

## ELICOS NATIONAL ROUNDTABLE INDUSTRY CONSULTATION FORA (2015)

### Structure of Report

This report provides a summary of the discussions and outputs of the NEAS-hosted ELICOS National Roundtable Industry Consultation Fora (2015).

It is structured in four parts in line with the intended outcomes of the Roundtable:

**1. Introduction**

Purpose of the Roundtable

**2. Setting the Stage**

Agenda for the Roundtable

**3. Roundtable Findings**

Highlights of Feedback from Attendees by State and ELICOS National Standard

**4. Recommendations**

Critical Items for Review and Modification

Way Forward - Concluding Remarks and Next Steps

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The ELICOS National Roundtable Industry Consultation Fora were hosted by NEAS (National ELT Accreditation Scheme) after discussions with the Commonwealth Department of Education's Policy Branch in Canberra. These discussions resulted in a suggestion that the Government would appreciate hearing the views of Australian ELT providers who had undertaken NEAS Quality Endorsement, with respect to the current status of the ELICOS National Standards (ENS).

It is important to note that the compliance with the ENS is a precursor and gateway for ELT providers to be able to engage in the process of continuous quality improvement, via the NEAS Quality Principles. It is through because of this mechanism, that NEAS and its quality endorsed members have a clear and present interest in the matter of changes to the ENS.

Participants in the roundtable discussions represented English language teaching centres from Australian universities, TAFE colleges and privately owned global and local ELT providers. Representation of these centres was by Academic Managers and Principal Administrators, as holding the most senior positions in such organisations.

The Roundtable had three objectives:

1. Defining whether the ENS requires reforming
2. If so, broadly identifying the elements which need to be reformed
3. Recommending to government the specific elements which should be reformed

The Roundtable made use of a mix of methods combining presentations, discussions and group work. A number of documents were prepared in advance of the Roundtable to inform the discussion (see annex 1).

Roundtable fora were held in Melbourne, Cairns, Brisbane, Perth, Adelaide and Sydney, with approximately ELT 90 centres represented.

NEAS welcomed participants to the Roundtable, underlined it's strong support for the ENS as the underpinning framework for a stable and well regulated language teaching sector and highlighted the following points:

- The history of the ELICOS National Standards and NEAS' role within their formation
- NEAS' role in consulting with industry on changes to the ENS
- How NEAS would report back to the Commonwealth Department and Minister for Education

NEAS Chief Executive facilitated a dialogue amongst the representatives. It was underlined that the Roundtable is an opportunity to put words into action and stressed that it was envisaged as a platform for developing new ideas together, forging relationships and facilitating joint planning that can make a real difference on the ground.

It was reiterated that the feedback from Roundtable participants would be consolidated into a report and would be circulated to participants for comment, prior to submission to the Commonwealth Government.



## **2. SETTING THE STAGE**

---

### **NEAS ELICOS NATIONAL STANDARDS ROADSHOW**

#### **Roundtable Agenda**

**1) NEAS Objectives:**

- Travel to major capital and regional centres to meet with providers
- Collect industry views on the ELICOS National Standards as they are
- Collect industry views on changing the ELICOS National Standards
- Collate data and report to Commonwealth Government
- Influence policy
- Report data to industry

**2) ENS History:**

- Origins of the ELICOS National Standards
- Birth of NEAS / Tiananmen Square
- Drafting of the first NEAS Quality Standards (1989)
- Adoption of the ELICOS National Standards in (2007) by Commonwealth Government

**3) What we are not discussing today:**

- ESOS Act
- SVP
- National Code of Practice

**4) Discussion:**

- Do we need a change at all?
- Why?

**5) Format of proceedings:**

- Review the ELICOS National Standards - page by page
- Collect notes and bullet points

**6) Closing remarks and thank you for the premises:**

### **3. ROUNDTABLE FINDINGS**

A summary of the qualitative feedback received from Roundtable participants has been summarised and consolidated for consideration by industry stakeholders, government representatives and departmental executives.

The summary is provided with four main “recommendation” headings, with their intent as follows:

*Note:* Where this heading appears, the report is defining a position as taken by the bulk of respondents.

