



Workforce Futures:

Towards an Australian Workforce Development Strategy

Skills Australia would like to hear your views on *Workforce Futures* and welcomes your written submission by **6 November 2009**.

To assist with the analysis of submissions received, we request that feedback is provided using this template. Your co-operation is appreciated.

Submissions received may be published by Skills Australia or quoted. Please indicate in the space provided below if you would like your submission to remain confidential.

5

Please email submissions to secretariat@skillsaustralia.gov.au

Submission information

Organisation	SIRF Roundtables / LEAN Rt
Contact	Joanne Law
Phone	03 9697 1106
Email	Joanne.law@sirfrt.com.au

Do you agree to the publication of your submission?

Please check one.

- I agree to Skills Australia publishing this submission and/or attributing quotes.
- This submission is to remain confidential but I agree to Skills Australia quoting content anonymously.
- This submission is to remain confidential.



Skills
Australia

Workforce Futures:

Background Paper One

What does the future hold? Meeting Australia's skill needs

The *Workforce Futures Overview* paper raised a number of questions relating to Skills Australia's proposed approach to developing an Australian Workforce Development Strategy. In this section, we seek your feedback on questions relevant to meeting Australia's skill needs. *Background Paper One* at www.skillsaustralia.gov.au/Publications_and_Resources highlights a number of issues for discussion which are relevant to your response.

Please provide feedback to these questions in the boxes below. A space has been provided at the end of the section to provide feedback on other issues you wish to raise.

Future skill needs and projections

Q1. Are Skills Australia's interpretations of our future skill needs reasonable? Is there other evidence or analyses that should be considered?

There appears to be little value given to certificate I and II qualifications among industry and I agree with the indication that there should be a movement away from these levels.

Certificate III and IV however are at a level where significant skill increase can occur if the training is appropriate to the needs of industry who employ the people undergoing the training. The past practice of specialising the responsibility for training into a HR function and away from operational leadership is something that has to be broken down so that industry is demanding real skill improvement from training that their workers participate in. Without this these levels of certificate training can be rubber stamping of existing levels of competence.

The results from the recent Melbourne Cup show that picking winners is a difficult task no matter how strong the evidence or the degree of analyses that takes place. If Skills Australia tries to predict/guess the occupations that will be required in the future and discourages others you risk distorting the market or forcing people to undertake training in something they have no interest in. A situation that is unlikely to lead to a long term career choice.

There are many people who have done no post secondary training for a number of reasons and bridging that gap by going straight to diploma or higher is unrealistic.

A risk-based approach

Q2. What is your response to our proposal that governments should adopt a risk-based approach to skills planning? What do you see as the respective roles of industry, governments, education and training organisations and individuals in planning?

The first three criteria for the risk based approach are Ok although information about the way it is intended to be applied is sketchy.

- *What would it actually mean if an occupation was classified as a priority one?*
- *What would it mean if it isn't?*
- *Are we talking about funding or not, quotas or ???*

There isn't clear information about what would happen if an occupation is identified for National Planning.

The forth criteria is concerning "there is sufficient information to assess the future demand for a skill." Lack of information doesn't seem to be a good criteria if the intention is to limit support for occupations that are not seen as being in demand. The lag time before government departments are able to notice demand and then to change lists such as this will be long unless the process is set up to be able to be dynamic. Challenging as it seems likely that the risk based approach will create shortages if the modeling is wrong (as it is almost certainly going to be)

Roles:

A mechanism for industry to alert to trend changes so that the data is as fresh as possible.

Government – track the trends by collecting data from industry in a timely manner (self service website to notify how long it takes to recruit required skills, through job adds etc and be prepared to adjust if the settings are wrong)

Education – provide access to the latest trend for employability of the various qualifications. Work with industry to establish a good fit with training – provide feedback to the Industry skills councils if qualificatons are out of date and don't meet the needs of the current economy.

Individuals – they are the beneficiaries/victims of the risk based approach depending if you get it right or wrong.

Investment to support workforce demands

Q3. How can we best use current investments to support our emerging workforce demands? What types of interventions may this require from governments, education and training organisations, industry and others?

It is important that access to support is easy and based on fair criteria.

Don't create more buerocracy to adminster funding programs that are based on subjective judgement and on set time frames such as the PPP program for existing workers in SA.

Currently previous qualifications of diploma or above or certificates less than 7 years old, make people ineligible for traineeship funding even if they are in a totally unrelated field. Understanding the current trends of people moving employers and occupations that seems to be short sighted.

