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## 

# Explanatory notes

## Scope

1. The data are sourced from the administrative records held by the state training authorities and other relevant bodies. The tables provide information on the government-funded VET delivered by:

* TAFE institutes and other government VET providers
* community education providers
* private training providers
* other training providers.

1. This publication does not cover the following types of training activity:

* fee-for-service training activity (reported with *funding source – national* '20 – domestic client', '30 international client', '31 – international onshore client', or '32 - international offshore client')
* delivery undertaken at overseas campuses of Australian VET institutions
* credit transfer (reported with *outcome identifier – national* '60 – credit transfer')
* superseded training (reported with *outcome identifier - national* '61 - superseded training')
* not yet started training (reported with *outcome identifier - national* '85 – not yet started')
* VET delivered in schools, where the training activity was undertaken as part of a senior secondary certificate and is not government funded
* any Commonwealth specific funded administrative records not held by state training authorities
* any activity where revenue was earned from another training provider in terms of subcontracting, auspicing, partnership or similar arrangements (reported with *funding source – national* '80 – revenue earned from another training organisation')

## Data sources

1. The information contained in this publication is, unless otherwise stated, derived from the National VET Provider Collection. Data are reported to NCVER via state training authorities. This collection is compiled under the Australian Vocational Education and Training Management Information Statistical Standard (AVETMISS), release 8.0. For further information on AVETMISS go to <<https://www.ncver.edu.au/rto-hub/statistical-standard-software/avetmiss-vet-provider-collection-specifications-release-8.0>>.
2. This publication also makes use of data and classification information from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). For more information, refer to the fact sheet Use of Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data in 'total VET activity' located at <<https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/collections/students-and-courses-collection/total-vet-activity-tva-fact-sheets>>.

## Data treatment

1. Note that the percentages presented in this publication are reported to one decimal place.
2. Other numbers have been rounded, after aggregation, to the nearest five. Rounding can lead to situations where individual numbers might not add to the rounded totals.
3. Students are counted distinctly against each by variable in a chart or table, including the total. This can lead to situations where the sum of rows or columns do not sum to the total (e.g., a student studying at multiple provider types is counted once per each type, but also only once in the total).

## Data revisions

1. Data from previous collections, represented within this publication, may differ to what was presented earlier as
   1. these data may have been rebased. Data revisions take place to facilitate comparisons across collection periods and years based on current data. For example, if a training provider was reported in the current year with provider type of ‘school’ but in the previous year the same provider was reported as 'community education provider', NCVER will adjust the previously reported provider type to match that of the current year. Improvements to the student counting methodology may also lead to minor variations in data reported between years.
   2. these data may have been submitted to NCVER after the original reporting window has closed. These data would not have been included in that collection’s publication. However, they will be included in the following years’ publications.

## Student counts

1. NCVER applies a methodology to distinctly count students who may be enrolled at multiple training providers. For further information, refer to the fact sheet Student counts in 'total VET activity' located at <<https://www.ncver.edu.au/research-and-statistics/collections/students-and-courses-collection/total-vet-activity-tva-fact-sheets>>.

## Training providers

1. Table 1 outlines the number of government-funded training providers, by reporting type, reported by each state or territory. The totals are distinct counts of training providers to account for situations where providers deliver vocational education and training in more than one state or territory. In this scenario, the training provider is included in each state or territory figure but then only counted once in the totals and for Australia.
2. There have been reductions in the number of TAFE institutes reported in New South Wales, Western Australia, and Queensland in recent years due to the implementation of reform measures in those jurisdictions. For example, from 1 January 2019 the number of TAFEs reported in New South Wales decreased from 11 to one as part of the One TAFE consolidation program.
3. Victorian funded training provider types are subject to differing reporting schedules. This can result in fluctuations in provider numbers when comparing against the same period for previous years. For example, TAFE institutes are required to report monthly, while community education providers supply data on a quarterly basis.
4. In New South Wales and South Australia (up to 2016), some training providers may be reported both as a ‘Community education provider’ and another provider reporting type. However, they are only reported and counted once in the total.

