

ECEC AND SAC SECTORS SKILLS PLAN				
Minutes of Meeting of Steering Committee, Advisory Committee, and T&PDRG				
Date	16 October 2012			
Location	The Grange, Campbell Town			
Time	10.00am – 12.30pm			
Present	<p>Project Officer - Helen Simmons, Jennifer Parsons</p> <p>Steering C'ee – Chris Symons, Jo Walsh, Annette Barwick (ECA Tas) and Linda Seaborn (Skills Tas)</p> <p>Advisory C'ee –Janelle Brennan (FDC), Shirley Grace (DEEWR), Allison Young (ECU)</p> <p>T&PDRG – Michelle Beakley (Care Bears), Nicole Schenk (Goodstart, Blackman’s Bay), Scott Gibson (BBCS, OSHC), Emily O’Brien (Little Bees), Kelly Ashton (Lipscombe), Robyn Horner (Clarence FDC), Una Lalagavesi (Discovery Dominic), Wendy Richards (Wynyard OSHC), Aileen Brett (Elanora), Susan Tuck (Abacus), Sharon Payne (St Patrick’s CS), Kate Whitbread (GCC)</p> <p>Observer – Aimee Wood (Lady Gowrie Campbell Burnett Training)</p>			
Apologies	<p>Steering C'ee - Ros Cornish</p> <p>Advisory C'ee - Helen Gibbons and Janette Armstrong (United Voice)</p> <p>T&PDRG - Tammy Bennett (Bagdad CCC), Shirley Kelly (BBCS)</p>			
Item	Discussion	Action	By Whom	By When
1. Welcome	Helen briefly welcomed those present, & presented apologies			
2. Minutes	Minutes of 31 July had been circulated. No requests for amendments. Adopted.			
3. Scoping Project	<p>3.1 Helen and Jennifer reported on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional support from Skills Tasmania to develop and conduct the Scoping Project, and appointment of Jennifer to assist with this ▪ Survey Monkey development – more difficult than anticipated. <p>3.2 Kate Whitbread, Janelle Brennan & Nicole Schenk had tested it out – generally fine. However, several issues arose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ‘What’s in it for me?’, esp. given amount of time required to complete Survey ▪ CBC focussed ▪ Need to know what info you’ll need before you start ▪ Put in page breaks ▪ Question re receiving copy of report should be at end of Survey ▪ Add in advice re whether you can ‘pause’ and return to the survey later <p>The meeting recorded its thanks to Nicole, Janelle and Kate for kindly undertaking the ‘test run’.</p> <p>3.3 How to deal with a likely response ‘What’s in it for me?’, given the current workload</p>	<p>3.2 Survey Monkey to be revised in light of the issues arising in the ‘test run’</p>	Helen Jennifer	Asap
		3.3 Discuss idea of	3.3 Helen	Asap

	<p>services have, etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Follow-up phone call from Project Officer (Jennifer) ▪ ‘Sell’ the message in the introductory email ▪ Offer an incentive eg an Ipad <p>3.4 Survey Collection phase.</p> <p>Meeting agreed that a 2 week turn-around would be appropriate.</p>	incentive with Steering C’ee		
<p>4. CS&H ISC Aged Care and Children’s Services Training Quality Forum, 5 October</p>	<p>Helen presented a short report</p> <p>Discussion points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap – educating the consumer re quality, ie what to look for in quality training • National VET regulator – need to focus on auditing quality of delivery of training not only training outcomes. <p>Does ASQA use RTO records only when conducting audit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cert III graduates are not ready – WHERE DOES THIS LEAVE THE EMPLOYER? ie the consequences of imperfect training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost to the sector ▪ Cost to the service ▪ Cost to the reputation of the service <p>Do RTOs see these consequences? Are RTOs aware of their responsibility to the student and sector?</p> <p>Are services complicit? ie Services sign off students that they feel are not ready.</p> <p>Do RTOs sometimes override the service when signing off students on placement?</p> <p>This issue different when it is a pre-service placement, c.f. service’s trainee – easier to extend period for assessment in that case.</p> <p>Linda noted that ASQA has 7 staff only to deal with ALL qualifications, nationally ie will be much more effective to use Tasmanian networking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competencies of trainers – some services have noticed big differences. This aspect is regulated; trainers need to do a ‘return to sector’ every 5 years. • The Training Packages – meeting felt that generally these sufficient to cover NQF. Noted however that some services still not using new terms/reflecting the reforms. Some applications for Certified Supervisor – reflect that not all services yet understand the new legislation • Students doing qualifications on-line – meeting has real concern re assessment: some things cannot be assessed through simulated scenarios etc. 	<p>CS&H ISC report re meeting to be distributed.</p> <p>Report back to ISC re discussion</p>	<p>Helen</p> <p>Helen</p>	

