Diploma and Advanced Diploma of Meat Processing Project

Summary of Feedback, Responses and Actions

April 2020

This project includes the review of three qualifications and approximately seventeen units of competency, as well as the development of two new units of competency within the Australian Meat Processing Training Package. The final draft materials were developed as a result of feedback provided by stakeholders and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) during the validation period 4 December 2019 – 9 March 2020.

A validation meeting was held on the 12 December 2019 where all documents were validated through this process.

Validation feedback was also received from a variety of stakeholders around the country via phone, emails and surveys. The table below provides an overview of the groups and jurisdictions that have provided feedback during this phase of the project.

	ACT	NSW	NT	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	National
Industry (employer / employee)		■		■	■		■		■
Industry association (includes feedback from Industry Advisory Bodies)									■
Union									
Registered Training Organisation (RTO) (includes feedback from CMMs)		■		■			■		
Government department			■					■	

* Note: Email reminders about the validation phase were sent to all SMEs and stakeholders who had registered their interest in the project, but this project was impacted due to the bushfires, floods and COVID-19. Some stakeholders who did respond to the reminder emails stated that where their industry has a representation on the Technical Advisory Committee they are happy to leave the validation sign-off in their hands, having already provided their feedback during the first draft public consultation stage.

Below is a summary of the issues raised for the draft qualifications and units of competency developed and reviewed for the Diploma and Advanced Diploma project, and how these issues have been dealt with. This involves a consideration of the information provided, views of industry stakeholders and from people who are part of the Subject Matter Expert Working Group process. Resolutions are constructed to consider the needs and views of stakeholders to the extent possible, and to comply with the Standards for Training Package 2012. The resolutions may represent a compromise on one or more stakeholder views with the aim of a workable outcome for industry, State and Territory Training Authorities (STAs) and training providers.

Acronyms - PC – performance criteria, PE – performance evidence, KE – knowledge evidence, AC – assessment conditions, SMEs – Subject Matter Experts

Please use the menu below to navigate to the feedback you wish to view.

Table of Contents

Summary of validation feedback on Qualifications

Revised qualifications

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General comments		
Government department, Western Australia	Via email (post validation meeting) Many thanks for sending through the information for validation for the following meat processing projects: - Diploma and Advanced Diploma in Meat Processing Project; - Game Harvesting Auditing Project; - Halal Meat Project; and - Poultry Processing Project. The STA has distributed the information to stakeholders in Western Australia. We have not received any feedback on the projects. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.	Thank you for the feedback.
RTO, Vic	The deletion of AMP50115 Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing) appears sensible and the revised qualifications all in order	Thank you for the feedback.
AMP50215 Diploma of Meat Processing		
Validation committee: - RTO, QLD - RTO, QLD - Employer, Vic - Employer, National	During the meeting, the validation committee approved the following motions: - that the project consultation undertaken was adequate and appropriate - that the Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing) should be deleted	Thank you to the committee for their time and support.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
• that the revised qualifications be approved and the AQF levels confirmed • that the two new units of competency (AMPMGT511 and AMPMGT512) be approved • that the seventeen revised AMP units of competency were suitable. • that the imported units of competency were all acceptable/appropriate	
AMP60115 Advanced Diploma of Meat Processing	
Validation committee: • RTO, QLD • RTO, QLD • Employer, Vic • Employer, National	During the meeting, the validation committee approved the following motions: • that the project consultation undertaken was adequate and appropriate • that the Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing) should be deleted • that the revised qualifications be approved and the AQF levels confirmed • that the two new units of competency (AMPMGT511 and AMPMGT512) be approved • that the seventeen revised AMP units of competency were suitable. • that the imported units of competency were all acceptable/appropriate	Thank you to the committee for their time and support.

Proposed qualifications for deletion

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMP50115 Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing)	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
Industry, SA	Supported the deletion of this qualification via the feedback survey. The reason given was: This qualification has been identified as having low enrolment with no objection for deletion.	Thank you for the support.
Validation committee: • RTO, QLD • RTO, QLD • Employer, Vic • Employer, National	The committee approved the deletion of this qualification at the validation meeting.	Thank you to the committee for their time and support.
RTO, Vic	The deletion of AMP50115 Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing) appears sensible and the revised qualifications all in order	Thank you for the feedback.

