

RTO Information

This report presents summary information about the Registered Training Organisation

Name	MEGT (Australia) Ltd
Street Address	29 Ringwood Street
City/town/suburb	Ringwood
State	VIC
Post code	3134
NTIS number	3945

Summary Report

The Summary Report provides information about the RTO and a snapshot of results for the scales measured by the Learner Questionnaire (LQ) and Employer Questionnaire (EQ).

For each scale, the Summary Report presents information about the:

- count of responses used to calculate the scale score;
- average scale score; and
- variation in scale scores.

Scores are reported on the response scale of 0 to 100, where 0 means 'strongly disagree' and 100 means 'strongly agree'.

Results are provided for learners and/or employers depending on the data entered into SMART.

This Summary Report can be used to analyse the number, average and variation of the survey responses. Comparisons can be made across scales, to previous reports, or between learners and employers.

Summary statistics

Scale	Employers		
	Response count	Average score	Average variation
Trainer Quality	101	77.3	17.6
Effective Assessment	101	77.4	15.8
Clear Expectations			
Learning Stimulation			
Training Relevance	101	76.6	15.5
Competency Development	101	76.5	14.6
Training Resources	101	76.0	14.9
Effective Support	100	76.2	16.6
Active Learning			
Overall Satisfaction	101	79.0	16.2

Respondent Report

The Respondent Report provides summary information about learner demographics and training characteristics.

For each characteristic, the Respondent Report presents the:

- number of learners/employers in the population;
- number of survey respondents; and
- percentage of respondents.

Results are provided for learners and/or employers depending on the data entered into SMART.

This Respondent Report can be used to analyse the distribution of survey respondents across the RTO learner and/or employer population. It provides information on the representativeness and hence generalisability of the survey responses.

Characteristic		Employers		
		Population count	Respondent count	Respondent per cent
Field of education	Natural and physical sciences	0	0	0.0
	Information technology	0	0	0.0
	Engineering and related technologies	0	0	0.0
	Architecture and building	0	0	0.0
	Agriculture, environmental and related studies	0	0	0.0
	Health	0	0	0.0
	Education	0	0	0.0
	Management and commerce	0	0	0.0
	Society and culture	0	0	0.0
	Creative arts	0	0	0.0
	Food, hospitality and personal services	0	0	0.0
	Other	101	0	0.0
	TOTAL	101	0	0.0

Item Report

The Item Report presents information about learner and employer responses to individual items on the Learner Questionnaire (LQ) and/or Employer Questionnaire (EQ).

For each item, the Item Report presents information on the:

- number of valid responses to each response category 'strongly disagree' (SD), 'disagree' (D), 'agree' (A), 'strongly agree' (SA), the number of 'agreement' (AG) responses, and the number of missing (MI) responses;
- percentage of valid responses to each response category 'strongly disagree' (SD), 'disagree' (D), 'agree' (A), 'strongly agree' (SA), the number of 'agreement' (AG) responses, and the number of missing (MI) responses;
- average score; and
- variation in scores.

Scores are reported on the response scale of 0 to 100, where 0 means 'strongly disagree' and 100 means 'strongly agree'.

Results are provided for learners and/or employers depending on the data entered into SMART.

This Item Report can be used to analyse feedback on phenomenon measured by each LQ and/or EQ item. It provides detailed information that can be used to address specific aspects of education and training.

EQ response category numbers

	Item	SD	D	A	SA	AG	MI
EQ1	The training used up-to-date equipment, facilities and materials.	0	2	69	29	98	1
EQ2	The training organisation dealt satisfactorily with any issues or complaints.	0	3	61	34	95	3
EQ3	The training organisation was flexible enough to meet our needs.	1	0	64	36	100	0
EQ4	Assessment was at an appropriate standard.	0	1	66	34	100	0
EQ5	The training resources were appropriate for learner needs.	0	1	70	30	100	0
EQ6	The training reflected current practice.	0	10	57	33	90	1
EQ7	The training organisation developed customised programs.	1	3	62	29	91	6
EQ8	The training organisation provided good support for workplace training and assessment.	1	10	55	35	90	0
EQ9	The training focused on relevant skills.	0	8	57	35	92	1
EQ10	Our employees gained the skills they needed from this training.	0	0	67	34	101	0
EQ11	The training was effectively integrated into our organisation.	0	3	62	35	97	1
EQ12	Overall, we are satisfied with the training.	0	2	57	42	99	0
EQ13	We would recommend the training organisation to others.	0	2	64	35	99	0
EQ14	We would recommend the training to others.	0	2	58	41	99	0
EQ15	The training organisation gave appropriate recognition of existing knowledge and skills.	0	0	61	37	98	3
EQ16	The way employees were assessed was a fair test of their skills and knowledge.	0	2	62	37	99	0
EQ17	Trainers had good knowledge and experience of the industry.	0	4	57	40	97	0
EQ18	Assessments were based on realistic activities.	0	11	55	34	89	1
EQ19	Trainers were effective in their teaching.	0	2	61	38	99	0
EQ20	The training was an effective investment.	0	2	63	35	98	1
EQ21	Trainers were able to relate material to the workplace.	0	11	54	36	90	0
EQ22	The training had a good mix of theory and practice.	0	0	66	34	100	1
EQ23	The training organisation acted on feedback from employers.	1	10	56	32	88	2
EQ24	The training has helped our employees work with people.	0	4	67	30	97	0
EQ25	Training resources and equipment were in good condition.	0	0	70	28	98	3
EQ26	The training helped employees identify how to build on their current knowledge and skills.	0	0	65	35	100	1
EQ27	The training prepared employees well for work.	0	1	69	31	100	0
EQ28	Our employees gained the knowledge they needed from this training.	0	2	68	31	99	0
EQ29	The training prepared our employees for the demands of work.	0	2	71	27	98	1
EQ30	The training organisation clearly explained what was expected from employers.	0	0	63	38	101	0