It would be better to support productivity by ensuring that people have the skills they need. I'm not advocating open season for people to continually be in training but at the moment there is no opportunity to put a business case for why there would be value in the person undertaking the training.

The other area of concern regarding funding is the special program funding is given to specific organisations who are large enough to put in winning tender proposals. Some result in good outcomes but often the services provided are generic and not targeted and result in people being churned through a system that gives them a piece of paper but few skills.

What would be better?

Training programs that provide real benefit to the employers so that they support the trainees with the time and resources to apply what they learn in their training. Training providers and employers could work together to establish training programs where the right people are included and there is strong support. Criteria regarding funding eligibility should be clear and fair with exceptions to the rules allowed based on demonstrated benefits.

Funding should not be done as a once a year application with subject decisions made by public servants regarding allocation of funds. It is a very expensive and inefficient way to support training.

Proposed actions

Q4. Do you have any comments about any of the specific actions suggested in Section 4.3 of Background Paper One?

The suggestings may be helpful especially if they lead to a reduction of the fragmentation between states in Australia regarding training. Duplication and the differneces between the various states imposes a cost and constraint on national training providers who have to be aware of the differences in each area.

A regular “snapshot” to give employers and potential trainees good, timely information would be useful. Particularly if communicated simply as a “dashboard” or other similar visual communication strategy. Good information contained in dense reports is of little value to busy managers – they struggle to have the attention available to find the information that would be valueable for them.

I still feel that the information provided about what the proposal for the “new planning methodology.” means specifically is unclear. Saying that there is going to be a new planning methodology isn’t a specific action.

The impact of government policies is apparent in the areas you highlight. Casual workers – underemployed people who most likely don’t have the resources to pay for training themselves and who are excluded from trainee funding. The value and importance of government funded training in ecouraging people to train is evident in the gap between those who are excluded (casual workers) and those who qualify.

Low literacy and numeracy levels – *the WELLS program appears to be not a very successful model. We don’t deliver training under WELLS but people have told me that it is very basic and of little value. The stigma of attending a “remedial training” in literacy or numeracy is a factor particularly for those people who are native english speakers who were failed by the school system.*

It would be better to incorporate this type of learning into other training programs however many training providers do not necessarily have the skills to train these skills. We don’t. It would be great if some excellent, innovative, FUN programs were developed by specialist providers who partner with other providers to incorporate the learning into helping people to achieve success in the other training they are doing. Supporting a collaborative approach between training providers in this area would be a great approach Unless these skills are sensitively and respectfully taught there will be low take up..

Foundation skills *are best taught on the job so an interesting approach would be to look at how employers can be supported to improve their foundtaion skills training. For example training in establishing visual work instructions and standard work so that new people can access information about what to do as often as they need to until they learn*

what to do. The assumption that putting someone through a class and assessing their immediate knowledge is going to lead to skills development in any degree. The vast majority of people need to practice skills to develop any degree of real competence let alone mastery. Education has to be able to provide the opportunity for them.

Note previous comments about making access to funding more of a “pull system” so that it can be accessed when the trainees/employer are ready not at arbitrary points in time. Work based learning is highly valuable but it needs to be outcome based not time based. Setting time requirements is a disincentive for employers to commit to training contracts however if there is a clear link between the training and productivity then there will be commitment on the employers part and likely more time made available for the trainee to practice their new skills than would be mandated.

Support Work based learning – as mentioned currently work based learning is predominately through apprenticeships and traineeships. The funding is generally only available for qualifications over 18 months in duration. This is a significant disincentive in busy workplaces. Consideration of funding parts of qualifications on a per unit basis would be interesting. There would be a great increase in vocational training, especially in areas of need such as improving management skills. A recent report on a benchmarking study on Australian management skills in manufacturing highlights a need. <http://www.innovation.gov.au/General/Corporate/Pages/ManagementMattersinAustralia.aspx>

Impact and ways to improve Skills Australia’s proposed approach

Q5. How might our suggestions impact on your organisation/industry? Can you see advantages or disadvantages to our proposals? What could we do about it? What else should we be considering to make our future planning even better?

We are a specialist training provider delivering Certificate IV in Competitive Manufacturing to manufacturers around Australia as part of a lean Competitive Manufacturing implementation program. We try to work with the key people with each site and this always includes the senior management group to ensure that the training delivered is aligned with their strategic direction. That ensures that the trainees learn skills that are absolutely relevant to their employer as well as being transferable to other future employers.