Summary of validation feedback on Units of Competency

New units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPMGT511 Manage feedlot facility		
RTO, Vic	This unit is quite unusual, has very, very high demands and does not comply with the Standards for Training Packages. The language of the PCs is ambiguous and does not always provide clear criteria against which a learner's performance can be measured. The required Foundation Skills would in no way support the achievement of the technical skills and knowledge demanded in the unit and the requirement to have "managed a feedlot for a minimum of six months" contravenes the essence of competency based training. We request that this unit is comprehensively revised before being presented for endorsement. Application 'This unit applies to individuals who take personal responsibility and exercise autonomy in undertaking complex work. They analyse information and exercise judgement to complete a range of advanced skilled activities.' The above text appears to be reflective of the AQF descriptors, which applies to qualifications rather than units. The unit outcome seems more reflective of a qualification outcome e.g. Feedlot Facility Manager. Not only are they managing the business operations and the feedlot animals (including monitoring their health), they are maintaining the business operations, managing and inducting staff, managing the customers and dealing with complaints. I note the Diploma includes BSBFIM501 Manage budgets and financial plans, and BSBMGT605	This unit underwent a significant rewrite in response to the feedback received with the assistance of an Independent Quality Assurance Panel member, experienced unit developers, and industry stakeholders. The following changes were made in response to the feedback: • The application was rewritten to provide greater clarity • Where appropriate the word 'Ensure' was replaced with 'confirm' • Element 1 - 'Manage' replaced with 'plant and monitor' • PC 1.2 had the reference to business plans and budgets removed, as these are complex tasks that are covered by Diploma level units in their own right • Qualifying statements and workplace standards were added to PCs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.7 to provide clearer intent • Qualifying statements and workplace standards were added to PCs 2.2, 2.4 to provide clearer intent • Qualifying statements were added to PCs 3.2, 3.4, 3.6 to provide clearer intent • PCs 3.6 and 3.7 reworded for better expression • a new PC was added to Element 5 – 5.1 Develop strategies to promote a positive workplace culture • Qualifying statements were added to PCs 5.3, and 6.4 • Three more skills were added to the Foundation Skills table for reading, writing and numeracy • The PE requirement for managing a feedlot facility for six months was replaced with 'monitored own or other staff member's completion of required documentation which covers at least a six month period'

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution

Develop and implement a business plan so why are these included in a unit?
 	
1.1 Prepare short and long term feedlot operational plans
1.2 Develop business plans, budgets and production schedules
1.3 Ensure security of all assets including land, livestock and inventories
1.4 Ensure compliance with applicable regulations and Standards
1.5 Benchmark and analyse weekly and monthly feedlot performance
1.6 Manage record-keeping requirements
1.7 Drive a continuous improvement culture
• Each of the above could be elements in their own right. How are the above actions to be performed? None of these tasks are expressed as a Standard (and therefore don't meet the Standards for TP UOC template (1.2) with the possible exception of 1.4 Ensure compliance with applicable regulations and Standards (but what are you ensuring is compliant?) and 2.5 Manage manure waste according to established organisational procedures/industry standards
I don't like to see 'Ensure' in pc's – what is the assessor assessing? Suggest 'Confirm (whatever), in conjunction with workplace practices and procedures and applicable regulations and Standards' is a better expression.
PC 1.2 There's quite a lot involved in developing business plans and budgets! The Foundation Skills should include reading and writing skills to support this at the very least.
PC 2. 1Oversee repair and maintenance of plant, equipment and structures as per established program including feed mills, trucks and loaders, stock water,
	• The following were added to the PE to ensure the PCs are covered:
	   o demonstrated the ability to identify and meet the service needs of a meat processor.
	   o documented a feedlot operational plan
	   o managed and monitored feedlot animals to ensure animal health and welfare, nutrition and traceability requirements are met
	   o 'completed an assessment of all facilities' rewritten to add 'and ensured plant, equipment and structures were appropriately cleaned and kept in good repair
	• Added the following to the KE:
	   o health and safety considerations, including manual handling
	   o relevant animal welfare and biosecurity requirements
	   o National Livestock Identification System
	   o strategies for training and managing staff
	• Assessment conditions:
	   o Removed the requirement for a minimum of six months in a feedlot management position
	
