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ABSTRACT

Even before the first industry Training Packages were endorsed by the National Training Framework Committee in September 1997, there was a great deal of interest in what the impact would be on curriculum. Traditionally, within the Vocational Education and Training (VET) system, curriculum has set out the approach to learning – a pedagogy, the process, learning outcomes and assessment criteria and the sequence of a training program. Training Packages will significantly change this given that they describe what is required of someone in a work situation, how and where competencies are to be assessed.

This paper presents a critical analysis of the impact of the introduction of Training Packages within the VET system on curriculum in Victoria. The authors explore some of the dominant ideas, images and misconceptions of Training Packages and explore the ambiguities created by the rhetoric that has accompanied their introduction. The paper examines the kind of “official” thinking which lies behind some of the changes to VET curriculum in recent years. It is argued that the introduction of Training Packages has failed to fully appreciate the place of curriculum and training for the range of stakeholders including industry, teachers and students.
Introduction

In Victoria, crown copyright curriculum is managed by a network of institutionally based curriculum maintenance managers. The role of Curriculum Maintenance Managers (CMMs) is to:

- Systematically review courses
- Improve existing curriculum
- Facilitate communication and information between training stakeholders including Industry Training Boards, Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) and the Office of Training and Further Education (OTFE)
- Contribute to Vocational Training and Education (VET) policy development and initiatives
- Provide authoritative advice to the VET system about curriculum matters and training initiatives.

As part of the introduction of Training Packages in Victoria, Curriculum Maintenance Managers have been responsible for the development of Victorian Implementation Guides to accompany Training Packages. These documents (available from the OTFE website [http://www.otfe.vic.gov.au](http://www.otfe.vic.gov.au)) assist providers in the transition from accredited courses to Training Package qualifications. The guides provide information on the relationship between current courses and new qualifications, nominal hours for units of competence and resources required for the delivery of training.

This role has positioned the authors of this paper to be able to observe and reflect on the initiatives that have taken place within VET in recent years.

Curriculum within the VET sector

Curriculum is part of the traditional education vocabulary. It has been the product of social, historical, political and economic forces within education and training and has involved the selection, interpretation, representation and assessment of culturally based knowledge, skills and values.

Curriculum work should:

- Be informed by political, social, economic and historical analysis;
- Involve explicit identification and evaluation of the values on which it is based;
- Be a collaborative experience for all participants;
- Involve collective critical reflection;
- Be resourced to ensure active participation by teachers, students and parents;
- Be based on action at personal, school, community and system levels;
- Acknowledge that individuals will experience the same learning activities in very different ways; and
• Acknowledge that curriculum should be flexible and responsive to the experience of learners.

Within Training and Further Education (TAFE) institutions, curriculum has been transformed by a combination of historical, social, political and economic forces. However, because of these interacting factors, a sense of equilibrium is yet to be achieved. The last two decades have witnessed one of the most dramatic periods in Australian VET history reform. One result of this has been a refashioning of curriculum in the broadest sense. Appendix No 1 identifies some of the initiatives that have had an impact on the VET system. The Australian VET and TAFE system is changing from a state based centralised course accreditation system, to one where RTOs can use what is described as flexible, industry designed and nationally endorsed Training Packages. The genesis of these can be traced to policy initiatives aimed at facilitating the uptake and implementation of New Apprenticeships.

Under the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) that was introduced in January 1995, there are six VET qualifications – Certificate 1 to IV, Diploma and Advanced Diploma. The AQF is represented in a diagram in Appendix No 2.

Fundamental to the reforms within VET has been the introduction of competency based training (CBT). In 1997, the National Training Framework (NTF) was introduced by the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA). The NTF is made up of the Australian Recognition Framework (ARF) and Training Packages, with embedded quality assurance guidelines. These initiatives are progressively being introduced across all industry areas and training applications. The projected goal of the ANTA is to have nearly 90 Training Packages endorsed by the turn of this century (in September 1999 there were 37 endorsed Training Packages). ANTA predicts that Training Package qualifications will replace 70% of the existing curriculum qualifications.