The government traineeship funding is essential for a number of the companies we work with. Without it they simply would not be able to take on our program. A threat to our work would be if certainly regarding funding eligibility was removed and it all became a once again subjective award process like the PPP program or a grant application. That would be a significant backward step and poor process. Please don’t make employer incentives less flexible.

If the rules for eligibility were relaxed so that the people who need the training were able to be funded it would be an advantage for our business. Currently the employer pays the

difference or the people miss out on getting a qualification. We deliver our training and we always wear the cost of having more people attend the training sessions we deliver than are paying.

Other comments

Q6. Do you have any other comments in relation to meeting Australia's skill needs or issues raised in *Background Paper One*?

Another idea that seems to be hinted at but not stated clearly in the background paper one is setting up centres or clusters. As a small specialist training provider that would be a real threat as we'd likely be excluded and have even more training providers competing against us backed by government money. There seems to be a trend in doing this and I don't think that it is a good step.

Rather than setting up exclusive arrangements money would be better spent on allowing existing providers (who would have the capacity to expand if there was demand for their offerings) to provide services as long as there was employer partnership showing that the program was of value. Let the market decide where the value is, not through costly and wasteful "pilot" programs where the government tries to pick winners and in cases fails to continue to support programs that actually are valuable once the pilot funding ceases.

A large proportion of government support for vocational training goes directly to educational institutions such as TAFE's who are in the main part inflexible and not really outcome focused. We are not an RTO we partner with RTO's to provide our services. We've partnered with TAFE's and private RTO's and have found the TAFE's to be bureaucratic and wasteful in their processes.

If you want to develop a system that is responsive to the needs of the market then pouring money into institutions that are inflexible and have difficulty in changing is not a good investment. Your last statement indicates you understand the importance of workplace based delivery and work integrated learning. This is the entire focus of our business and it is challenging not the least in re-educating our customers to understand that the responsibility for the learning and development of their people is something of concern for their line management not something that is the responsibility for their HR departments. Getting alignment between training and the improvement strategies of the business is critical if you want training to be linked to productivity and performance improvement. Getting good feedback to the Industry skills councils so that the qualifications that providers are able to train against are up to date and relevant. For example many are lagging in incorporating Lean principals into their qualifications.

The government targets in Appendix A of 3.6 million additional people with qualifications at or above Cert III by 2020 is going to require a considerable effort. Employers are not

going to be able to bear the full cost of it. It will require resources from the government, a greater respect for skills that people develop regardless of how they are developed (eg good RPL processes with gap training) and reducing the barriers to training such as different rules for different states and subjective decisions about what programs will be supported.

The booting of education funding in 2008 and 2009 has been very difficult for non-government training providers to access. Some states it was just given to government funded training and elsewhere it has been a once a year competitive process that is very much contrary to the way a training relationship develops in the real world.

I am not aware that the loading you mention being made available for institutions enrolling students from low socio-economic backgrounds is being flowed out to private providers. The barriers are more than just financial. The inflexible semesters and training delivery makes them very difficult for single mothers or people who are working (in low paid jobs with irregular hours and inflexible bosses)

There needs to be a shift in flow with education and funding from push to pull. These are lean concepts which I hope I can explain. Push means focusing on the process and putting out the offering regardless of customer demand. This involves a lot of waste – like a hamburger shop that makes up a pile of burgers before lunch time on the grounds of efficiency but without really knowing what the level of demand will be. They then have to throw some away and the customers get something that isn't very fresh.

The other approach – pull is about the customer triggering the delivery when they are ready for it. In our burger shop analogy it means making to order when the customer is ready and to their exact requirements. It might take a few minutes more but the end product is far superior.

Institutional education is very much a push system. A program is put together, advertised and run if enough people can be attracted to put together a class. Many people who would like to attend can't because it's run at the wrong time.

The role the government should be playing is helping education to become more customer focused and demand driven making use of alternative delivery methods such as recordings of training sessions, e-learning, workplace based practice at the convenience of the students and flexible design of delivery. There are barriers that providers have to the adoption of these techniques.



Workforce Futures:

Background Paper Two

Powering the workplace Realising Australia's skill potential

The *Workforce Futures Overview* paper raised a number of questions relating to Skills Australia's proposed approach to developing an Australian Workforce Development Strategy. In this section, we seek your feedback on questions relevant to realising Australia's skill potential by powering the workplace. *Background Paper Two* at www.skillsaustralia.gov.au/Publications_and_Resources highlights a number of issues for discussion which are relevant to your response.