	<p>So, how can the sector collaborate with RTOs to improve placement/practical experience?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with RTO prior to placement, go through the Workbook and adjust desired outcomes if necessary, ie agreement between service and RTO re outcomes before the placement commences 2. Develop a Guide for services for Best Practice Training – what is good quality training? Why sector needs it; why/how service chooses a good RTO, etc. 3. Chris Symons noted that – 1st stage = 16 October Roundtable 2nd stage = our group spreading the word to services that we want to get feedback to improve training outcomes 3rd stage = cancel placements if necessary 4th stage = complaints – 1st to the RTO, then to ASQA. 	<p>Discuss with Steering C’ee whether BP Guide would be approp Skills Plan project</p>	<p>Helen</p>	
<p>4. Sector expectations of Cert III and Diploma graduates</p>	<p>The meeting broke into 3 groups to discuss, using a template with Core competencies and Electives as a reference.</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <p>Group 1:</p> <p>Cert III graduates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Core competencies: group expected Cert III to perform at ‘Well’ – however, feel that for most, Cert III grads perform at ‘Not Well’ or ‘With Support’. ▪ Plus, lots of Elective ‘overlap’. ▪ Training resources not realistic for sector expectations ▪ Higher expectation now because of new approach to assessment of services ▪ NB: Do Cert III graduates understand the importance of their role? Many can perform, but don’t have the underpinning understanding. ▪ Concern re literacy levels. <p>Diploma graduates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group expect Dip graduates to perform at ‘Very Well’, because it is a high level of VET qualification specified in the NQS – however, group feel that most are at ‘With Support’ of ‘Well’ level. ▪ Overlapping of Electives, eg Inclusion 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need more emphasis on understanding and implementing Legislation and Regulation. <p>Group 2: Cert III graduates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need more emphasis on child development and underpinning theory ▪ Cert III Training Package covers what graduates should be doing, but problems with delivery, the method/s and the support of the student (RTO and workplace). ▪ Key gaps – active involvement in programming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - active involvement in children’s learning and development - capacity to think reflectively: NQF is about reflective thinking, not ‘performing’, ‘what guides our pedagogy?’ <p>Critical reflection and analysis need to be embedded from the start</p> ▪ Training Package is repetitive – hopefully streamlining will help ▪ Understand importance of their role which will →behave ethically ▪ Need good role to look at ‘self’, and level of own professionalism ▪ Valuing the qualification – in good old days, had a graduation ceremony, nowadays graduates may get an email! <p>Group 3: Cert III graduates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group had different expectations for Cert III graduates in FDC – because FDC educators are operating on their own, need to understand professionalism, have reflective practice. ▪ FDC educators, if Cert III graduates, are finding it hard to take on board EYLF etc – whilst those with Diploma are sailing through ▪ Similar scenario with SAC sector as with FDC. ▪ Entry level tests for Cert III would assist. ▪ Potential issue for services who have educators ‘actively working towards’ Diploma and who are counted as fully qualified – their level of reflective practice, and knowledge will be assessed at that ‘fully qualified level. 			
--	---	--	--	--