system could benefit from review and improvement. The survey suggests that work still needs to be undertaken on the link between the training and QA functions in some abattoirs in order to increase the QA managers' confidence in the assessment process and tools. In the first instance MINTRAC should utilise the QA managers' network meetings to identify the causes for the lower levels of confidence in the assessment process. Then the these factors can be addressed through professional development sessions for both QA and training personnel in how to fine tune the assessment process so it better serves the operations of both departments.

In a similar way MINTRAC will take RTO and industry's advice on how assessment tool formatting can be improved so as to minimise duplication and facilitate the use of the assessment tools for both accredited and non accredited assessment.

## Contents

	Page
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Aims of this Project.....5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology.....6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Assessing competency in the meat processing industry.....7</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Survey results and analysis .....7</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Acceptance by training regulators of the assessment system..... 7</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Acceptance by the RTOs delivering in the industry..... 7</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>The uptake of the MINTRAC assessment system by industry ..... 8</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>The level of employer and employee confidence in the assessment system..... 9</b>
<b>5.5</b>	<b>The extent to which assessment tools are customised to site and species to ensure total relevance..... 11</b>
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Currency of assessment..... 11</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Recommendations.....12</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion .....14</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Attachment - Survey Forms.....15</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms ..... 15</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms ..... 18</b>
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms ..... 20</b>
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Meat Processing Industry Assessment Practices..... 23</b>
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms ..... 26</b>

## 1 Introduction

### ***Why are valid training and assessment processes important?***

The integrity of the training and assessment processes used in the meat industry are important because the industry often relies on these systems to defend market access. The industry also relies on the assessed competency of its personnel to demonstrate compliance with Australian regulatory requirements and avoid additional and onerous requirements that may be imposed by importing countries in the areas of hygiene and sanitation, QA and meat inspection.

Additionally individual companies use evidence of the delivery and assessment of accredited training to satisfy the requirements of specific customers. Overseas, particularly in the European Union, there is a growing trend to mandate training and accreditation for key tasks e.g. animal welfare assessment, stunning, sticking and shackling. Australia has a widely implemented standardised training and assessment program for meat processing workers. This system can be used to demonstrate equivalence with overseas standards and therefore Australia should be able to avoid having to adopt bureaucratic licensing arrangements.

### ***Why assess the validity of assessment processes?***

Since 1992, the Australian meat industry has devoted substantial funds towards the development of standardised training and assessment materials as well as assessment moderation programs. However to date no industry-wide evaluation has been undertaken to establish

- the uptake of standardised assessment processes
- the validity of the assessment that occurs within the sector.

This type of evaluation is important to the industry in order to gain an understanding of the reliability of industry competency assessment processes.

### ***What makes an industry competency assessment system valid?***

The meat processing sector has developed a standardised set of assessment tools for all the Units of Competency in the *Australian Meat Industry Training Package*. In addition MINTRAC has run professional development and assessment moderation workshops which have been attended by 90% of the Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) providing training and assessment services to the industry.

RTOs have also participated in training materials and assessment tool validation workshops for each version of the *Australian Meat Industry Training Package*. So there is a clearly identifiable approach to competency assessment applied by RTOs in meat processing industry.

## 2 Aims of this Project

The purpose of this research project was to evaluate the effectiveness of the red meat industry's competency assessment process as determined by the responses of the major stakeholders in the evaluation process. The major stakeholders identified were company training and QA managers, the Registered Training Organisations and the trainees themselves.

There are a number of measures that are indicative of the validity of a competency assessment process utilised by an industry. These include the

- acceptance by training regulators of the assessment system

- acceptance by the RTOs delivering in the industry
- the uptake of the assessment system by industry

- level of employer and employee confidence in the system
- the extent to which assessment tools are customised to site and species to ensure total relevance.

### 3 Methodology

In order to gain information on these indicators of assessment process validity MINTRAC sent survey forms to:

- 55 of the major export and domestic meat processing companies
- 26 of the largest RTOs delivering the Meat Processing national qualifications to the abattoir sector
- 200 meat industry employees.