Please provide feedback to these questions in the boxes below. A space has been provided at the end of the section to provide feedback on other issues you wish to raise.

Time for the next step in progressing Australian workforce development?

Q7. Is it timely to adopt an innovative approach to skills that includes a focus on how skills are used and is linked to the way work is organised? How relevant do you find the definition of workforce development offered by Skills Australia (see Paper Two, Section 1.1)? How could it be improved?

Yes the award of a qualification does not directly relate to the acquisition and retention of skills. Skills can only be said to be acquired if they are used. It is great to note that this is now being understood.

Many of the qualifications need to be reviewed to ensure that people are being trained in skills that they will be able to use and develop within the workplace.

The qualification that we train (Cert IV in Competitive Manufacturing) is quite good in this regard as it goes into leading the application of aspects of change, systems and tools and is quite holistic in the approach. Many of the other training packages are outdated and not as good as they need to be.

If training providers are going to support the changing industrial structure to a more skilled, flexible labour force and to meet the needs of those groups that are currently under represented then the education providers need to be more flexible. This will also support meeting the needs of those individuals who are excluded from training because of inflexibility. The ability to break down the commitment of qualifications into smaller

logical “chunks” of workskills and still be funded would help for these people as well.

The definition of workforce development is a good one covering the individual, their employer and the wider community and if the support follows it is likely to really help with bridging the gap between training offerings and development for individuals and productivity outcomes.

Encouraging workforce participation and improving productivity

- Q8. How can we link education and community-based strategies to build the level of workforce participation in Australia? How can we ensure our workplaces make effective use of people’s skills and knowledge? What do you think are the pluses and minuses of localised, regional or industry-based approaches?

This needs to be considered in the context of the larger environment and the root causes of marginalisation need to be explored. For example with people in disadvantaged circumstances struggle to access skills development if it is inflexible as well as the psychological aspects. People who have been marginalised for a period of time struggle to be proactive about accessing services that may help them through poor self esteem or lack of self belief and appropriate role models.

Breaking down qualifications and building up a success model may be a strategy. To people who are drifting through life committing to a two to four year training program may be excessively daunting.

Employers often advertise and select based on qualification levels regardless of the appropriateness of the degree to the job. This is probably based on assumptions of intelligence or perseverance that are expected to make the person a good employee. Many jobs do not have a qualification that accurately maps the skills required so employees use criteria such as prior qualifications in the hope that their new employees will have good learning strategies. Conversely people with no post secondary training may be seen as having little drive.

The fact that someone has qualifications doesn’t always mean that they have skills that can be used in the workplace as your question pre-supposes.

A national approach

Q9. Do we need a shared national workforce development framework to link and coordinate the range of activities being undertaken across Australia? What elements should it contain? What might be a good outcome from having a shared framework?

Yes! As a specialist skills training provider in the VET system the current fragmentation of development nationally makes it very difficult to access information about what support we can access to help us work with our customers. We have a need to move into e-learning but do not have the resources to do the research and work out the best way to use ICT to support our trainees more. We work with a lot of regional firms and I know that we could afford to provide even more support than we currently do if we could access the technology.

There is a national qualification framework but there are state differences in simple things like how long it should take to train them! This affects the funding eligibility and disadvantages people who are in states that are unfunded because their state government says that their qual. Takes less time than the minimum requirement.

The RTO's and training providers waste resources navigating a fragmented system that could be used for innovating.

The recommendations for strengthening linkages between programs and governments seem to be good although the devil is in the detail and making sure that it doesn't continue to exclude some providers in preference for others or just be another layer of complexity. The mandate and KPI's for the "vehicle" would need to be carefully chosen to drive the desired behaviour.

Impact of workforce development

Q10. What impact would a workforce development approach have for your organisation and/or industry? How might government support or facilitate change, thinking about both the productivity and the workforce participation aspects?

It would give us more competition as this is the approach we currently take.

We train a qualification that among other things provides the trainees with problem solving and leadership skills that are applicable in any area of their lives.

One of our trainees is Qld trainee of the year in the running for National trainee of the year and he has done this and applied what he learnt to his life. He's used what he learnt about creating standard operating procedures and mistake proofing to help his mother learn how to reverse her caravan with confidence.