Key principles that have driven the introduction of the NTF include:

- Direct involvement of industry in determining training needs
- Streamlining training and assessment systems across industries throughout Australia
- Quality assurance mechanisms for the provision of the training and assessment.

Even before the first of the new industry Training Packages was endorsed by the National Training Framework Committee in September 1997, there was a great deal of interest in these new national products together with an element of concern about their impact on curriculum. Since its introduction, there has been an ongoing debate about the efficacy of CBT.
Features of Training Packages

Training Packages specify the outcome for vocational education and training programs. In general they have been developed by national industry training advisory bodies. Each Training Package contains an endorsed component and a non-endorsed component. Endorsement is by the National Training Framework Committee.

In every Training Package the endorsed component includes:

- Competency Standards that outline the competencies each industry needs its workers to achieve
- Assessment Guidelines that outline how skills will be measured and assessed in industry. Assessment guidelines outline the who, how, what, where and when of assessment
- Qualifications that identify the formal AQF awards a person can receive when they have demonstrated competence following assessment against the industry competency standards.

Non-endorsed components of Training Packages include:

- Learning Strategies
- Assessment Materials,
- Professional Development Guidelines.

Learning strategies are described as materials that may have been traditionally used by teachers and trainers. Regarded as an optional component, they provide information on how training programs may be organised in workplaces and through registered training organisations to deliver competency based national qualifications. The focus for teachers and trainers in the future will be to design and structure learning strategies to meet participant needs to achieve the industry standards.

Assessment Materials, as the name suggests, provide assessment instruments and materials to support the industry's assessment guidelines. These materials are also an optional component of Training Packages.

Professional Development Guidelines are intended to assist trainers, teachers and others seeking to use Training Packages. Once again, these materials are also an optional component of Training Packages.

AQF qualifications are achieved by demonstrating a selected range of competencies determined by industry and specified in the packaging rules, to be found in the Training Package qualifications framework.

Mark Rowe (Rowe, 1999) argues that the underlying ethos within VET has shifted to one culminating in a series of economic and political constructs including:
• A focus on cost rather than educational accountability (under the guise of efficiency);

• The development of an open competitive training environment;

• A state and federal government devolution of responsibility rather than control; and

• The development of training provision based on and driven by industrial prescriptions.

Paul Brady (Brady, 1999), questions that the goal for VET, set by the Employment and Skills Formation Council in 1992, to produce a highly skilled and adaptable workforce can be achieved through CBT and Training Packages. A summary of criticisms of CBT include that it:

• too narrowly focuses on skills at the expense of cognitive development and problem solving ability (Stevenson and McKavanagh, 1992)

• over emphasises the routine visible aspects of work at the expense of less visible integrating skills such as planning, problem solving, perceptions and judgement (Field, 1995)

• stresses learning strategies that run contrary to the acquisition of abilities to handle complex indeterminate situations (Middleton, 1994)

• encourages modularised, linear, individual self paced learning approaches that are not supported by extant learning theories (Blunden, 1996)

• is too fragmented and compartmentalised to assist integrated and holistic development of competence and expertise (Harris et. al. 1995)

• leads to classroom Taylorism (Brown, 1994).

Curriculum is a social, historical and material construction which typically serves the interests of particular social groups at the expense of others. Curriculum development involves identifying these interests and their relation to curriculum and advocating corrective action to redress any disadvantage experienced by individuals or groups.

While various commentaries have outlined the merits of CBT and Training Packages, it would appear that the rationale for training and education has been to create a competitive training market through increased industry ownership of vocational education and training. The end result of this is that TAFE is continually being reshaped to assume a strategic business focus. This has been, at best a minimilisation and at the extreme, the expense of the need for consideration about issues associated with the teaching and learning strategies.
What has this got to do with curriculum? When an educational institution predominantly focuses on adopting changed work practices, re-channeling capital expenditure, re-aligning resources, from low return areas and reducing corporate and administrative costs, there is often little time to discuss curriculum issues. While this orthodoxy enthuses some, it does however, leave some weary. An historical snapshot of the changes introduced by the reform initiatives of each decade is depicted in Appendix No 3.