The red meat processing companies were selected on the basis of through put (the 25 largest companies) plus all the other export and domestic companies that participate in the QA Managers' networks. The major export companies all responded to the surveys and the majority of the larger domestic companies also responded.

The 25 RTOs were selected on the basis that they had major clients or provided training into more than one abattoir. All of the employer RTOs were surveyed. Those RTOs providing training into a meat processing plants are referred to in this study as 'external RTOs' as opposed to 'employer RTOs' which provide the accredited training within their own organisations. External RTOs are either private companies or government owned TAFE Colleges. The vast majority of training is provided by external RTOs approximately evenly divided between TAFE and private RTOs.

RTOs and employers assisted in the collection of trainees responses. The presence of one or two quite negative responses suggests that there was not a great deal of censorship or pre-selection of trainee respondents MINTRAC initially trialled the survey forms (See Attachment One to this report) with two RTOs, two QA managers and two training managers.

The survey forms were then revised and distributed electronically through MINTRAC's QA and Training Managers mail out lists. The hard copy versions were also handed out at the Training Managers' and QA Manager Network meetings around Australia. The respondents then were contacted by e-mail and telephone to ensure they had received the forms and they were able to complete them. The whole process took approximately six months from the form design to the last of the data being received at MINTRAC.

Responses were gathered from:

- 48 of the 55 meat processing companies
- 17 of the 20 external RTOs
- 5 of the 6 employer RTOs
- 155 employees out of the 200 requested.

Of the 48 companies that responded 36 were export plants and 12 were domestic plants. The average export company employed 650 people at an average of two sites while the average domestic company employed 160 at one site.

Twenty-two RTOs delivering training into the industry responded to the survey: five of these were employer RTOs and 17 were external RTOs.

The 155 employees who were surveyed came from the five mainland states and were trained by both categories of RTO.

## **4 Assessing competency in the meat processing industry**

Before discussing the outcomes of these surveys it is important to note that there are two different competency training and assessment systems operating in the meat processing sector. In the first instance an employee is trained and assessed as part of a traineeship or other State accredited training program. In such cases the training and assessment is delivered according to the *Australian Meat Industry Training Package*. The delivery of such training is monitored and audited by a State Training Authority. Alternatively, an employee can be trained and assessed as part of an in-house non-accredited training program. This type of training is not nationally recognised and does not contribute to the achievement of national qualifications.

Where these are different processes for a company and/or the industry there may be an impact on the perceived consistency and validity of the overall industry approach to competency assessment. This aspect of competency assessment in the meat industry has also been explored in this survey.

## **5 Survey results and analysis**

As discussed earlier in the paper MINTRAC sought to assess the validity of the competency assessment processes used by the meat industry through the following five measures:

1. acceptance by training regulators of the assessment system
2. acceptance by the RTOs delivering in the industry
3. the uptake of the assessment system by industry
4. level of employer and employee confidence in the system
5. the extent to which assessment tools are customised to site and species to ensure total relevance.

The survey also asked respondents their opinion on what constituted 'currency' of assessment, whether or not they are undertaking currency assessments and if so how they are undertaking such assessments.

### **5.1 Acceptance by training regulators of the assessment system**

---

The respondent RTOs indicated that the nationally developed assessment processes and tools complied with the Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF). Through MINTRAC's national training manager network MINTRAC is not aware of any RTO receiving a major non-conformity notice on their assessment process from STA audits.

### **5.2 Acceptance by the RTOs delivering in the industry**

---

The use of the MINTRAC national assessment tools and process by employer and external RTOs is an expression in confidence in the materials and the development process. The RTOs are relying on the national assessment tools to enhance their relationship with the employer, State Training Authority and their client, the trainee.

The take up rate on the assessment tools by both external (18) and employer (5) RTO respondents is 100% and to MINTRAC's knowledge this list of respondents accounts for all the major RTOs delivering the national Meat Processing qualifications. In addition, all the RTO respondents have sent staff to either moderation or professional development days for assessors.

When asked to assess the effectiveness of the assessment tools employer RTOs rated the tools and process at 8.75 out of 10 and external RTOs rated the tools and process at 8.9.