	After the unit was rewritten it was emailed to the SMEWG to confirm the unit was valid and met industry requirements for the role.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
fences, yards, and buildings – the Diploma already includes an elective AMPMGT505 Manage maintenance systems? Poor expression (below) 3.6 Monitor animals closely to watch for early signs of health issues 3.7 Work closely with Assist the veterinarian in treating the animals to ensure achieve optimal animal health Performance Evidence: The evidence that the learner has managed a feedlot facility for a minimum of six months. Doesn't meet the principles of competency-based training. I note the Assessment Conditions specify that the assessment must be carried out in a feedlot facility, however it appears it would be very difficult to simulate the delivery of this unit. The Performance Evidence is silent on the volume of evidence to be performed ie how many times the evidence must be provided over the 6 month period described. Presumably, the Assessor is to imagine this is to be covered at least once during the 6 month period as stipulated in the Assessment Conditions? Knowledge Evidence This only appears to focus on the animal management aspects. What about financial management (budgets, expenditure, allocation of funds etc), knowledge of facility and equipment maintenance and management, business plans, operational plans, production schedules; knowledge of relevant legislation and industry standards etc., 5.2 Oversee efficient and productive personnel management, training and deployment of staff Seems to me you would need knowledge of industry/workplace standard training methods and also human resource management to perform the above. Not sure how you would assess 'productive'"	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
RTO, QLD	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate	Thank you for your time and support of the project.
RTO, QLD	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate	Thank you for your time and support of the project.
Industry, Vic	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate	Thank you for your time and support of the project.
Industry, National	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate	thank you for your time and support of the project.
AMPMGT512 Manage supply chain and enterprise animal welfare performance		
Industry, SA	Answered 'yes' to the question 9: In your view does this final draft meet the needs of industry?	Thank you for the feedback.
RTO, Vic	1. The unit AMPMGT512 Manage supply chain and enterprise animal welfare performance is also rather unusual. It has some of the same ambiguities in the Performance Criteria, lacks any guidance on Foundation Skills and has the longest list of Performance Evidence requirements that I have come across. Again we request that this unit is significantly revised before being presented for endorsement. AMPMGT512 Manage supply chain and enterprise animal welfare performance 4.3 Ensure staff training systems are in place to that meet organisational requirements – Establish or Confirm would be better Then this – how do you measure this, and against what?: 'Implement/develop strategies to foster etc' would be better	This unit underwent a significant rewrite with the assistance of an Independent Quality Assurance Panel member, experienced unit developers, and industry stakeholders. The following changes were made in response to the feedback: • The application was rewritten to provide greater clarity • PCs in element 1 revised to remove ambiguity, and a PC added 'Provide information and training to foster supplier compliance with organisational requirements' so that the performance evidence was clearly linked to the PCs • PCs 2.3 and 2.5, and 2.7 revised to remove ambiguity • Evaluate replaces with 'assess' in PC 3.1 • PC 4.3 – 'at least annually removed' • Confirm replaced with 'ensure' in PC 4.3 • PC 4.4 reworded to add 'Implement strategies to foster a culture of continuous improvement'