**Curriculum Basics - CBT and Training Packages**

Winning (Winning 1993) outlines three basic curriculum questions developed by Shubert (Shubert, 1986):

- What knowledge is most worthwhile?
- Why is it worthwhile?
- How is it created?

The answers given to these questions reflect certain philosophical assumptions and particular conceptual frameworks. By consciously questioning what knowledge is considered worthwhile, it is possible to move beyond taking for granted the existing social dictates. The type of curriculum, its development, implementation and evaluation are dependent on a particular paradigmatic view of the world. According to Winning (Winning 1993) this includes the following paradigms:

- **Empirical analytical paradigm**: Explanatory and technical knowledge is deemed of primary significance.
- **Interpretive paradigm**: Which places primacy on the meaning which people give to a situation.
- **Critical paradigm**: People are concerned with critical understanding of fundamental interest, values, assumptions and implication for human and social action.

Winning (Winning 1993) maintains that the empirical-analytic paradigm has been the dominant orientation for inquiry and problem solving this century. The main interest is in the technical control resting in efficiency and accountability. This has translated to a dominance of descriptive curriculum theories within educational spheres. The function of such theories is to define, describe, predict and direct.

The trend towards increasing specification and precision in curriculum design began in the 1920’s with the work of social behaviourists, such as Bobbit, Thorndite and Sneddon. Experientialists, such as John Dewey, actively opposed the social behaviourists who adhered to curriculum that demonstrated precision, efficiency, mechanical technique and could be easily measured. Experientialists focussed on learner centered, progressive
democratic and problem solving curriculum orientations. It is worthy of comment that these monumental variations in curriculum approaches still plague curriculum development at this late stage of the Twentieth Century.

Winning (Winning 1993) maintains that the difference is grounded in opposing notions of value attributed to each of three sources of curriculum emphasis, that is the learner, society and subject matter. Curriculum policy is presently being driven by economic rationalism, through a framework concomitant with the definitions of the empirical analytic paradigm.

Economic rationalism demands a flexible and skilled workforce driven by industry requirements. Reforms have been linked to a technical, instrumental agenda rather than a humanistic one.

Inherent within curriculum which aims to create a skilled workforce is that of CBT. CBT is, according to Winning, an amalgamation of some of the leading natural science-based theories of learning. It comes form an empirical-analytic paradigm. It contains elements of programmed instruction, specified behavioral objectives, hierarchical beliefs about knowledge acquisition and social behaviorist assumptions about learning techniques.

CBT meets the criteria presently required by reform agendas, namely accountability, relevance to the demands of the market, accessibility and flexibility. CBT’s greatest strength lies in its political saleability in that it reinforces the existing status quo rather than promoting real change. It does this because the content of training is determined by industry standards the content of which is controlled by so called experts from industry. How Training Packages are promoted and the image they convey, not only supports CBT but strengthens the use of CBT as a valid teaching and learning pedagogy. However, CBT is still challenged as a teaching and learning method. For example, a criticism of CBT that Broudy (Broudy 1990) highlights is that in its positive stance it overlooks a dimension of teaching and equates teaching with the transfer of discrete, inter-related skills or competencies. CBT de-professionalises teaching through the Taylorised, commodity production version of transfer of skill which it promotes. In this way Training Packages reinforce the status quo.

Again, the paradigm from which such a view of teaching and curriculum comes is the empirical-analyst paradigm with its insistence on discrete measurable skills as opposed to a recognition of more holistic, complex, context bound interactions – which are, after all, the reality that keeps most teaching personnel in the profession.

Training Packages with their narrowly focused and prescriptive outcomes ignore the experiential dimension of understanding education, the dimension which belongs to the situational-interpretive paradigm. It ignores the need for teachers to go beyond the prescriptions of discrete learning outcomes in order to teach a real person in a real, perhaps unpredicted, situation. It also ignores the opportunity for students to explore and extend themselves beyond the prescribed limits.
Training Packages will not promote social change in that they ensure existing positions of power remain and that access to education and training is in reality merely access to skills that ensure that the existing social structures remain. For a start, Training Packages are based on what is required in a workplace, which is legitimate, however the focus is on recognising existing skills through assessment. There is a need for attention and acknowledgment of training and education for entry into the workforce.