*YES change:* Where this heading appears, the report is confirming that a change to the ENS is required, with a specific mention made of the item(s) that require changing.

*NO change:* Where this heading appears, the report is confirming that a change to the ENS is not required.

*Definition:* Where this heading appears, the report is confirming that there was some confusion as to the intent or definitions for which the section is responsible, and that clarification is required.

The feedback and comments received in relation to each standard are summarised below.

#### **Standard C1.1 Course Applications**

*Note:* It was noted that this standard requires stand-alone integrity, and that the removal of items that might be deemed to be duplicated in other areas of the ENS should not result in their removal from Standard C1.1.

*YES change:* The format for items to be included for submission for addition to CRICOS was deemed correct and fit for purpose to protect students (consumers).

The only change suggested was that relating to “*Maximum Course Fees*”, which it was recommended be removed.

*Definition:* It was noted that definitions of the following terms were required along with appropriate support documents to increase quality by reducing confusion and expediting compliance:

- syllabus
- curriculum
- delivery mode

**Standard P1.1A                      Contact Hours**

NO change:      Contact hours to remain 20 for CRICOS registered courses.

YES change:      More specific standards for the care of young learners were recommended to be drafted by the industry for review and/or adoption.

Definition:      Clarification of terms such as “*face-to-face*” and “*blended learning*” to be achieved, alongside their connection to the minimum number of class contact hours required

Concern:          Any erosion of this standard creates options for exploitation and a reduction in quality by unethical providers.

**Standard P2                      Young Learners**

YES change:      More specific standards for the care of young learners were recommended to be drafted by the industry for review and/or adoption.

YES change:      A clear requirement for the separation of young learners from adult learners to be effected immediately.

Concern:          The industry noted a clear and present issue relating to the safety of young learners.

**Standard P3                      Teaching**

NO change:      Maximum class sizes to remain at 18 in order to be competitive with other countries.

**Standard P4:                      Assessment**

NO change:      Assessment principles and requirements are robust and fit for purpose.

Concern:          Consistent assessment of learning outcomes to support comparison of proficiency levels between graduates of different centres remains an issue. Standardisation via scales, grades and tests is recommended.

**Standard P5:                      Resources**

NO change:      The minimum requirements as they are currently presented were deemed sufficient.

Concern:          Influence of “*self-paced*” and “*independent*” study resources on “*face-to-face*” class-time needs defining, i.e.: does the use of these contribute to the 20 hour minimum requirement?

**Standard P6: Staff**

*NO change:* Current qualifications for both teachers and Academic Managers or Directors of Study, were noted as being suitable, with no recommendation to increase or decrease the minimum requirements.

*YES change:* There was significant recommendation for the inclusion of Applied Linguistics to be included alongside the current TESOL and CELTA teaching qualifications.

**Standard P7: ELICOS Premises**

*NO change:* No changes to the current minimum requirements were suggested or recommended.

**Standard P8: Business Management**

*YES change:* Recommendation to remove Accounting requirements as these are covered by ASQA and TEQSA.

*YES change:* Recommendation that all centres be required to maintain Professional Indemnity insurance.

*Definition:* Student records management requirements require clarification.

## **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Critical Items for Review and Modification**

It can be concluded that the ELICOS National Standards are an important component of the value proposition for consumers of Australian-delivered English language teaching through their support of sound pedagogy and the management of risk.

Roundtable participants were generally supportive of the ENS, and expressed the view that the role of the Standards was to protect the reputation of the Australian ELT sector and the rights of its students. They recognised that while the desire for greater flexibility was common, a strong ENS provided a “trade-barrier” against unethical and low quality providers, whose focus was not on the delivery of quality educational learning outcomes.

A common remark amongst participants was that an erosion of the ENS would negatively impact on the entire sector. This is largely as minimum attendance hours and maximum sizes are viewed by quality providers as a counter to unethical providers whose primary commercial focus is helping students secure a visa.

It was also remarked that for Australia to compete against other ELT study destinations, this jurisdiction requires comparable and competitive quality features. An example of this is that other destinations often have smaller mandated class sizes, which already puts the Australian market at a disadvantage.