### **5.3 The uptake of the MINTRAC assessment system by industry**

The uptake of the assessment system by industry has two components:

- firstly, the use of the assessment system in the accredited component of a company's training program and
- secondly, the use of the assessment system when the company is using non-accredited training with its workers.

#### **Participation in nationally accredited training and the use of the MINTRAC industry assessment system when delivering accredited training**

The participation rate in accredited training among the survey respondents was very high with 90% of all companies surveyed using accredited training in their plants. The average export employer RTO enrolled 259 trainees per year while the average non- RTO export employer enrolled 76 trainees per year. On average the export processors were larger users of accredited training in keeping with their larger workforce and higher through-puts.

<i>Non-RTO employers</i>	<i>Average workforce</i>	<i>Cert II Average enrolments/year</i>	<i>Cert III Average enrolments/year</i>
Export	406	60	16
Domestic	104	25	6
<i>RTO employers</i>			
Export	650	239	20
Domestic	155	20	8

The use of the MINTRAC standardised assessment tools was very high with 100% of the employer RTOs using the industry assessment tools and 100% of the external RTOs using the industry assessment tools. The tools are highly customised for site and species in most cases and are often formatted according to the RTO's own Quality Assurance protocols.

#### **The use of the MINTRAC industry assessment system when delivering non-accredited training**

The use of the industry assessment tools when delivering non-accredited training presents a different picture. The industry does not have such a universal adoption of the national assessment tools when assessing competency of in-house trained workers.

When asked "Do you use the same assessment process regardless of whether employees are enrolled in accredited training or not?" the answer was 'yes' in 75% of the cases, but only 55% used the same assessment tools. This figure is borne out by the survey of QA managers which suggested that approximately 60% of plants were using the national assessment tools when assessing competency for non-accredited trained personnel.

The RTO perspective on this issue is more negative, with the survey answers suggesting that only 38% of employers use the same assessment tools for assessing competencies after non-accredited training. This view will in part be due to the fact that these RTOs may not be privy to practices in employer RTO operations. Those plants which do not use the same assessment tools variously describe their assessment process for non accredited training as follows:



- in-house/on job assessment
- monitoring by supervisors
- company work instructions and SOPs
- customer compliance
- customised assessment
- in-house assessment tools
- in-house prepared questionnaires and observation assessments.

#### **5.4 The level of employer and employee confidence in the assessment system**

The level of confidence that the various stakeholders have in the assessment process is perhaps the most telling measure of the validity of the assessment process.

Plant Quality Assurance managers were asked a series of questions about the assessment process. As end users of the data generated by the assessment process the opinion of QA managers is very important and any lack of confidence they have is a real issue and needs to be addressed.

On average QA managers rated the assessment tools a 7.4 out of 10 in terms of effectiveness and had a 78% level of confidence in the accuracy of the assessments.

Approximately 87% of the plants utilise the assessment records provided to them by the RTOs in their QA process. This group had the lowest level of confidence in the assessment process but the range of scores was also broad, suggesting that some RTOs may need to engage with the relevant QA staff more fully.

The meat processing company training and/or HR managers however rated the assessment process conducted by external RTOs more highly giving it 8.6 out of 10 for effectiveness. Employer RTOs rated the tools and process even more highly at 8.75 and not surprisingly external RTOs rated the tools and process at 8.9. However, perhaps the most important stakeholders in the whole survey, the trainees, rated the training and assessment very highly. The table below gives a summary of the trainees' responses to a variety of questions about the training and assessment process they experienced.

The trainees came from a variety of RTOs, qualification levels and work areas. The characteristics of the respondents were:

- 2/3 male and 1/3 female
- average age was 28
- 35% worked in the boning room
- 25% worked on the slaughter floor
- 40% worked in other areas of production
- approximately 65% were undertaking or had undertaken Certificate II courses
- 25% were undertaking or had undertaken Certificate III
- 10% were undertaking or had undertaken Certificate IV.