Winning (1992) argues that the use of industry standards to produce curriculum is questionable given that Australia industry has failed to excel and that CBT entrenches Tayloristic practices rather than promote new ways of thinking. Training Packages will extend this scenario. It is worthy of comment that the goals established for the introduction of industry standards have never been achieved. For example, Mawer (Mawer, 1992) claimed that it was envisaged that 50 per cent of the workforce covered by industrial awards would have their competency based standards established and ratified by 1992 and 90 per cent by the end of 1994. The reality has been no where near this.

In summary, the dominant philosophical position and paradigmatic framework in which emerging VET curriculum policy fits is that of instructional rationalism viewed through an empirical-analytical paradigm. The curriculum policy is driven by economic rationalism and the major goal of this approach is to ensure that human capital contributes to national economic goals determined by industry and politicians. Any notions of individual or community well-being come into the equation only in terms of the economy.

Returning to Winning's (1993) key questions in relation to Training Packages, the answer to the question what knowledge is of most worth appears to be that knowledge which pertains to increased productivity. In answer to the second question why is that knowledge worthwhile, it seems that the most obvious answer is that it is for the sake of the national economy. The final question dealt with how the knowledge should be acquired. The answer would appear to be via Training Packages in workplaces. Training Packages continue the previous policy established by CBT policy which advocates the transmission of knowledge which is in keeping with the philosophies of instrumental rationality importance being placed on performance of discrete, measurable skills.

Training Packages – a misguided curriculum technology

There are misconceptions about what a Training Package is. Perhaps the description Training contributes to the misunderstanding as it may suggest that the primary role is to describe how people should be trained. Maybe they should have been called Assessment Packages. Given that the initial Training Packages publicity material claimed that Training Packages would replace curriculum, it is little wonder that a degree of confusion ensued. This publicity did not reflect the true purpose of the intention of Training Packages which was initially to recognise existing skills. In reality, there is still a need for curriculum to provide a structured learning process for people to develop skills, knowledge and expertise. In this regard, the use of Training Packages as the means of providing a structured learning process is misguided.
Recent activities in the refinements of best practice approaches to the development of the endorsed component of Training Packages have been at the expense of consideration about issues associated with structured teaching and learning strategies to support the achievement of the industry competency standards.

Unlike a curriculum, which in VET, sets the process, learning outcomes and sequence of a training program, the endorsed component of a Training Package describes what skills are and their performance criteria. The competency standards component of a Package is therefore a highly detailed description of the skills required for a particular industry or function and the workplace environment and conditions. There is little reference to the structure of the context of the underpinning skills and knowledge that was evident in traditional curriculum documents. To demonstrate competency, this may mean that teachers and trainers are required to obtain and structure additional information as part of the learning and assessment activities. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that this may involve questioning or the gathering portfolios of information, which on the ground becomes a bureaucratic nightmare.

Andre Lewis (Lewis, 1998 p 19) maintains that in describing the competencies required by an industry, a Training Package makes no assumption about how someone may gain those skills. To a certain extent this is true. Lewis rightly points out that many people who are highly skilled and valued by their employers may not have gained some or even all of their skills through formal training. With this in mind, Lewis maintains that Training Packages accommodate this flexibility by not assuming any particular learning approach but instead concentrate on describing workplace outcomes clearly and in sufficient detail to support training delivery and assessment. Lewis’ approach extends the idea that the skill and professional expertise of VET teachers and trainers will enable them to respond appropriately to the particular needs of their students, who Lewis refers to as clients.

ANTA has dedicated considerable time and money to infuse an established rigor into the development of industry standards so that they contain educational values. However, there is an urgent need to assist teachers and trainers to fully comprehend what assessment against competency standards means, more often than not within a workplace environment and how to contextualise industry standards.

A challenge confronting both industry and training providers is the issue of cross industry commonality in industry standards. For example, what will it mean if a student presents to either an RTO, higher education institution or an employer a Statement of Attainment outlining that they have achieved competencies in generic areas, such as business management? Does that mean that they do not need to undergo training and education in a related area is a different industry? Furthermore, what impact does this have on the industry context inherent in each industries standards?