Low quality providers were seen to tarnish the entire sector’s reputation. This was from the standpoint that as English language teaching is a relatively undifferentiated industry, all providers would be affected should unethical providers have fewer guidelines to abide by.

As a result, many participants adopted the role of “*industry watchdog*” during discussions, and ultimately were conservatively favourable to maintaining the current standards with a few “*tweaks*” to support innovation.

The outcome is that the Roundtable recommendations focus on improving clarity around loosely defined elements within the ENS, and in protecting the well-defined areas that support quality pedagogy.

#### **Firm Recommendation - Consensus**

The primary topics of debate with respect to the ENS continue to be those associated with mandated minimum tuition hours, maximum students per classroom, qualification requirements and a definition of “face-to-face” teaching.

##### ***a. DO NOT CHANGE: Minimum tuition hours per week to be 20***

It was noted that students who participated in their study in a pattern that was “regular and often”, were more likely to achieve the course’s claimed learning outcomes. Most agreed that four to five days study per week for an average of four to five hours per day, provided statistically reliable

learning results across student cohorts. The overwhelming majority of participants support maintaining this requirement.

**b. DO NOT CHANGE: Maximum learners per class to be 18**

Participants were clear in their support of maintaining a maximum of 18 per class, as such class sizes are easier to manage in the context of achieving solid learning outcomes for students. It was also noted that to compete with other ELT study destinations, the figure of 18 per class was already “three students more” than other jurisdictions, and that to remain competitive it should not be raised. The sector was unable to consider a drop in maximum numbers, as it would not be commercially viable.

**c. DO NOT CHANGE: Qualifications**

The minimum qualifications for teachers and academic managers were seen as reasonable and as hallmarks of quality and value in the sector. There was no appetite to reduce these requirements, notwithstanding the cost implications for staff and school owners. It was also recognised that these current qualifications competitively position the Australian sector in the global ELT marketplace. A minor note of change was that the ELT qualifications matrix be expanded to include Applied Linguistics qualifications.

**d. CHANGE: Definitions of “face-to-face” tuition**

The impact of technology on education is being felt in the ELT community, with the interaction between traditional classroom learning models producing challenges for teachers, and for compliance and academic managers. A common request was for the “20 hour face-to-face tuition per week” requirement to be retained, but for greater clarity on what face-to-face tuition actually was. An example is that pedagogues are asking whether “Skype” delivery constitutes “face-to-face” tuition, which can then be included in the 20 hours mandated minimum.

As such, it is deemed critical that any changes to the ENS include definitions, including the following terms in the context of their contribution to effective learning outcomes and the sector’s reputation:

- i. Face-to-face
- ii. independent or self-paced learning
- iii. blended learning
- iv. electronic and online learning

**e. CHANGE: Care and Protection of Young Learners**

It was a commonly held view that the ENS and associated legal instruments needed improvement to provide adequate protection for young learners aged 18 and under.

An urgent review of the overall manner in which young people are supported by the ELT sector, including how the ENS standards associated with young learners achieve this, is recommended. A key focus on accountability measures, homestay and guardianship arrangements is suggested.

## ❑ **Broad Recommendations**

A range of other issues point to the need for greater clarity around definitions within the ENS, to reduce confusion and support quality providers.

- a. Remove multiple referencing or duplication of requirements “within” the ENS, excluding those attributable to Standard C1.1 which should be reviewed independently of the other standards.
- b. Remove language in the ENS that is non-specific or non-attributable to a measurable requirement, or risk the potential for exploitation by unethical providers. Examples include the use of words like “suitable” and “appropriate” to describe quantifiable items.
- c. Under *Section 3 Roundtable Findings*, many minor items are recorded for consideration for changes which participants in the sector tended to consider a “tweak” to the standard, rather than a wholesale change.
- d. It was noted that the ENS may have elements in common with the updated ESOS Act and other Commonwealth and State Government regulatory and legislative instruments.