On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how would you rate the training in core skills such as hygiene safety and QA?	8.56
--	------

On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how would you rate the training in the on floor tasks?	8.35
---	------

	Y	N	N/A
Was the assessment process explained to you clearly?	96%	4%	0

On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how would you rate the assessment of your skills for the on floor tasks?	8.60
---	------

	Y	N	N/A
Did you know your assessor?	92%	8%	0

	Y	N	N/A
Did your supervisor play a role in the assessment?	70%	28%	2%

	Y	N	N/A
Did you agree with the assessors decisions?	100%	0	0

	Y	N	N/A
Did you feel you were competent at the end of the training?	98%	2%	0

	Y	N	N/A
Did the training give you the skills you needed to do your various jobs on the floor?	98%	2%	0

	Y	N	N/A
Did you use any training materials?	92%	8%	0

	Y	N	N/A
Did you find the training materials useful?	84%	16%	0

	Y	N	N/A
Are you interested in further training in the meat industry?	80%	14%	6%

	Y	N	N/A
Were you assessed in the theory of the tasks you were doing?	94%	6%	0

On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how accurate do you rate the assessment process?	8.37
---	------

These responses indicate that trainees were generally well prepared for assessment, had confidence in the process and believed the training and assessment was relevant to their employment.

### **5.5 The extent to which assessment tools are customised to site and species to ensure total relevance**

---

The site-by-site customisation of the national assessment tools is vital to their validity and ongoing acceptance by the stakeholders, particularly QA managers, HR managers and trainees. In this survey MINTRAC asked if the tools were being customised and how frequently they were reviewed.

QA managers were asked “Are the assessment tools used on your plant customised to your QA system and are they kept current?” to which 92% answered in the affirmative.

Meat processing plant HR/Training managers were asked “Does your RTO customise assessment tools for your plant(s) including work instructions and SOPs?” and 83% replied that customisation did occur. The majority of plants also indicated that the assessment tools were updated at least annually.

All of the employer RTOs surveyed indicated that they customised assessment tools and that they were reviewed on a regular basis. Overall the survey revealed that customisation of assessment tools is the norm in the industry and furthermore the assessment materials are regularly reviewed and modified.

### **5.6 Currency of assessment**

---

Currency of competency is an important issue for meat processing plants and specifically for QA managers who are attempting to meet customer requirements for evidence of currency of competency.

The purpose of the survey questions in this area was to gain an indication of the methods of addressing currency and how stakeholders were dealing with this issue.

#### **QA Managers’ responses**

Currency assessment is being undertaken at 45 % of the plants surveyed and at those plants the following approaches were reported by the QA managers:

- QA input to design of assessments
- Work instructions reviewed annually
- company work instructions
- the MHA process system determines the workers currency
- biannual review and as required
- only for animal welfare, use WIs
- done by the departmental foreman and supervisors that have completed Cert IV in Training and Assessment
- moderation activities
- monitoring individuals
- we have a committee that comprises of union member, worker, trainer and management
- tools received from MINTRAC (CDs) adding site specific tools.

When asked “How long should competency be regarded as current for if the workers is using the skills” nearly 65% answered that it was either irrelevant because it was not an issue at their plant

or that currency should be regarded as permanent. Of those who nominated a time span for currency the average time was 3.5 years with a range of 1 to 10m years. The more pertinent comments on the matter from QA managers included the following.

- If they are constantly using the skills and are kept up to date on new procedures etc then it would be ongoing.
- Once you have it you have it.
- Should be like a car licence, unless they do something wrong it should be maintained.
- On-going as refresher training and updates are given to workers.
- On-going competency assessment is maintained though process assessment, if the worker cannot demonstrate proficiency then further training or retraining is required.
- Depending on skills used and frequency of task we would conduct annual assessment only if work standard lags.
- Competency is regarded as current for the worker for the duration of their employment.

### **Meat Industry HR/Training Manager responses**

When asked "Are you engaged in currency assessments and if so what process do you use?" 45% of HR/Training managers responded in the affirmative and offered the following processes for addressing currency assessments.

- Modified MINTRAC tools - 3 sources of evidence.
- Internal training review/assessment every 12 months.
- Moderation activities at various plants.
- External RTO performs this task.
- We assess workers in ability to function according to Work Instructions.
- Only customer requirements e.g. McDonalds, SRM etc, reissue work instructions/SOPs, conduct theory/practical assessments.