People are used to the concept of a Certificate or Diploma being the end result of undertaking a course and the mindset of seeing a credential as meaning completed time based training.
A further complication is the changed delivery program profile. The shift to a competency based system has required TAFE teachers to undergo significant reorientation. Rowe synthesise these changes including a reorientation to:

- Change from a training culture to an assessment culture;
- Interpret and apply national standards to training programs;
- Develop, customise and implement different training materials and technologies;
- Adopt a variety of training and assessment strategies dependent upon different workplace and classroom environments; and
- Adopt new reporting and accountability requirements.

In the past, quality assurance mechanisms for curriculum were integrated into accreditation processes and course maintenance procedures. The introduction of the NTF has resulted in a variety of new quality assurance guidelines that support assessment activities and Training Package qualifications. The emphasis has moved away from training as the benchmark, to assessment against industry standards as the indicator of competency achievement.

Increasingly industry and training organisations are becoming aware of the potential for well designed Packages to improve analysis of skill needs and guide the way for more effective and innovative training. They can assist individuals to more clearly determine their career options and the training and recognition required to achieve them. It is time now for the emphasis to be directed towards the non endorsed components, particularly associated with structured learning strategies.

**Conclusion**

Training Packages radically alter the way in which those involved in teaching, training and assessment interact with curriculum. Training Packages provide recognition of discreet measurable skills. Teachers, trainers and participants are not provided with guidance or directed in the traditional manner of curriculum. This may limit the potential for teaching and learning experiences, that not only provide the acquisition of skills relevant to the workplace, but are also deal with critical understanding of fundamental interest, values, assumptions and implication for human and social interaction. There are some who will welcome Training Packages because they provide the flexibility to customise and contextualise learning activities based on the needs of learners. However, there are some teachers and trainers who are concerned about the loss of the potential opportunities provided by structured learning strategies.

Instead of an emphasis on refining the endorsed component of Training Packages, the time has come for attention to be given to instruments that assist stakeholders in structured learning strategies. There needs to be a form of curriculum to maximise the full potential of Training Packages. Consideration needs to be given to the form and flexibility of such a curriculum in order to meet the requirements of training and education.
The use and perception of Training Packages has undergone a significant shift from the original concept of what they were established to achieve. Perhaps the debate should focus on a more pertinent question such as whether or not the assessment of a qualitative and responsive training and education system should be based predominantly on economic grounds. There is a growing voice in Australia that such a system should not be prefaced by economic efficiency alone, especially at the subjugation of curriculum.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP Home Page</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atp.net.au">http://www.atp.net.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Training Reform Agenda to National Training Framework Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Yr.</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia Reconstructed</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Report of the Mission to Western Europe that articulated recognition of the important of training in the industrial relations system and the need for the restructuring of complex and unwieldy industrial awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wage Case</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>In 1987 a decision was taken to shift the basis for wage determination away from national cost of living increases and to tie wage increases to productivity gains - the second tier of wage gains would only come about with these productivity gains. The Structural Efficiency Principle (SEP) laid down guidelines to review industrial awards (skills based career paths in awards, new training arrangements, multi-skilling, new forms of work organisation and fewer demarcations award restructuring). For the first time the formal link was established between training and awards. (ACTRAC 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of the NTB</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Establishment of the National Training Board (NTB) to assist in formulating and endorsing National industry competency standards to define workplace skill requirements at Australian Standards Framework (ASF) levels 1-6. The NTB also implemented and coordinated the ASF to provide skill recognition in industries regulated by industrial awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of NOOSR</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition (NOOSR) established to enhance recognition of skills gained internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of CBT</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>In 1990 the Ministerial Council endorsed Competency Based Training in A Strategic Framework for the Implementation of a CBT System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of ACTRAC</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>The Australian Committee for Training Curriculum (ACTRAC) was formed to develop national competency based curriculum and learning materials to support delivery of National curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Deveson Report'</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>In the report Training Costs of Award Restructuring (Deveson report) Ivan Deveson provided a summary of the training context as it was and proposed how it could be in a more open training market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of the 'Finn Report'</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>This report argued for an increase in post compulsory education and training to better equip the workforce with the skills needed to perform in the global economy. It proposed that education and training should prepare student for the world of work through a new entry level training system and proposed new national completion rates for vocational education and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of NFROT</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>N 1992 Commonwealth and State ministers adopted the National Framework for the Recognition of Training (NFROT) which provided guidelines for the development of competency based training programs and enhanced national recognition of training. This replaced the RATE system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of the 'Mayer Report'</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>This report extended the concept of seven employment related competencies and their application to training developments and delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of the Carmichael Report</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Proposed the establishment of a competency based entry level training system - the Australian Vocational Training System (AVTS) as promoting entry level training and pathways between secondary and post compulsory education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Working Nation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>This White Paper included a number of training related initiatives such as industry involvement in training reform, access to disadvantaged groups, range of training providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of ANTA</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) was established under a 1992 agreement to develop and implement a national plan for the VET sector and to distribute funds for training research and development. In 1994 Towards a Skilled Australia promoted ANTA's strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of NTRA</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Amid concerns about its progress Dr Vince Fitzgerald (Allen Consulting Group) reviewed the NTRA. CEDA conducted consultations on the NTRA. Both these led to proposals for reforms to simplify and promote the NTRA, eventually under the National Training Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of the AQF</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) provided a Nationally agreed set of eight credentials that embraced all aspects of post compulsory participation in education and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of National Training Framework Committee</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The national Training Framework Committee established to oversee the policy framework for development and endorsement of Training Packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of ATP</td>
<td>1996/7</td>
<td>Formerly known as ACTRAC Products Ltd, Australian Training Products is a specialist publisher and distributor focused on providing training materials for the VET sector. Training packages are purchased form ATP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of the NTF</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>National Training Framework (NTF) developed by the incoming Liberal Federal government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Training Packages endorsed</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NTFC endorses first Training Packages made up of endorsed components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Recognition Framework</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Arrangements for the Australian Recognition Framework take effect together with quality assurance measures including nationally agreed registration requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Guidelines for Training Package developers</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Packages Policy</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Policy for Training Packages released by ANTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix No 2

