NCVER

Appendices C–F

The **changing role** of **staff development** for **teachers** and **trainers** in **vocational education** and **training**

Roger Harris

Michele Simons

Doug Hill

Erica Smith

Ron Pearce

John Blakeley

Sarojni Choy

David Snewin

Delphi study of VET key informants

This research has as its focus the future staff development needs of teachers and trainers working for VET providers. The prime concern was to identify the significant challenges facing teachers and trainers over the next five to seven years and to gauge the extent to which they had the necessary knowledge, skills and other attributes to meet these challenges. The 'gaps' between what is perceived to be required to meet those challenges and the current levels of knowledge, skills and other attributes of teachers and trainers is a useful indicator of staff development needs over that period. The Delphi method was utilised to solicit the views of senior people responsible for policy, staff development and other significant VET commentators, about the issues described above.

Planning staff development in the VET sector

Staff development is a broad term, which can encompass both activities organised by the employer to ensure that staff are able to operate effectively in their present positions in a changing environment and activities selected by individuals to enhance their opportunities for advancement. This research was mainly concerned with the first kind of staff development where an organisation is responsible for maintaining and upgrading the performance of its staff.

It is relatively easy to talk to or survey staff about the quality of staff development they have received and to identify strengths and shortcomings. However, while this kind of research provides useful information about the way in which such programs should be run in the future it has much less to contribute concerning the actual content of and emphasis needed in future staff development programs. Such limitations are evident in a number of recent studies (for example, Chappell & Melville 1995).

In the past it has also been common to obtain estimates of future staff development needs for State or national systems by getting together a small group of people for a relatively short period and pooling their thoughts. Commonly those involved in such 'think tanks' are professionals in the staff development field. The gathering and analysing of information from such groups is an ill-defined process and the outcomes depend very much on the nature of interactions between members of the group over the period. Such interactions are influenced by the status and power of individual participants. In some cases a particular issue, concern, government policy, political imperative or recent development can dominate the deliberations. For example, a consultant engaged by a TAFE system may present a particular view of the future of VET which may affect the way in which the system plans its long-term staff development policy. Alternatively, a carefully thought out strategy may be upset by an ANTA initiative such as the introduction of training packages, which necessitates diverting resources to meet an immediate need.

For these reasons the typical one-shot expert approach has had limited success in providing useful longer-term guides to staff development and it seems that another approach may be needed. Accordingly, a different approach was sought in the current project, and it was decided to use the Delphi method, a research method more common in the period from the mid 1950s to the late 1970s but in less common use nowadays. However, the method is described in current texts on research (for example, Gredler 1996), research journals (for example, Raskin 1994) and conference proceedings (for example, Bell & Cleasby 1995). It is a method for attaining group input which differs from the more commonly-used focus group or nominal group techniques.

Delphi method

The Delphi technique was named in honour of Apollo's oracle in Delphia in ancient Greece and made popular by the Rand Corporation which originally used it to identify likely industrial targets for Soviet bombers. This research method is useful for obtaining a pooled judgement about something. It is essentially a method for aggregating the opinions of a number of individuals who are considered to be expert and in a position to make an informed input. The technique is useful in obtaining input into an evaluation related to a current situation or a situation which is considered likely to exist in the future (Gredler 1996). It is similar to the nominal group technique, which is often used for identification of issues and concerns (Pokorny et al. 1988). The nominal group technique usually involves a group of seven to nine individuals who begin by developing a set of ideas in response to a stimulus question in silence. After this each person contributes an idea which is recorded. Each idea is discussed and the session ends with each person rank ordering those ideas.

The Delphi technique usually involves many more people than the nominal group technique and can be more extensive in terms of content. The members of the group do not meet but respond individually to a series of questionnaires in an iterative process which extends over a period of time (Uhl 1990). The first questionnaire is used to set the parameters for latter questionnaires and generally consists of fairly open ended items concerned with broad issues to which individuals respond anonymously. The responses to the first questionnaire are processed and used to construct a second questionnaire.

