

Committee Secretary
Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Committee
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

The Education Services for Overseas Students Amendment (Re-Registration of Providers and Other Measures) Bill 209

Committee Secretary,

The following is my submission to the above inquiry.

I worked in the International college industry from 2006-2008 and was quite disturbed at how the organisation I worked for operated. I believe there needs to be stronger scrutiny of these colleges especially as they are feeding students in to some of our top universities. The re-registration of these colleges need to be more invasive in to their teaching methods and procedures.

As these colleges operate under VETAB, trainers (or teachers) needed to have their TAA or equivalent. At the time, I was one of two teachers who held that minimum qualification. My understanding is that the majority of teachers at this particular college do not hold the TAA.

The courses were crammed over four week at sixteen to twenty hours per week. This was for a Diploma of Business course which at TAFE runs over eighteen weeks or thirteen weeks at University. This put enormous stress on teachers and students who had to study a whole text over that time for one subject. Over this four week period, students had to undertake a mid-term and final exam plus assignments. The college left it up to the teachers what was taught and had no syllabus to follow. We were not provided any of the training packages or modules from NTIS. Nor did they provide any college modified training package documents to guide the teachers. These packages outline what needs to be taught and how as well as what assessments need to be undertaken for a student to pass. These documents validate the course and assist an organisation in complying with the national training requirements. Something this organisation has not done.

I was instructed that I had to pass a minimum 85% of students. My pass rate was much lower (around 8-20% depending on the subject) as the students were not able to pass their exams or other set work.

Students that failed were provided the opportunity to re-sit the course which is allowable under VETAB. However, they were charged a further \$400.00 to re-sit the course over one week. The re-sit was taught by someone who was not qualified in that particular subject nor did they hold their TAA and it was also taught in their native tongue (Chinese). Students who sat this re-sit did not fail and received an automatic pass. As the person who taught the course, and qualified, I was not provided the opportunity to hold the re-sit nor to set the

exam. I am not aware of what was taught and what the students did to pass the course. This happened for all subjects in the Diploma of Business.

Also of concern was that my final marks were lifted to give students entry into their selected University. I have attached the emails which show this and a range of other concerns. I also have in my possession some exam papers and other records to show how these students should not have passed. I am willing to provide these to the committee upon request.

There is also the issue of over-protection of students who were in breach of their student visa. There is a requirement that students had to attend a minimum number of hours. Many students fell well below this. When I stated that students had missed too many classes, they would always say something along the lines of 'we are looking in to it' or 'we are taking care of that'. They would have warning letters on standby but rarely was anything followed through.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission. Contact me anytime if you require further information.