#### The Australian Qualifications Framework - Qualifications according to Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools Sector</th>
<th>VET sector</th>
<th>Higher Education Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VET in Schools &amp; Senior Secondary Certificate of Education</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Diploma</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Advanced Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate IV</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Based Curriculum System</td>
<td>Competency Based Curriculum System 90’s</td>
<td>Training Packages 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Features</td>
<td>Key Features</td>
<td>Key Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ The “unit of currency” of the training system was the course</td>
<td>♦ The “unit of currency” of the training system is the module of training</td>
<td>♦ The “unit of currency” is the demonstration of competency against industry standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Curriculum was developed and accredited</td>
<td>♦ The standards and curriculum are developed and endorsed separately</td>
<td>♦ Integrated development of standards, assessment guidelines, learning resources, professional development packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Limited assessment information and scant detail</td>
<td>♦ Assessment information located in the accredited curriculum</td>
<td>♦ Assessment is a key element of the endorsed component and is located within the standards and directly linked to the standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Some learning resources are available but these are generally developed by each provider</td>
<td>♦ Some learning resources are available but these are generally developed by each provider</td>
<td>♦ Learning resources development linked to training packages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ RATE system</td>
<td>♦ AQF</td>
<td>♦ AQF revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Qualifications are based on content areas and loosely industry focused</td>
<td>♦ Qualifications are based on course outcomes with the courses linked to industry standards</td>
<td>♦ Qualifications packaged from competency standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ A qualification meant that a graduate had spent a specified time acquiring knowledge</td>
<td>♦ A qualification does not necessarily mean that a graduate is competent against the industry standards</td>
<td>♦ A qualification signifies competence to the required industry standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways</td>
<td>Pathways</td>
<td>Pathways - The challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Course structure limited the potential for credit transfer</td>
<td>♦ Modular structure improved the potential for credit transfer</td>
<td>♦ Curriculum from Secondary Schools, VET and Higher Education to be aligned to Competency Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>