

23 March 2015



Service Skills Australia
GPO Box 4194
Sydney NSW 2001
By Email: info@serviceskills.com.au

Dear Service Skills Australia

Submission regarding the Review of SIS10 Outdoor Recreation training – Outdoor Recreation Discussion Paper

Outdoors WA is the peak body in Western Australia for the outdoor recreation sector incorporating outdoor recreation, outdoors education, camping, adventure tourism and adventure therapy.

Outdoors WA has been consistently proactive in the development and support of industry training packages for outdoor recreation and has worked in conjunction to implement training with our national body the Outdoor Council of Australia and partners such as Future Now.

Outdoors WA has sought feedback from the WA outdoor recreation sector and presents a range of issues for consideration in the development of the future structure of national outdoor recreation training. The issues are attached and matched to the outdoor recreation discussion paper headings.

1. Qualifications
2. Skills sets
3. Changes to the templates.

Outdoors WA looks forward to ongoing engagement and consultation as the reforms progress and is quite happy to take further questions in regards to this submission.

Sincerely

Jamie Bennett
Executive Officer
Outdoors WA

Office: 7 Irvine St BAYSWATER 6053

p: 08 9468 0102

e: admin@outdoorswa.org

www.outdoorswa.org

Facebook: Outdoors WA Inc

Twitter: outdoorswa

Supported by





Department of
Sport and Recreation

Outdoors WA with the support of the WA Department of Sport and Recreation and Future Now held a consultation forum on the 26 March for the WA outdoor sector.

18 people attended representing a broad cross section of organisations as detailed below.

- Department of Sport and Recreation
- Fairbridge WA Inc
- Scouts WA / Perth Bushwalkers Club
- Southern Hills Christian College
- Yachting WA
- Notre Dame University
- Adventist Outdoors WA
- Outdoors WA
- Friends of Adventure
- Scouts WA
- YouthCARE
- Future Now
- Vetsis
- Point Peron Camp School
- PX2 Consultancy

Qualifications – page 5 from discussion paper	Feedback from the WA Outdoor Recreation Training package review forum.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are core industry job roles? • How do qualifications reflect these? • In what ways do current quals meet/not meet industry needs? • What issues are there with packaging rules that needs reviewing? 	
Issues	Solutions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What's the difference between the roles - clarification needed • Confusion around is a guide a Cert III or IV? • Core industry job roles: Instructor/Assistant (activities); training officers; teachers, tour guides; managers. There is different hierarchy amongst organisations (Department of Sport and Recreation, Department of Education,) no common ways of moving up ladder • Employers hire on the units of competency completed, not on the Certificate. The Certificate needs to reflect what is wanted by employers. • Cert IV – required for delivery in certain areas. Cert IV – teacher. Teachers also require Cert IV TAE • Keeping up with new innovations (e.g Scouts new climbing wall) – provision for different sort of activities – linking competencies • Does the training package meet needs of volunteers? Small businesses don't have the money to put volunteers/employees through full certificates • Difficulties Cert II/III • Skilled volunteers eg scouts – cost with getting qual • Cert II not enough 'meat' to meet needs of industry (job role – assistant or trainee). Provides learning for next step in the training pathway • Cert III is the minimum needed to work in the outdoor recreation industry • Majority work is seasonal and hard to find • Workplace assessor – don't recognise moving from instructor to assessor – links needed • Different needs across the industry and pathways are not clear • Cert III job role: depends on units selected. Cert IV job role: experience needed. Dip: Guide, instructor, manager. Dependant on units 	<p>Development of a template for organised training</p> <p>A clear pathway for careers in the outdoors.</p>