Currently we do considerable work with the senior leadership team at the beginning of the program to ensure that their productivity improvement vision for the business is clearly articulated, that there is a strategy to achieve it and that they cascade KPI's down through the organisation. We mainly train team leaders and supervisors at the Cert IV level but do this work with the senior leadership team otherwise the training would be disconnected from the business objectives (we have yet to work with a company that is doing strategy deployment well) and the support that trainees need from their employers to be able to take training and turn it into skills.

There seems to be a trend of governments to fund business advisors etc who evaluate the business improvement needs of companies and then recommend training. Enterprise connect and bridging and brokerage activities are mentioned in your report. Unfortunately this has been set up on a tender basis and many of the organisations that are providing these services are also training providers or have limited numbers of providers that they "partner" officially or unofficially. We get work based on the quality of our work without any recommendations from these bodies but if this strategy accelerates or if funding is distributed through establishments such as those it would be a real threat to small, non-aligned providers.

I have not been able to see any indication that training in lean principals are being considered as a strategy in improving productivity. The fact that technology can be easily copied is noted but how the important work of improving management and engagement of people is not clarified. Lean is being adopted in hospitals, logistics and service industries but it is not supported by any of the qualifications that relate to those industries. Currently employers are spending money on training that is not recognised in the AQF. Internationals who have mostly developed and are in the process of deploying lean production systems are much more productive than our small and privately owned business who are still relying on outdated national training to provide skills training for their leaders.

Strategic priorities and leadership

Q11. What is your response to our proposed strategic priorities? What are the implications for your organisation/industry? Who might take leadership responsibility for these different elements?

I agree that there are local differences between regions especially in regards to the needs of disadvantaged groups but am concerned about taking a totally "local" approach for a number of reasons.

- Fragmentation such as the "local" state based approach to vocational training which causes waste, difficulty in accessing information and duplication.
- Governments have a track record of funding "pilot programs" that are locally successful but then do not continue and the learnings do not get shared with others where they could be modified and applied to their local needs

- Duplication robs funds and means that well meaning groups of people continue to reinvent the wheel as they don't know what others are doing.

Yes things need to be done at a local/individual level. Generic approaches don't work and training and education shouldn't be done to people. It's important to be respectful of the individuals and not treat them like cattle.

The users are the ones who know what works for them. Where is the research about peoples **attitudes** to vocational training, it's relevance to them and especially those who are not accessing it? Would be good to know from them why not because that would tell you what the real root causes are so that the approach would address what is really happening not what people who have had the education think is happening.

People on the margins of the workforce. I have personal experience that can illuminate this point. Child care responsibilities is a significant contributor to exclusion of low income people from training and the workforce. My daughter, a single mother of a three year old, is moving to Melbourne. She didn't complete her HSC but she's just finishing a cert IV in community care in Canberra and wants to start her diploma in 2010 but the uni's and tafes are inflexible – "You must attend one of two open days to enroll." and child care of a quality that she would be happy to have caring for her daughter is difficult to find. My other daughter is working as a store manager with no post secondary training and her partner is out of the workforce caring for their children. The can not afford to pay for childcare as it costs more than they earn.

There also needs to be quality control over the services offered if they are done at a local level to ensure that local "disadvantaged" thinking or feelings of hopelessness doesn't also come through the service providers.

Developing a shared language and Workforce Development assessment tools would be a useful thing for governments to do as would helping to strengthen linkages and shared effort. We'd like to find a way to partner to develop e-learning and also to strengthen the support we can give people with language and literacy issues.

Linking framework and funding

Q12. How can we strengthen the linkages between government agencies and organisations responsible for education and skills on the one hand, and business development and innovation on the other? Can you envisage different program arrangements or funding flows?

A useful role for government would be as a "clearing house" or connector between, individuals, employers and education and training service providers. This would be

valuable for those who are proactive about sourcing resources. More help is needed for those who are not aware of the support that is available.

CSIRO and universities are doing some excellent work with industry working to innovate especially in regards to sustainability issues. This needs to continue and expand to other training providers who work with people who are not employed giving them an opportunity to work with industry to get an understanding of industry. Several of our customers work with local TAFE trainees from disciplines such as media studies where the students come in to help to put together training videos for example.

I've talked about funding before and the backward step that going to once a year, subjective program or grant application for funding or excluding private RTO's. Set some realistic criteria, expect employer engagement if it is workbased training (line management not HR) and let the market take its course.