## **The Way Forward – the Next Steps**

NEAS recommends that the Commonwealth Government and the Department of Education works with NEAS (National ELT Accreditation Scheme) in the formation of a steering committee, to oversee the drafting of a revised set of ELICOS National Standards.

The revised ENS would need to be designed to support the ELICOS sector and the international students who choose to study English in Australia by protecting the current minimum requirements for the delivery of ELICOS courses.

It is recommended that the Steering Committee have a remit to incorporate sector feedback around technology, and how technological innovation in English language teaching might be incorporated into the standards without concern that its absence may be an indicator of a reduction in quality, nor that its presence is a precursor of same.

The revised ELICOS National Standards would need to be created in consultation with the sector, and based on the findings of this and other research. Once drafted, they would be circulated for comment and confirmation of sector support.

It is envisaged that this process would take approximately 12 months, before being considered by the Commonwealth Government and Department of Education as an effective replacement to the current ELICOS National Standards.

## **With Thanks**

NEAS would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who dedicated their time and energy to participating in the Roundtable.

## **5. APPENDIX: ATTENDANCE LIST**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Centre Name</b>	<b>Session</b>
Andrew	Laing	St Paul's International College	Sydney (1)
Daniel	Yuen	Cambridge English	Sydney (1)
Denise	Metzger	EF Sydney	Sydney (1)
John	Rusnak	Strathfield College	Sydney (1)
Joumana	Naja	QIBA, Sydney	Sydney (1)
Lily	Johannes	Imagine Education	Sydney (1)
Maggie	Swannock	ACU English Language Centre	Sydney (1)
Marina	Kendal	TELC Meadowbank	Sydney (1)
Nikki	Cole	University of Wollongong College	Sydney (1)
Roxana	Ene	Greenwich English College	Sydney (1)
Sally	Kuhne	Kingsway Institute	Sydney (1)
Simon	Chaplin	QIBA	Sydney (1)
Veronica	Keating	Navitas	Sydney (1)
Heidi	Reid	AICE	Sydney (1)
Rima	Ibrahim	EL SIS	Sydney (1)
Ben	Stubbs	Deakin University English Language Institute	Melbourne
Brian	Smith	IDP Education	Melbourne
Craig	Shayer	Australian National College of English	Melbourne
Di	Kay	Avalon College	Melbourne
Eileen	AHN	INUS Australia - Education and Training	Melbourne
Iryna	Dwyer	English Language Services, TasTAFE	Melbourne
Janine	Rainbow	Discover English	Melbourne
Janine	Rainbow	Academies Australasia Polytechnic	Melbourne
Karen	Eager	Chisholm International English Language Centre	Melbourne
Kerry	Olsen	Greenwich English College	Melbourne
Lakshmi	Kannambra	Education Access Australia	Melbourne
Leisl	Bruhn	Ivanhoe Grammar School	Melbourne
Paul	Hoban	Avalon College	Melbourne
Ruth	Rosen	Oxford English Language Centre	Melbourne
Sener	Alkan	Universal English	Melbourne
Shin	Shimizu	Greenwich English College	Melbourne
Sue	Bidesi	TMG English Language Centre	Melbourne
Tracey	Schilder	ACU Melbourne	Melbourne
Wei Ching	Lim	EAA	Melbourne
Oksana	Razmova	Victoria University	Melbourne
Paula	Vigorelli	IELTS	Melbourne
Brian	Smith	IELTS	Melbourne
Keren	Moskal	Embassy English (Study Group)	Melbourne
Anne	McDougall	Union Institute of Language	Brisbane
Anne	Mackenzie	ELT Works	Brisbane