Table 1 Government-funded training provider reporting type by state/territory, January to September 2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training providers | NSW | Vic. | Qld | SA | WA | Tas. | NT | ACT | Aust. |
| TAFE institutes | 1 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 24 |
| Other government providers | 1 | 4 | 3 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 10 |
| Community education providers | 32 | 216 | 11 | 17 | 7 | - | - | - | 283 |
| Private training providers | 279 | 170 | 360 | 134 | 140 | 67 | 47 | 63 | 937 |
| Other training providers | 103 | 40 | 33 | 41 | 17 | 30 | 26 | 16 | 217 |
| Total | 385 | 442 | 408 | 193 | 171 | 98 | 75 | 80 | 1 420 |

A dash (-) represents a true zero figure, with no data reported in this category.

## Reporting derivations

1. Students undertaking nationally recognised training have undertaken at least one nationally recognised subject delivered by a registered training organisation. Because students may enrol in multiple programs and/or subjects in a calendar year, the sum of students will not add to the total.
2. *Government-funded students and courses* reports training activity according to the state/territory that administered the funding of that training. NCVER applies several derivations to the data in scope of the government-funded collection, submitted by state training authorities, so that the data are reported from a state/territory perspective.
3. One of the major derivations is *provider reporting type*, which determines how training organisations are reported in the various *Government-funded students and courses* resources. A matrix was developed by NCVER – in consultation with state training authorities in each jurisdiction – to determine how different types of training providers are to be reported in each state/territory. The *provider reporting type* derived field is based on the combination of *submitter identifier* and *training organisation type* *identifier*. For example, training delivered by a TAFE institute in its own jurisdiction is reported as being delivered by a ‘TAFE institute’. However, if the TAFE institute successfully contests funding contracts in other jurisdictions, then any training delivery is reported as being delivered by ‘other training providers’ in that jurisdiction.

## Data quality and comparability issues

1. NCVER has improved the method used to calculate program completions resulting in a slight increase compared with previously published data.
   1. NCVER would report completions based on two collections worth of data. For example, if the latest collection year was 2019 (reported in 2020), the reported program completions that completed in that year were published as ‘preliminary’, with an expectation of receiving a ‘top-up’ of programs that completed in 2019 in the 2020 collection (reported in 2021).
   2. Once NCVER received data for the 2020 collection, the published 2019 completion counts would be revised upwards. However, this boundary was maintained preventing a revision of completion counts for earlier years. For example, programs reported to the 2020 collection as completing in 2018, would not be included in a revised 2018 completion count.
   3. As of the 2020 collection, this boundary was removed so that program completions are always revised based on later data. For example, programs that completed in 2018 reported to the 2020 collection are now included in a revised published 2018 completion count.
2. The COVID-19 pandemic, and states and territories’ economic responses, may have impacted training data, particularly from March 2020 onwards. Any comparison with previous years should be made with caution.
3. Some training providers do not report data to state training authorities until the final submission period, which can affect the completeness of data provided to NCVER. This limits comparisons that can be made from this publication to annual publications. Table 2 presents a distinct count of providers by submitting state and compares the publication count to the latest annual; numbers can also fluctuate as providers enter and exit the training market.

Table 2 Count of providers by submitting state and collection

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Submitting state | Annual 2021 | Jan-Sep 20 22 | Jan-Sep 2022  (% of Annual 2021) |
| New South Wales | 413 | 385 | 93.2 |
| Victoria | 449 | 442 | 98.4 |
| Queensland | 454 | 408 | 89.9 |
| South Australia | 204 | 193 | 94.6 |
| Western Australia | 182 | 171 | 94.0 |
| Tasmania | 100 | 98 | 98.0 |
| Northern Territory | 83 | 75 | 90.4 |
| Australian Capital Territory | 76 | 80 | 105.3 |
| Total | 1 518 | 1 420 | 93.5 |

1. Caution must be used for quarter-to-quarter comparisons as several jurisdictions have experienced implementation and system issues in different quarterly submissions.