Skill sets – page 6 from the discussion paper	Feedback from the WA Outdoor Recreation Training package review forum.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the rationale for the current approach to skills sets? • To what extent do the skills sets replicate quals? • Should the NOLRS scheme be considered in any review of these? Why? / Why Not? 	
Issues	Solutions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOLRS – Recognition of what it is, is it needed? Shows currency/being professional in industry • Skill set: for the voluntary sector needs to be broken down in simple terms and education provided around it • Once you have a skill set (eg artificial climbing) other generic uocs need to be assessed. Need guiding skill set (core skills), then go into specialisations • NOLRS – currency of skills versing keeping current • Some employers need NOLRs registration for access to Department of Parks and Wildlife sites • Setting benchmark for who to employ? Cert II or III but do they have the units of competency needed for particular skill set? Would be watched/assessed first by the employer • Skills such as rescue need to be practiced and upskilled on regular basis. • Performance management is needed to update skills – currency (latest PD) workshops for best practice/update. Show attendance rather than assessment • Look outside of organisation for best practice – up to individual employer. • Upgrading of skill sets in line with training packages changes. Industry are not always consulted during the training package process and people aren't always aware of changes. There is a need to bring old skill sets up to speed. Cost is an issue • There is confusion between pathways from skill sets to qualifications. • Is a unit of competency transferable between skill sets and qualifications? • Contextualisation of skill sets to different activities. Eg risk - generic and specific to pursuit • Currency outsourced • Some skill sets only a few units away from full Certificate qualification • VET qualifications are used as a pathway to university (however skill sets are not always recognised) – exception roping skill set is recognised by the University of Notre Dame • High cost of RPL • Understanding RPL system. Workshop needed. Collection of evidence over time (e.g logbooks) • What are the ideal number of units for skill sets – depends on the activity • Units of competency exist because of the requirements of that skill • Clustering assessments to make things easier – holistic assessment • Depends on situation – some areas require a lot of skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector needs to offer generic PD (skills) • NOLRS to be adopted by industry – minimum standard • Use NOLRS to show currency to auditors (for RTOs) – but also for anyone working in the outdoor recreation industry • Currency – maintaining skills by proving still in the game. E.g PD • Swimming qualifications renewed 12 months – could be also done in outdoor rec skills. Yearly test • New practices are not being passed on to old/mature instructors – use newsletters to provide latest information • There is the need for an organisation to audit instructors and test their skills (who is making sure they are competent?) • Performance management needed to update skills – currency (latest PD) workshops for best practice/update. Show attendance rather than assessment • Upgrade of skill set – a day where you can go and get upgraded • RTO to contact person/s who have completed a skill to get them to come back and upgrade when needed – however this would be a high cost to maintain currency • RPL to be used for upgrading of skills • Online OHS for theoretical components – could be beneficial for generic content but not for hard skills

- Does the industry require skill sets or qualifications? – skill sets are the building blocks of a qualification

General – re Template pages 11-28

Feedback from the WA Outdoor Recreation Training package review forum.

- In general what are strengths/benefits of the proposed approach?
- Can you make the structure work? If not what would make it better?
- What should the performance criteria/ evidence spell out? How many times should a person perform a skills and in what conditions?
- What assessment conditions should there be spelled out?
- Are there areas that should only be assessed in the workplace? And/or with real clients?
- What are the industry expectations of those instructing and assessing? What qualifications or experience should they have?



Issues

Solutions

- Reduction of size of unit of competency document makes it more user friendly but now have two documents – but advantages are that there is more uniformity/structure across industries New assessment requirements defines a set number of hours but not what needs to be done in those hours
- Where the skill should be demonstrated is dependent on skill and the level (should be progressive)
- Reducing content in tools and simplifying
- What are the assessor requirements? Discussion around one level above plus Cert IV TAE. Plus have the unit delivering
- School teacher delivering the Cert II Outdoor Rec – packaging rules different to employer rules – need to find balance
- Currency/competency is a mixture of experience and qualification
- Timeframe for experience required? What would be the benchmark minimum? Depends on the specific activity, experience (min 12 months, 2 years, 5 yrs), logbooks, PD.
- Comparison to UK/NZ systems

Possibility to cluster Units of Competency.

Assessment criteria should be tighter and more specific as the level of qualification increases, and the job outcome takes on an increased leadership role.

General – are there other issues to do with the training package?

Feedback from the WA Outdoor Recreation Training package review forum.

- If there are other topics that came up, please highlight the these below.



Issues

Solutions

- Units of competency are not standard across states and organisations – interpreted differently
- Units of competency allow out of date practices to be taught
- The VET system keeps changing
- The elements in some units of competency don't reflect the unit eg interpret weather
- Missing link – no textbooks
- The Australian Activity Standards don't necessarily match skill sets
- New units needed to bring activities up to date
- High cost associated with outdoor recreation training
- Education of package to industry – lingo and VET acronyms are difficult to understand
- There is a need for better relationships between RTO – industry - trainee. Communication is vital between the parties
- Need for a defined time period to complete assessment – complete within 'x' amount of time
- There are a lack of outdoor recreation training providers in WA

Define elements accurately