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	4.4 Foster a culture of continuous performance improvement 4.2 Assess and re-evaluate established performance indicators at least annually - this is not the place for describing how many times competency needs to be demonstrated – should be in the Performance Evidence	- Two more skills added to foundation skills table, for reading and oral communication - Two points added to knowledge evidence: 'measures of animal welfare at the various points in the supply chain' and 'strategies for assessing, recording and monitoring animal welfare at various points in the supply chain The performance evidence for this unit was not considered unduly long, there are only eight requirements, other units at this level in other packages with similar roles, such as AHC, have much longer requirements. After the unit was rewritten it was emailed to the SMEWG to confirm the unit was valid and met industry requirements for the role.
Industry, SA	As long as animal welfare is considered in all parts of the venue, from transport unloading through to the kill room. Kill room needs to have species specific equipment and design features. Handling techniques to be species specific. The best thing I am guessing is to see if the reports that are being prepared on Meramist in QLD by State and Federal government, that their recommendations are incorporated. Not sure how timings will line up, but I believe reports are due in March	The draft unit was further reviewed by a SME in light of the comments. This SME has been working closely with Meramist delivering animal welfare training there. The following modifications were made to the unit: Commonwealth' added to application, third paragraph just before state/territory. PC 2.5 reworded to '2.5 Report breaches of regulations to relevant authorities' to 'respond to detected breaches of regulations and standards according to workplace requirements. PC 4.3 Added 'and assessment' so it reads '4.3 Ensure staff training and assessment systems are in place to meet organisational requirements'. PC 5.1 Added 'opportunities for' improvements, so it reads 'Actively assess published research to identify potential opportunities for improvements to supplier and enterprise animal welfare practices', 5.3 added 'the' before organisation's so it reads '5.3 Prepare

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		documentation which details the organisation's approach and commitment to animal welfare, with evidentiary support'. Performance evidence - pullet point three, added 'reviewed' to developed or updated appropriate documentation and record keeping requirements to enterprise standards. Knowledge evidence: 1. added bullet point •　　　measures of animal welfare at the various points in the supply chain; 2. added 'best practice to' point 4 •　　　animal behaviour and best practice handling techniques; added point 5 - •　　　strategies for assessing, recording and monitoring animal welfare at various points in the supply chain
RTO, QLD	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate.	Thank you for your time and support of the project.
RTO, QLD	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate.	Thank you for your time and support of the project.
Industry, Vic	SME was provided with the revised draft of the unit after significant rewrite and asked to confirm the unit was valid. They confirmed the revised unit was appropriate.	Thank you for your time and support of the project.

Revised units of competency

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
General comments on the revised units		
RTO, Vic	In general the reviewed units appear sound. However I believe that more appropriate use may be made of the Foundation Skills field in some of the units and I would like to have seen some improvements to the Assessment Requirements. The Performance Evidence field is	In reviewing and validating the units the SMEWG were careful to ensure that where foundation skills were not explicit in the PC these were included in the foundation skills table. However many of the meat industry units do include foundations skill explicitly in the PCs of the unit, which the Standards do allow.

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
provided as an opportunity for industry to specify the evidence that must be presented by the learner for assessment (the product and /or frequency / volume of performance). It is not to be used to provide a precis of the Performance Criteria which is often merely confusing and misleading. Also please note that every aspect listed in the Performance Evidence field must be directly related to the Performance Criteria. It must be remembered that all items listed as Performance Evidence must be assessed on several occasions by the assessor. In some revised units the lists of both Performance Evidence and Knowledge Evidence are excessively long.	The SMEWG considered that the performance evidence listed do relate to the PCs. The lists for many units can be long, however these are units at AQF level 5 and 6 covering complex management roles in the industry.
RTO, Vic	Assessment Conditions * a minimum of three different forms of assessment must be used I would have thought it was the core business of the RTO to determine their own assessment strategy, as required by the Standards for RTO and not part of the role of industry to tell them how to do it. The 6 month time frame should be removed from the Assessment Conditions – the Performance Evidence should describe how demonstration of competency is evidenced ie by doing such and how many times it needs to be demonstrated."	The SMEWG agreed that the six month time frame can be removed from that particular unit, and this was reworded that the individual must be assessed using documentation covering a six month period, not that they have to be in the role for six months. Regarding the minimum of three forms of assessment, the meat industry has long considered that adding this requirement ensures the consistency of practice and fosters confidence in the training system. This requirement has been in the AMP Australian Meat Industry Training Package (in various forms) for every version. The inclusion has ensured consistency of practice across RTOs and fostered industry confidence in the qualifications and assessment practices. For role-related Units, the three forms are usually prescribed because the industry expects evidence of: • performance at production speed • understanding and application of the underpinning knowledge • demonstration of consistency of performance. • The industry expects the assessment process to: • align with the Work Instruction and company processes • reflect the regulatory and customer requirements • confirm worker ability to work effectively at production speed • include the tools and technology used at the workplace