Donna	Cook	ACU English language centre	Brisbane
Garth	Keppie	Australian International College of Language	Brisbane
Helen	Cook	ETS TOEFL	Brisbane
Ian	McGregor	Queensland University of Technology English College	Brisbane
Jun	Craft	Inforum Education Australia	Brisbane
Lillian	Myers	Citipointe Christian College International	Brisbane
Linda	Towler	International Education Consultant	Brisbane
Maxine	Griffiths	TAFE Queensland Gold Coast	Brisbane
Michael	Bos	John Paul International College	Brisbane
Neil	Preston	International House Brisbane	Brisbane
Robin	Simpson	Langports	Brisbane
Rosemary	Taylor	OAC, University of Southern Queensland	Brisbane
Simon	Craft	Inforum Education Australia	Brisbane
Sue	Woods	Australia Catholic University English Language Centres	Brisbane
Thomas	Roche	Southern Cross University College	Brisbane
Michael	Singh	Western Sydney University	Brisbane
Christine	Bundesen	NEAS Advisory Council	Sydney (2)
Daniel	Bruce	CET	Sydney (2)
David	Hill	n/a: NEAS Assist consultant	Sydney (2)
Denver	Craig	Think Education	Sydney (2)
Greg	Alexander	TOEIC/Pro-Match	Sydney (2)
Kellie	Marzol	Australian Pacific College	Sydney (2)
Lyn	Scott	ELC	Sydney (2)
Sharon	Luhr	Australian Pacific College	Sydney (2)
Penny	Kozlowski	English College of Adelaide (ECA)	Adelaide
Andrew	Foley	Bradford College (Adelaide University)	Adelaide
Helen	Cox	SACE	Adelaide
Tina	Beltsos	Kaplan English	Adelaide
Angelo	Mele	Federation University Australia (IIBIT)	Adelaide
Anne-marie	Wright	UWA Centre for English Language Teaching (UWA CELT)	Perth
Callum	Cowell	UWA Centre for English Language Teaching (UWA CELT)	Perth
Kirsten	Routledge	IIBT	Perth
Larry	Davies	NEAS	Perth
Linda	Resnick	IIBT	Perth
Paul	Aucoin	Murdoch Institute of Technology	Perth
Peter	Rogers	Kaplan International Perth	Perth
Pia	Valeen	Cambridge International College	Perth
Rex	Sadewater	WAEC	Perth
Rhian	Healy	Polytechnic West- Education and Training International	Perth
Robynne	Walsh	Phoenix Academy	Perth
Sheree	Millen	Curtin English	Perth
Simon	Winetroube	Curtin English	Perth
Simon	Baronowitz	Central Institute of Technology / Navitas English	Perth
Denver	Craig	Think College	NEAS AC

Trish	Scott	Kaplan International English (Cairns)	NEAS AC
George	Brown	Study Group	NEAS AC
Chris	Burgess	Impact English	NEAS AC
Susan	Delahunty	MCIE	NEAS AC
Patrick	Pheasant	Sydney University CELT	NEAS AC
Bianca	Panizza	Western Australia University CELT	NEAS AC
Erika	Schembri	Western Sydney TAFE ELT Centre	NEAS AC



Cairns  
Cairns  
Cairns  
Cairns

Note: AC = NEAS Advisory Council (National)

## APPENDIX

### *Notes (Sydney Session 1)*

#### **Broad Recommendations**

Providers stated that the ENS governs their policies and procedures. It constitutes the bare minimum of what they have to do.

About half the room said they would like to see some changes to the ENS. The rest were not so sure.

#### **Standard C1.1          Course Applications**

- Course name needs to reflect what students are purchasing.
- National outcomes / course codes would be good for “Brand Australia”.
- Are national course codes an option? ie: classification of course types etc?
- Remove reference to Course Fees here.

#### **Standard P1.1A          Contact Hours**

- Recommendation not to reduce 20 hour minimum.
- Relationship between electronic AV learning and face-to-face learning needs to be defined.

#### **Standard P2          Young Learners**

- ENS needs to be closer aligned to Board of Studies requirements.
- There is no legislation covering host families. This needs rectification and is a risk area warranting further investigation.

#### **Standard P3          Teaching**

- Externally recognised frameworks such as CEFR are an alternative to IELTS.
- Methodology of courses and tests is not the same.
- Relationship between ELICOS provider and partners is a concern.
- Proficiency does not equate to academic success in further education.

#### **Standard P4:          Assessment**

#### **Standard P5:          Resources**

- Most want to keep the student common room and shared facilities.
- E-learning should be incorporated in resources. Ideas need to be broadened in this regard.