### New South Wales

1. The increase in training activity for New South Wales in 2020 is due to the introduction of fee-free online short courses by TAFE NSW to people wanting to upskill during the COVID-19 pandemic. The majority of these fee-free short courses are locally developed skill sets.
2. NSW Private Providers reported locally developed skill sets for the first time in 2020. This training activity was previously reported as subject only enrolments.
3. Some training activity submitted by TAFE NSW between 2015 to 2020 may have been reported with an outcome of ‘70 – Continuing activity’ instead of activity not started, which is out of scope of reporting. TAFE NSW investigations to date have shown the impact on previously reported data is immaterial. Users of this information should be aware of this issue while conducting comparisons between years. Data on reporting hours and FYTEs are unaffected.

### South Australia

1. The number of apprentices and trainees undertaking off the job training in 2021 in South Australia has been underreported.  As a result, comparisons with previous periods should be made with caution until the data are rectified in future reporting.

### Western Australia

1. The increase in training activity for Western Australia in 2020 and 2021 is due to the introduction, by the Department of Training and Workforce Development, of a wide range of initiatives during the COVID-19 pandemic to encourage people to enrol fee-free or at much reduced rates in targeted areas of training both at the qualification and skill set level.
2. Due to poor response rates, Western Australia have comparably high missing client demographic across several attributes including labour force status, Indigenous status, disability status, and previous highest education level.

### Northern Territory

1. The decline in training activity in the Northern Territory between 2018 and 2019 was partly due to improvements in reporting practices in 2019. Previously, some students were enrolled in their training activity prior to commencing the actual training component, and their participation was reported as ‘continuing’. Using the ‘70 – continuing’ outcome identifier meant that the student and their training activity were ‘in scope’ for reporting purposes. This practice changed in the January-March 2019 period, and their participation was reported as ‘not yet started’. This ‘85 – not yet started’ outcome identifier was introduced in AVETMISS release 8.0, for reporting from 2018 onwards. Subjects with an outcome identifier of ‘85 – not yet started’ are not in scope of this publication.
2. Types of training reported by Northern Territory may be different in 2021 compared with previous years due to further reporting and policy changes.

## Australian Bureau of Statistics data

1. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) is an ABS-developed product that ranks areas in Australia according to relative socio-economic advantage and disadvantage. This publication uses the Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage (IRSD). Further information on SEIFA can be found at <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/censushome.nsf/home/seifa>.
2. Student remoteness is based on the Access/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+), produced by the Hugo Centre for Population and Housing, the standard ABS-endorsed measure of remoteness. For more details of ARIA+ refer to <https://arts.adelaide.edu.au/hugo-centre/services/aria>.

## ‘Not known’ information

1. Data are reported as ‘not known’ are due the following reasons:

* information was not collected
* a student has not responded to a question on the enrolment form
* invalid information was supplied
* where duplicate student records have conflicting demographic information; for example, where the same student is reported as both Indigenous and non-Indigenous.

1. Caution should be taken when using data which allow a 'not known' response.
2. The extent of ‘not known’ data nationally for selected variables is illustrated in the table below.

Table 3 Government-funded students with ‘not known’ data, January to September 2018 – 2022 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Jan-Sep  2018 | Jan-Sep  2019 | Jan-Sep  2020 | Jan-Sep  2021 | Jan-Sep  2022 |
| Indigenous status | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Disability status | 7.1 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.1 |
| Is a language other than English spoken at home | 6.0 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Labour force status | 10.5 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 10.1 | 10.0 |
| School status | 3.0 | 26.3 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.2 |

## Miscellaneous

1. In tables containing student remoteness, ‘offshore’ refers to the overseas postal addresses of students studying in Australia.