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
		- confirm the worker's ability to work at the level of independence expected at that AQF level - confirm the worker's ability to work safely, hygienically, and as a team player. The demonstration of competency of meat industry personnel to both domestic and international reviewers of our industry requires that operators have a: - knowledge of the underpinning principles for the tasks they perform, and that this knowledge has been formally assessed - that the entity has ensured that the individual is under close supervision / tutoring while in training and assessed as competent before being left under lighter supervision (signed off on a work instruction) - that a final assessment confirms that the operator has been compliant over a period of time.
AMPMGT501 Design and manage the food safety system		
Industry, SA	I note your query in 5.2 of the unit: 5.2 Promptly report food safety incidents and non-compliance to relevant authorities 'Not sure that this is possible - what if there are none?' I think all meat premises will need to be registered with the state regulator/authority so reporting should be fine. I would however consider adding "where appropriate" as not all food safety incidences will necessarily require reporting to the regulator/authority. Or would the use of "significant" rather than appropriate i.e. in the context of food safety risk assessment?"	The unit has been revised to include the word 'significant'
AMPMGT502 Manage new product or process development		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	No direct comments received	
AMPMGT503 Develop and assess a meat retailing business opportunity		
Government department, NT	I've just had a quick look at one of the revised units AMPMGT503 Develop and assess a meat retailing business opportunity and really do have to make some comment in regard to one of the evidence requirements: There must be evidence that the individual has on at least one occasion: • related to people from a range of social, cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and with varying physical and mental abilities Apart from being the most ridiculous hair brained requirement that has absolutely nothing to do with the skills and knowledge required to identify, develop and assess a new business activity or opportunity for a meat retailing enterprise; this is almost a word for word cut and paste from CPPDSM4005A - Establish and build client-agency relationships. I realise that inclusion of this is not a joke because it is included in the previous two versions of the unit. However after a search on VOCSTATS can find no evidence of any enrolments in this unit whatsoever so would question this unit being maintained within the training package at all.	The evidence requirement referred to has been removed from the unit. The unit will still be retained in the qualification despite the lack of enrolments, to ensure sufficient electives for meat retail managers in the Diploma. The feedback is correct that the unit has had no enrolments – it is a unit from the AMP50115 Diploma of Meat Processing (Meat Retailing), which this project is proposing to delete as this qualification has had very low enrolments. In deleting this qualification however the SMEWG wanted to ensure that managers in the meat retail sector of the industry would have suitable electives to choose from if they undertook the AMP50215 Diploma of Meat Processing, which is why the unit needs to remain in the training package.
AMPMGT504 Develop, manage and maintain quality systems		
	No direct comments received.	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
AMPMGT505 Manage maintenance systems	
No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT506 Manage utilities and energy	
No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT507 Manage and improve meat industry plant operations	
No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT508 Manage environmental impacts of meat processing operations	
No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT509 Manage, maintain and continuously improve workplace health and safety plans and systems	
No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT510 Manage transportation of meat, meat products and meat by-products	
No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT601 Benchmark to manage and improve enterprise performance	

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues		Consideration and Proposed Resolution
	No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT602 Monitor and manage organisational legal responsibilities		
	No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT603 Manage meat processing systems to maintain and improve product quality		
	No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT604 Manage effective operation of meat enterprise cold chain and refrigeration systems		
	No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT605 Assess and purchase livestock		
	No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT606 Analyse and develop enterprise systems for new opportunities		
	No direct comments received.	
AMPMGT607 Establish new markets		

Stakeholder Comments and Identified Issues	Consideration and Proposed Resolution
No direct comments received.	