Governments should be supporting with assistance to access resources such as e-learning and access to the new technologies that have excellent potential to greatly improve the accessibility of training and knowledge acquisition for people who have circumstances that make it difficult for them to attend training at rigidly set times. Let people dip in and out and develop their lifetime learning pathway according to their interests and the opportunities they can see.

Re the Draft approach for funding the points are good. The thing left out is the treatment of people who have had previous training regarding funding.

- The inclusion of all workersand those who have prior qualifications that have not provided them with the skills needed by their employer is considered where relevant.
- RPL isn't mentioned. This is an area of workforce development the many training providers have a predjudice against and yet it is an opportunity for people who have developed skills in the workplace to have them recognised, building up confidence and leading to greater engagement with formal learning and development.

There is a disproportionate amount of funding going into public institutions that in many cases are rigid and out of date.

Flexibility and partnering are important to support workplace development rather than the old model of just deliver training with little or no responsibility and accountability for the trainees skill development and ability to apply what they learn. We find that people really struggle to implement what they learn in the workplace. Our trainers work onsite and we have had to incorporate Implementation Coaching into our program to ensure that the trainees can apply what they learn.

Other comments

Q13. Do you have any other comments in relation to realising Australia's skill potential or issues raised in *Background Paper Two*?

The quote from the OECD defining workforce development is disturbing. It talks about the management of human resources to meet the demands of the global economy. It would be better to consider the global economy supporting.

The move towards brokerage by government funded bodies threatens to reduce diversity in training providers if they recommend their alliance partners only. Governments shouldn't be preferentially supporting some providers over others. There are also issues previously mentioned with the need to improve qualifications to meet the current needs of industry.

There are other models for really focused industry based learning such as SIRF Roundtables which provides a learning network that is fully funded by our members. We facilitate shared learning of people who are experts in their roles with those who are developing.

Another issue not mentioned in point 3.3 in section 2 is the danger of destroying viable businesses such as SIRF through duplicating work that is already being done effectively.

To recap the key points that come to mind.

Silos – encouraging that there is recognition of the need to move towards a common language, shared vision and objectives in all areas of government. I'd like to extend this to all areas of support for industry such as the industry skills councils.

Flexibility - it seems likely that the mobility of the workforce is going to continue as a trend and it would be great if our training frameworks reflected this by having a structure of foundation skills across industries and then specialist training within industry with heavy involvement of employers. Foundation skills in this context could include things such as problem solving, leadership, coaching and mentoring, project management etc. There is plenty of literature available about the kinds of skills good management needs and plenty of evidence that those key skills are lagging in Australia.

Inclusion – as a small provider there is a worrying trend towards picking winners regarding providers for programs and marginalising some providers. A better model would be for governments to focus on sharing learnings, brokering partnerships and establishing and maintaining standards of excellence and letting the customers decide on providers.

Valuing Skills – a two pronged approach here:

1. Ensuring that workplaces respect and value their employees and their skills development.

2. Ensuring that skills match the needs of industry through close consultation and evaluation of trends and strategies that update qualifications and skill sets.

Root Cause Analysis – more work appears to be needed to understand and deal with root causes of some of the issues raised. Don't just treat the symptoms. Eg if industry is not valuing the "skills" of their employees perhaps the assumption that they are useful skills is wrong. Are the quals outdated and mismatched to the current business needs? Have people actually learnt what their peice of paper says they have? Why else would employers be paying a premium for skills they are not utilizing?

Enterprise and industry level development and resourcing – Currently resourcing is on a per individual basis for traineeship funding. This is wasteful when delivering enterprise level workforce development programs such as ours. It would be good to see a "program " approach to these programs regarding funding.

Career pathways – incorporating skills development into career pathways using RPL and flexible learning and assessment strategies would increase access and entry points for learners. Mapping of generic skills across industries and creating a model for best practice learning organisations such as McDonalds or some of the other multi nationals.

Facilitation – training providers need to become learning facilitators and the focus has to shift from a delivery and time based model to an outcome focused model. This shift has to be reflected in the way training is assessed. We have a model where we have mapped the qualification we train to tangible business outcomes we want to see and yet have to do things for the assessment process that add no value to the trainees or their employers to avoid the wrath of the dreaded auditors.

Skill level of trainers – our trainers have come from the industry that they train and a credible in their role. This is not always the case. There are many people like my trainers who work as consultants and are marginalised from formal training. A train/implement model such as ours could make use of their skills.