### **RTO responses**

External RTOs were of the opinion that existing worker currency should be around the five year mark for Certificate II, III, and IV competencies.

## **6 Recommendations**

### ***General observations***

Overall the survey is an endorsement of the time and investment the industry has put into the creation of a national system for competency assessment in the meat industry. The levels of acceptance, uptake and confidence in the assessment process and tools are very high.

However the analysis of the survey data does indicate that some areas of the assessment system could benefit from review and improvement.

The survey suggests that work still needs to be done on the link between the training and QA functions in some abattoirs in order to increase the QA manager's confidence in the assessment process and tools.

### ***QA Manager confidence***

QA managers are increasingly asked to demonstrate to auditors that their Approved Arrangement ensures that the workers on the floor are competent and that they have been assessed in a rigorous manner. The responses from these managers suggest that some (about 20%) are not particularly confident of the accuracy of the assessment process. Whether or not an RTO is external or an employer RTO they should be actively monitoring the level of confidence

QA managers have in competency assessment outcomes and if there is a problem, address the issue.

In the first instance MINTRAC should utilise the QA managers' network meetings to identify the causes for the lower levels of confidence in the assessment process. Then these factors can be addressed through professional development sessions for both QA and training personnel in how to fine tune the assessment process so it serves the operations of both departments.

### **Assessment Tools**

When it came to the assessment tools and process a number of suggestions were made as to how improvements could be made including the following.

#### **Employer suggestions**

- Problems caused from assessment materials for imported Units not being available
- Maybe separate employability skills in assessment tools
- Have assessment materials audited to ensure they meet AQTF 2007 guidelines
- Streamlined if possible. Holistic designing of assessments
- Less signatures
- Keep reviewing
- Questions, answers and comments in all modules
- In house assessment tools
- Less repetition
- Less theory
- Streamline and a better format. Current format is a waste of paper
- Review Cert IV QA Qualification requirements: Food Industry units made compulsory amended to optional, reinstate Meat Industry Auditing Material from the MTM00 package, which was more related to the Australian Standards AS4696 and ECMMP0's and the re inclusion of Animal Welfare into the QA stream as this is a critical area for all QA currently in Australia
- Need time to assess
- Some promotional material on what is available
- Verifications on assessment materials bi annually
- More functionality and flexible mode of delivery
- They should be reviewed by a panel of meat industry experts

#### **External RTO suggestions**

- Too many signatures required and a lot of repetition
- Consistency, Font, Electronic Structure

#### **Trainee suggestions**

- Little bit more one-on-one time
- Trainers who can speak English properly on the floor
- To be trained by someone that knows what they are doing
- Some of the wording (descriptions)
- More information on the meat and its specifications
- More time with trainers
- Slightly more information on cuts specifications
- More off-the-job training

#### **Employer RTO suggestions**

- Too many signatures required and a lot of repetition

There are some common threads to these recommendations with stakeholders looking for a more simplified format with fewer signatures. There is a need for MINTRAC to revisit the topic of assessment tools with meat industry assessors to determine what changes may aid their functionality and increase their usefulness.

Eighty four percent of QA managers who responded to the survey agreed that nationally standardised competency assessment tools would be useful when assessing the competency of employees **not** enrolled in accredited training programs. Some suggested that this would best take the form of *guidelines for assessment of competency following non accredited training*. MINTRAC should therefore take on the review of the assessment tools through both the QA and Training managers' networks and identify how to best address any existing shortcomings in the assessment tool sand process. Additionally, MINTRAC should seek advice from industry as to how best develop a strategy to address any differences between assessment as part of an accredited training program and the assessment system employed in non-accredited training.

## 7 Conclusion

The study has enabled MINTRAC to gain a comprehensive understanding of how the assessment tools and process are holding up to the pressure of being implemented in an industry which is quite new to competency assessment processes. Overall the survey is highly favourable in terms of the acceptance and uptake of the assessment tools and process.