#### **Standard P6:          Staff**

- Qualification standards are suitable for good providers but less reputable providers need monitoring in respect to the currency and experience of teacher qualifications;
- Conditions for teachers have gone backwards. If teachers do not have qualifications then their conditions will be eroded.

**Standard P8: Business Management**

- This standard is difficult to monitor.
- Professional indemnity insurance should be required.

**Note: P8.3**

Should be removed as this is covered by ASQA or TEQSA.

## ***Notes (Sydney Session 2)***

### **Standard C1.1 Course Applications**

- This standard is vague and insufficiently prescriptive. It could be tightened up considerably. A template was discussed as a solution, but concerns were also raised that a template could undermine its own purpose. Guidelines were preferred.
- There is a lack of standardisation across the entire industry, particularly regarding learning outcomes. Some providers don't even know what learning outcomes are. There is also considerable variation in course levels, e.g. upper intermediate in one centre may be comparable to pre-intermediate in another.
- There was concern that it may be commercially stifling to require the course name to reflect its purpose.
- Students must be able to trust what they are choosing. While the course name tells the student what they will be learning/the purpose, they need to know what they are buying.

### **Standard P1.1A Contact Hours**

### **Standard P2 Young Learners**

### **Standard P3 Teaching**

- Concerns were raised regarding the number of students acceptable for specialised classes.
- Providers need flexibility in class numbers.

### **Standard P4: Assessment**

- Documentation requirements need to be clarified
- Student assessment records need to be standardised across the sector for ease of comparison
- Weeks at each level should be clarified and recorded on certificates which should reflect this .
- Change "evaluating" to "reviewing" in relation to course outcomes and student achievement of these.

### **Standard P5: Resources**

- This Standard lacks a focus on the quality of student services and clarification ELICOS providers as to what should be provided.

### **Standard P6: Staff**

- Qualifications of teachers are more specific than those of academic management. 6.2 needs to be teased out to reflect this requirement.
- Add a practicum requirement to teacher qualifications.
- Remove terms such as 'appropriate' and 'suitable' and specify what is required.

### **Standard P7: ELICOS Premises**

### **Standard P8: Business Management**

## ***Notes (Melbourne Session)***

### **Standard C1.1      Course Applications**

- EAL is compromising the sector.
- Will there ever be a time when ELICOS will be comparable to the AQF, with no class limits, no attendance requirements.
- Exit expectations for each course need to be a requirement in the form of clear learning outcome.

### **Standard P1.1A      Contact Hours**

- The 20 hours per week requirement is suitable, but 20 hours over 5 days should be specified.
- Contact hours should be redefined. Does research in the library count as contact hours?
- There is an argument that if you are preparing students for further studies, then you should expose them to lecture style and on-line learning.
- Where blended learning is provided well with a purpose, then it is valuable but it can be abused.
- One participant suggested taking out the whole clause. Their view was that different providers have different delivery models and terms on how they are providing the course to students. They expressed that the provider and student are the decision makers in how many hours (etc) are acceptable

### **Standard P2      Young Learners**

### **Standard P3      Teaching**

- 18 is too many for beginners or intensive classes such as IELTS preparation.
- Learning outcomes should be articulated so as to be readily understandable to all stakeholders.

### **Standard P4:      Assessment**

- Keep student assessment results for 5 years.

### **Standard P5:      Resources**

### **Standard P6:      Staff**

- **6.4** Appropriate teaching experience should be required. Quality will be compromised if this is watered down.

### **Standard P7:      ELICOS Premises**

### **Standard P8:      Business Management**

## ***Notes (Brisbane Session)***

### **Standard C1.1 Course Applications**

- Students and agents recognise that an ELT centre is endorsed or registered by government or other agency.
- Providers like the thoroughness of **C1.1** because it can be used as a tool to write a better product.
- Copyright is an issue. A provider who does not own a course may not be able to deliver.