EQ response category percentages

	Item	SD	D	A	SA	AG	MI
EQ1	The training used up-to-date equipment, facilities and materials.	0.0	2.0	69.0	29.0	98.0	1.0
EQ2	The training organisation dealt satisfactorily with any issues or complaints.	0.0	3.1	62.3	34.7	96.9	3.0
EQ3	The training organisation was flexible enough to meet our needs.	1.0	0.0	63.4	35.7	99.0	0.0
EQ4	Assessment was at an appropriate standard.	0.0	1.0	65.4	33.7	99.0	0.0
EQ5	The training resources were appropriate for learner needs.	0.0	1.0	69.3	29.7	99.0	0.0
EQ6	The training reflected current practice.	0.0	10.0	57.0	33.0	90.0	1.0
EQ7	The training organisation developed customised programs.	1.1	3.2	65.3	30.5	95.8	6.0
EQ8	The training organisation provided good support for workplace training and assessment.	1.0	9.9	54.5	34.7	89.1	0.0
EQ9	The training focused on relevant skills.	0.0	8.0	57.0	35.0	92.0	1.0
EQ10	Our employees gained the skills they needed from this training.	0.0	0.0	66.3	33.7	100.0	0.0
EQ11	The training was effectively integrated into our organisation.	0.0	3.0	62.0	35.0	97.0	1.0
EQ12	Overall, we are satisfied with the training.	0.0	2.0	56.4	41.6	98.0	0.0
EQ13	We would recommend the training organisation to others.	0.0	2.0	63.4	34.7	98.0	0.0
EQ14	We would recommend the training to others.	0.0	2.0	57.4	40.6	98.0	0.0
EQ15	The training organisation gave appropriate recognition of existing knowledge and skills.	0.0	0.0	62.3	37.8	100.0	3.0
EQ16	The way employees were assessed was a fair test of their skills and knowledge.	0.0	2.0	61.4	36.6	98.0	0.0
EQ17	Trainers had good knowledge and experience of the industry.	0.0	4.0	56.4	39.6	96.0	0.0
EQ18	Assessments were based on realistic activities.	0.0	11.0	55.0	34.0	89.0	1.0
EQ19	Trainers were effective in their teaching.	0.0	2.0	60.4	37.6	98.0	0.0
EQ20	The training was an effective investment.	0.0	2.0	63.0	35.0	98.0	1.0
EQ21	Trainers were able to relate material to the workplace.	0.0	10.9	53.5	35.7	89.1	0.0
EQ22	The training had a good mix of theory and practice.	0.0	0.0	66.0	34.0	100.0	1.0
EQ23	The training organisation acted on feedback from employers.	1.0	10.1	56.6	32.3	88.9	2.0
EQ24	The training has helped our employees work with people.	0.0	4.0	66.3	29.7	96.0	0.0
EQ25	Training resources and equipment were in good condition.	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	100.0	3.0
EQ26	The training helped employees identify how to build on their current knowledge and skills.	0.0	0.0	65.0	35.0	100.0	1.0
EQ27	The training prepared employees well for work.	0.0	1.0	68.3	30.7	99.0	0.0
EQ28	Our employees gained the knowledge they needed from this training.	0.0	2.0	67.3	30.7	98.0	0.0
EQ29	The training prepared our employees for the demands of work.	0.0	2.0	71.0	27.0	98.0	1.0
EQ30	The training organisation clearly explained what was expected from employers.	0.0	0.0	62.4	37.6	100.0	0.0