The response rate of over 85% for RTOs and employers and 75% for trainees has given us great confidence in the reliability of the survey outcomes. We now know that the vast majority of domestic and export plants have structured training and assessment programs and 70% of those plants use the same assessment process regardless of whether the training is accredited or in-house. Over one half of all the meat processing plants surveyed use the same assessment tools regardless of the type of training.

We know that all the RTOs surveyed use the national standardised assessment tools and rated them on average 8.9 out of 10 in terms of effectiveness. Employer RTO and company training managers had similar levels of confidence. State Training Authorities have universally accepted both the assessment tools and process. QA managers had a slightly lower level of confidence in the assessment tools at 7.8 out of 10 but the scores from individual QA managers indicate that this problem might be limited to a relatively small number of plants and RTOs. Nevertheless this is an issue that MINTRAC can move to rectify through the networks and professional development activities.

The recommendations of the stakeholders in relation to how assessment can be improved should also be investigated by MINTRAC with a view to improving their ease of use and making them more easily adapted to use in non-accredited assessment activities.

This report should be distributed back to RTOs and Companies through the networks as well as being made available to industry bodies such as MLA, AMPC, AMIC and if they are agreeable to the regulators. These bodies may find the survey results useful when arguing the case that mandated training is not necessary in the Australian meat industry because of an exceptionally high level of existing industry participation in structured and reliable competency assessment.

## 8 Attachment - Survey Forms

### 8.1 Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms

Survey of meat processing company Training Managers that are NOT their own Registered Training Organisation

No.	Question	Response	
1.	<p>How many sites does your meat processing company operate?</p> <p>Approximately how many employees at each site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Export slaughtering and or boning?</li> <li>• Domestic slaughtering and or boning?</li> </ul>	No of sites	No of employees
2.	How many sites do your external RTO deliver training at?		
3.	<p>On average, how many enrolments per year do you have in Cert II in Meat Processing (Abattoirs) with your external RTO?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In export registered premises?</li> <li>• In domestic registered premises?</li> </ul>		
4.	<p>In average, how many enrolments per year do you have in Cert III in Meat Processing (Slaughtering, Boning, Rendering or General) with your external RTO?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In export registered premises?</li> <li>• In domestic registered premises?</li> </ul>		

5.	Does your RTO use the National MINTRAC Assessment Materials or customised versions of these assessment tools when delivering Cert II and Cert III?	
6.	Do you use the Certificate III in Meat Processing (General) for training in QA?	
7.	Does your RTO customise <i>training materials</i> for your plant(s) including work instructions and SOPs?	
8.	Does your RTO customise <i>assessment tools</i> for your plant(s) including work instructions and SOPs?	
9.	How often are these materials updated and or checked for currency?	
10.	Do you use an external RTO to deliver the whole qualification or Units from the National Cert IV in Meat Processing (Quality Assurance) when training your QA staff?	
11.	Does your RTO use the National MINTRAC Assessment Materials or customised versions of these assessment tools when assessing QA staff?	
12.	Do you use the same assessment process regardless of whether employees are enrolled in accredited training or not <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at Certificate II Level</li> <li>• at Certificate III Level</li> <li>• at Certificate IV Level?</li> </ul>	
13.	Do you use National MINTRAC Assessment Materials (or customised versions of these materials) for assessing competency when the employee is not enrolled in accredited training?	
14.	On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is not accurate and 10 highly accurate) how effective does your organisation rate the	



	MINTRAC assessment tools?	
15.	What improvements could be made to the national MINTRAC assessment materials?	
16.	How long should Certificate II/III core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker IS working in the industry?	
17.	How long should Certificate II/III core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker is NOT continuously working in the industry?	
18.	How long should Certificate IV core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker IS working continuously in the industry?	
19.	How long should Certificate IV core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker is NOT working continuously in the industry?	
20.	Are you engaged in currency assessments and if so what process do you use?	