### **Standard P1.1A Contact Hours**

### **Standard P2 Young Learners**

- Should professional indemnity insurance be required?
- Operations should be defined more closely. There should be supervision standards. Does this standard refer to primary and secondary school students? Can a 14 year old be placed with adults?
- **P2.1** Arrangements for students aged under 18 years comply with Australian, state and territory government legislation.
- **P2.2** Students under 16 are not in classes with adults.
- **P2.3** Students under 16 are enrolled in courses of preparation for entry to Australian state or territory primary or secondary schools.
- **P2.4** Age appropriate playgrounds and facilities are provided.
- **P2.5** ELICOS teachers:
  - a) have knowledge of the Australian school system, school disciplines, literacy requirements and developmental stages of childhood and adolescence
  - b) provide pastoral care and continuous supervision with a focus on student safety suitable for school age children
  - c) have classroom management skills and manage all areas of student work such as homework, classwork and study skills

### **Standard P3 Teaching**

### **Standard P4: Assessment**

- Benchmarking is important, but not good if overly prescriptive. Providers need to be able to differentiate their product they lose autonomy if benchmarking is imposed.
- CEFR is used by publishers and provides a level of comparison.

### **Standard P5: Resources**

### **Standard P6: Staff**

- **P6.5** Where the registered ELICOS provider offers courses of preparation for entry to Australian state or territory secondary schools, 75% of the TESOL teachers are registered to

teach in the Australian state or territory primary/secondary system as determined by state/territory legislation.

- **P6.6** Where the registered ELICOS provider offers courses of preparation for entry to Australian state or territory primary schools, teachers hold a TESOL qualification and a recognised primary teaching qualification.
- Directors of Studies need to have experience in educational management.

**Standard P7: ELICOS Premises**

**Standard P8: Business Management**

## ***Notes (Adelaide Session)***

### **Standard C1.1      Course Applications**

- The course name that is put up in the application for accreditation is the name of the course in the brochure.

### **Standard P1.1A      Contact Hours**

- What's wrong with delivering at night or on weekends?
- I don't want to see changes for the agents to have to deal with.

### **Standard P2      Young Learners**

### **Standard P3      Teaching**

- Number of students in each class should be up to the provider.
- In order to protect the national standard, we need to have a definition which allows this concept to be communicated.
- Each provider will make a decision about optimal numbers.
- Question around how should "special needs" be dealt with?
- The provider has the capacity to verify the accuracy of the student's application and is able to modify or respond to the learning agreement and course offer.

### **Standard P4:      Assessment**

- Grades need to be defined using a key or scale.
- CEFR, test scores or AQF? Needs to be universally understood

### **Standard P5:      Resources**

### **Standard P6:      Staff**

- There may be other qualifications, besides TESOL which are appropriate.
- In regional areas it is difficult to get staff with suitable or appropriate qualifications. There is a need to add something about experience because it accounts for a lot.

### **Standard P7:      ELICOS Premises**

### **Standard P8:      Business Management**

- How long should records be kept?

## ***Notes (Perth Session)***

### **Broad Recommendations**

There is the possibility of a global framework (QALEN).

Standards are written for the present, based on the past and not really forward-looking.

How is it possible to avoid legislating for the lowest common denominator?

The majority of participants feel that the standards cover the right bases but would like the opportunity to tweak them, the opportunity for flexibility – no one wants massive change but no one wants the standards to stay as they are either.

### **Standard C1.1          Course Applications**

- It would help to have an indication of level of detail required, e.g. a form to fill out or a template indicating how much to write (maybe with appendices).

### **Standard P1.1A          Contact Hours**

- It has long been a problem for ELICOS providers that VET has no requirements and because of this it is not a level playing field between them and ELICOS – so what do we do about this?

### **Standard P2              Young Learners**

### **Standard P3              Teaching**

### **Standard P4:              Assessment**

- Mapping issues – assessment and content, assessment and learning outcome

### **Standard P5:              Resources**

### **Standard P6:              Staff**

- If you have four classes together for lecture based content, do all four teachers have to be fully qualified? Should teachers be allowed to have other qualification levels for different types of class?
- There was some discussion around qualifications for Principle Administrators

### **Standard P7:              ELICOS Premises**

### **Standard P8:              Business Management**