EQ item averages and variations

	Item	Average score	Average variation
EQ1	The training used up-to-date equipment, facilities and materials.	75.7	16.3
EQ2	The training organisation dealt satisfactorily with any issues or complaints.	77.2	17.6
EQ3	The training organisation was flexible enough to meet our needs.	77.9	17.8
EQ4	Assessment was at an appropriate standard.	77.6	16.4
EQ5	The training resources were appropriate for learner needs.	76.2	15.9
EQ6	The training reflected current practice.	74.3	20.6
EQ7	The training organisation developed customised programs.	75.1	18.8
EQ8	The training organisation provided good support for workplace training and assessment.	74.3	22.1
EQ9	The training focused on relevant skills.	75.7	20.0
EQ10	Our employees gained the skills they needed from this training.	77.9	15.8
EQ11	The training was effectively integrated into our organisation.	77.3	17.7
EQ12	Overall, we are satisfied with the training.	79.9	17.7
EQ13	We would recommend the training organisation to others.	77.6	17.1
EQ14	We would recommend the training to others.	79.5	17.6
EQ15	The training organisation gave appropriate recognition of existing knowledge and skills.	79.3	16.2
EQ16	The way employees were assessed was a fair test of their skills and knowledge.	78.2	17.3
EQ17	Trainers had good knowledge and experience of the industry.	78.5	18.6
EQ18	Assessments were based on realistic activities.	74.3	21.1
EQ19	Trainers were effective in their teaching.	78.5	17.4
EQ20	The training was an effective investment.	77.7	17.1
EQ21	Trainers were able to relate material to the workplace.	74.9	21.3
EQ22	The training had a good mix of theory and practice.	78.0	15.9
EQ23	The training organisation acted on feedback from employers.	73.4	21.8
EQ24	The training has helped our employees work with people.	75.2	17.4
EQ25	Training resources and equipment were in good condition.	76.2	15.1
EQ26	The training helped employees identify how to build on their current knowledge and skills.	78.3	16.0
EQ27	The training prepared employees well for work.	76.6	16.0
EQ28	Our employees gained the knowledge they needed from this training.	76.2	16.6
EQ29	The training prepared our employees for the demands of work.	75.0	16.0
EQ30	The training organisation clearly explained what was expected from employers.	79.2	16.2

Group Report

The Group Report provides information about each nominated group and a snapshot of results for the scales measured by the Learner Questionnaire (LQ) and Employer Questionnaire (EQ).

For each scale, the Group Report presents information about the:

- count of responses used to calculate the scale score;
- average scale score; and
- variation in scale scores.

Scores are reported on the response scale of 0 to 100, where 0 means 'strongly disagree' and 100 means 'strongly agree'.

Results are provided for learners and/or employers depending on the data entered into SMART.

This Group Report can be used to analyse the number, average and variation of the survey responses. Comparisons can be made across scales, to previous reports, or between learners and employers.

Group 6 - Employer Satisfaction survey

Scale	Learners		Employers	
	Average score	Average variation	Average score	Average variation
Trainer Quality			77.3	17.6
Effective Assessment			77.4	15.8
Clear Expectations				
Learning Stimulation				
Training Relevance			76.6	15.5
Competency Development			76.5	14.6
Training Resources			76.0	14.9
Effective Support			76.2	16.6
Active Learning				
Overall Satisfaction			79.0	16.2

Comments Report

The Comments Report lists the comments provided to the two open-ended questions on the Learner Questionnaire (LQ) and/or Employer Questionnaire (EQ).

Both the LQ and EQ contain questions that seek information about the best aspects of training, and about the aspects of training most in need of improvement. The report provides a print out of these.

EQ best aspects

Everything

EQ needs improvement

Nothing

Administration Report

The Administration Report provides information provided by the training organisation on survey management. It provides a print out of responses entered into the SMART system.

Learner survey feedback	
Staff days spent managing learner survey	
Cost of direct expenses of learner survey	
Problems encountered during learner survey	
Employer survey feedback	
Staff days spent managing employer survey	
Cost of direct expenses of employer survey	
Problems encountered during employer survey	

Registering body report

19 May 2017

RTO Information

NTIS number	3945
Name	MEGT (Australia) Ltd
Street Address	29 Ringwood Street
City/town/suburb	Ringwood
State	VIC
Post code	3134

Learner and employer response

	Learners	Employers
Response count (number)	0	101
Population count (number)		101
Response rate (per cent)		100.0

Learner and employer feedback

Scale	Learners		Employers	
	Average score	Average variation	Average score	Average variation
All scales			76.9	17.8
Trainer Quality			77.3	17.6
Effective Assessment			77.4	15.8
Clear Expectations				
Learning Stimulation				
Training Relevance			76.6	15.5
Competency Development			76.5	14.6
Training Resources			76.0	14.9
Effective Support			76.2	16.6
Active Learning				
Overall Satisfaction			79.0	16.2

Survey contexts and use

Completion of this section is optional and may be used by the RTO to provide information and an explanation of the data provided.

Information	Explanatory notes
Specific contexts to consider when interpreting survey results	
Main ways data has been used for continuous improvement	