## 8.2 Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms

### Survey of meat processing company employees who have completed or are enrolled in a Certificate in Meat Processing traineeship

*Trainee to complete*

**Age:**

**Gender:**

**Work area:**

**Level of Traineeship: Certificate .... in Meat Processing (.....)**

No.	Question	Response
1.	On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how would you rate your training in core skills such as hygiene safety and QA?	
2.	On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how would you rate your training in the on the floor tasks?	
3.	Was the assessment process explained to you clearly?	
4.	On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being poor and 10 being good) how would you rate the assessment of your skills for the tasks you perform in the processing area?	
5.	Did you know who your assessor was before the assessment took place?	
6.	Did your supervisor play a role in the assessment?	
7.	Did you agree with the assessors decisions?	
8.	Did you feel you were competent at the end of your training?	

9.	Did the training give you the skills you needed to do your various jobs on the floor?	
10.	Did you use any training materials?	
11.	Did you find the training materials useful?	
12.	Are you interested in further training in the meat industry?	
13.	Were you assessed in the theory of the tasks you were doing?	
14.	On a scale of 1-10 (when 1 is not accurate and 10 highly accurate) how accurate do you rate the assessment process?	
15.	What improvements could be made to the traineeships?	
16.	Are your skills ever reassessed and if so what process is used?	

### 8.3 Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms

#### Survey of Employer Registered Training Organisations.

No.	Question	Response
1.	<p>How many sites does your meat processing company operate?</p> <p>Approximately how many employees at each site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Export slaughtering and or boning?</li> <li>• Domestic slaughtering and or boning?</li> </ul>	
2.	How many sites do your own RTO deliver training at?	
3.	<p>On average, how many enrolments per year do you have in Cert II in Meat Processing (Abattoirs) with your own RTO?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In export registered premises?</li> <li>• In domestic registered premises?</li> </ul>	
4.	<p>On average, how many enrolments per year do you have in Cert III in Meat Processing (Abattoirs) with your own RTO?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In export registered premises?</li> <li>• In domestic registered premises?</li> </ul>	
5.	Do you use the National MINTRAC Assessment Materials (or customised versions of these assessment material) when assessing Cert II and Cert III?	

6.	Do you use <i>accredited training</i> for training in QA?	
7.	Do you customise <i>training materials</i> for your plant(s) including work instructions and SOPs?	
8.	Do you customise <i>assessment tools</i> for your plant(s) including work instructions and SOPs?	
9.	How often are these materials updated and or checked for currency?	
10.	Do you use the whole qualification or Units from the Cert IV in Meat Processing (Quality Assurance) to train your QA staff?	
11.	Do you use an external RTO to deliver the whole qualification or Units from the national Cert IV in Meat Processing (Quality Assurance) when training your QA staff?	
12.	Do you use the MINTRAC Assessment Tools or customised versions of these assessment tools when assessing QA staff?	
13.	Do you use the same assessment process regardless of whether employees are enrolled in accredited training or not <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at Certificate II Level</li> <li>• at Certificate III Level</li> <li>• at Certificate IV Level?</li> </ul>	
14.	Do you use MINTRAC Assessment Tools (or customised versions of these materials) for assessing competency when the employee is not enrolled in accredited training?	

15.	On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is not effective and 10 highly effective) how effective does your organisation rate the MINTRAC Assessment Tools?	
16.	What improvements could be made to the National MINTRAC Assessment Tools?	
17.	How long should Certificate II/III core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker IS working continuously in the industry?	
18.	How long should Certificate II/III core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker is NOT working continuously in the industry?	
19.	How long should Certificate IV core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker IS working continuously in the industry?	
20.	How long should Certificate IV core skills' competencies be regarded as current if the worker is NOT working continuously in the industry?	
21.	Are you engaged in currency assessments and if so what process do you use?	

## 8.4 Meat Processing Industry Assessment Practices

### Quality Assurance Managers Survey

No.	Question	Response
1	<p>The meat processing company at which you manage the QA system is:</p> <p>Export slaughtering and or boning ?</p> <p>Domestic slaughtering and or boning ?</p> <p>How many establishments</p>	
2	Do you have the Certificate II delivered to employees at your site?	
3	Do all employees enrol in accredited training?	
4	<p>If not all employees are enrolled, are MINTRAC assessment tools used to assess</p> <p>Core skills</p> <p>Task competency</p>	
5	<p>Do you use Cert III accredited training for Slaughterers</p> <p>slicers</p> <p>boners?</p>	
6	Are the assessment tools used on your plant customised to your QA system and are they kept current?	
7	Do you use the national MINTRAC assessment materials or customised versions of these assessment tools when assessing task competency for workers NOT enrolled in the Certificate II?	
8	Do you use the national MINTRAC assessment materials or customised versions of these assessment tools when assessing task competency for workers NOT enrolled in the Certificate III?	
9	Would nationally standardised competency	

	assessment tools be useful when assessing the competency of employees not enrolled in accredited training programs?	
10	Do you utilise the assessments made by RTOs when keeping competency records for the employees in your plant (s)?	
11	On a scale of 1-10 (when 1 is not accurate and 10 highly accurate) how effective does your organisation rate the national assessment tools?	
12	What improvements could be made to the national MINTRAC assessment materials? On a scale of 1-10 (when 1 is not accurate and 10 highly accurate) how confident are you of the accuracy of assessments made by the RTO assessors in your plant?	
13	How do you assess task competency if you do not use the national assessment tools ? What improvements could be made to the national MINTRAC assessment materials?	
14	Do you use company developed assessment materials when assessing competency when delivering non accredited training? How do you assess task competency if you do not use the national assessment tools ?	
15	How long should competency be regarded as current for if the worker is using the skills from Certificate II? Certificate III? Certificate IV? "Do you use company developed assessment materials when assessing competency when delivering non accredited training?"	
16	Are you engaged in currency assessments and if so what process do you use?	



	<b>How long should competency be regarded as current for if the worker is using the skills from Certificate II? Certificate III? Certificate IV?</b>	
<b>17</b>	<b>Does your plant use the same assessment tools for accredited and non accredited training? Are you engaged in currency assessments and if so what process do you use?</b>	
<b>18</b>	<b>Does your plant use the same assessment tools for accredited and non accredited training?</b>	

## 8.5 Assessment in Australian Abattoirs and Boning Rooms

### Survey for Registered Training Organisations

No.	Question	Response
1.	<p><b>How many meat processing companies do you deliver training for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Export slaughtering and or boning?</b></li> <li>• <b>Domestic slaughtering and or boning?</b></li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b>On average, how many enrolments per year do you have in Cert II in Meat Processing (Abattoirs)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In export registered premises?</b></li> <li>• <b>In domestic registered premises?</b></li> </ul>	
3.	<p><b>On average, how many enrolments per year do you have in Cert III in Meat Processing (Slaughtering, Boning, Rendering or General?)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>In export registered premises?</b></li> <li>• <b>In domestic registered premises?</b></li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Do you use the National MINTRAC Assessment Materials (or customised versions of these assessment tools) when assessing Cert II and Cert III Units of Competency?</b></p>	
5.	<p><b>Do you use the Certificate III in Meat Processing (General) for fee for service training in QA?</b></p>	

6.	<b>Do you customise <i>training materials</i> for a plant including work instructions and SOPs?</b>	
7.	<b>Do you customise <i>assessment tools</i> for a plant including work instructions and SOPs?</b>	
8.	<b>How often are these assessment materials updated?</b>	
9.	<b>Do you use the National MINTRAC Assessment Tools (or customised versions of these assessment tools) when delivering Cert IV in Meat Processing (Quality Assurance?)</b>	
10.	<b>Do the companies whose staff you train use your assessment process when determining an employees competency for:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• core skills?</li> <li>• tasks?</li> </ul>	
11.	<b>Do you participate in the assessment of competency of workers in non accredited training programs? If yes, what role do you play?</b>	
12.	<b>Do you use National MINTRAC Assessment Materials when assessing competency when delivering non accredited training?</b>	
13.	<b>On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is not useful and 10 highly useful) how useful does your organisation rate the National Assessment Tools for assessing task competency?</b>	
14.	<b>What improvements could be made to the National MINTRAC Assessment Materials?</b>	

<b>15.</b>	<b>How long should competency be regarded as current for if the worker is using the skills from:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Certificate II?</li><li>• Certificate III?</li><li>• Certificate IV?</li></ul>	
<b>16.</b>	<b>Are you engaged in currency assessments and if so what process do you use?</b>	