This second instrument serves two purposes: to provide feedback to participants concerning the results from first questionnaire and to allow them to respond again to the same issues in the light of this feedback. The second questionnaire generally contains relatively closed items, which accurately reflect the spectrum of opinion obtained in the first questionnaire. The items are designed in a way which gets participants to rank the relative importance of issues and the appropriateness of particular responses to those issues. Likert scaling is frequently used to obtain such rankings. Participants are also able to comment on any matter and identify new issues, concerns or responses to those issues or concerns. A summary of responses to the second questionnaire is prepared to accompany a third questionnaire, although in some cases only two are used.

This final questionnaire asks participants to consider the items in the second questionnaire, possibly in a refined form, together with any new items. It is designed to obtain a measure of the strength of agreement on the issues identified in the first and second questionnaires. In this sense the Delphi technique encourages a degree of consensus and for this reason the initial selection of participants is critical. The selection must be such that a broad range of judgements will be expressed. This enables participants to temper their judgements in the knowledge of what other informed individuals have expressed. As the process of judgement gathering takes place over a period of time individuals are able to engage in extended reflection on the central issues. This is an important attribute of the Delphi technique. It provides a very different environment from that of a focus group or think tank where individuals interact over a relatively short period and some opinions are not necessarily expressed or not taken up by the group.

Participants

Early in the design of the project it was agreed that a group of about 50 key stakeholders in the VET sector would be selected for the Delphi study. The project team decided to seek nominations from the following categories:

❖ State/Territory VET executives—CEOs

❖ ACPET executives

❖ State/Territory professional development managers (TAFE)

- ❖ National Assessors and Workplace Trainers Body
- ❖ Department of Employment, Education Training and Youth Affairs VET Division
- ❖ University VET academics—person in charge of teacher education
- ❖ VET policy-makers
- ❖ VET consultants/researchers/project managers
- ❖ union representatives
- ❖ two overseas senior VET people (UK and USA)
- ❖ other significant commentators

An initial list was drawn up and circulated to members of the project team who consulted with others they considered might make appropriate suggestions about additions and deletions. The revised lists were reviewed by the team and a final list of 56 key stakeholders was sent questionnaire one (see attachment 1).

Process

Fifteen responded by the initial due date, with twelve more responding by the extended due date following reminder phone calls, making a response rate of 48%. The respondents had been given a reference number in order to identify who had returned surveys and to enable follow up of non-returns. A further four responses were received too late for the initial analysis. In some cases delays in replying were due to the fact that CEOs had passed the questionnaire to appropriate management or curriculum staff for a response.

Each of the 56 key stakeholders received feedback from round one and was asked to participate in round two irrespective of whether they had responded in the first round. A total of 30 people responded to questionnaire two (see attachment 2), a response rate of 53%, including a small number who had not participated in round one. No reminder phone calls were made for this round. This represented an excellent response rate, especially considering that this survey was conducted in December 1998, a very busy time for most VET personnel. The timing and time interval between rounds is a critical issue (Bell & Cleasby 1995). The same process as used in round two was employed in the third and final round conducted in autumn 1999 (only the covering letter is included in attachment 3). Twenty-one usable responses were received in round three.

One challenge faced by the research team was analysing the responses to the first questionnaire, which had been devised with a large proportion of open-ended questions concerning such issues as the challenges likely to be faced by teachers/trainers in the next five to seven years, the attributes needed to meet these challenges and the barriers to their development. The responses needed to be analysed not only to give meaningful data, but also to be fed back to the participants. The responses to the open-ended questions were categorised, firstly by a research assistant then by the researchers. Wherever possible the language used to describe categories was consistent with current use in VET literature. After the responses from the first round survey were analysed and aggregated/summarised they were returned to the respondents and also to those who had failed to respond in time so that all the nominated stakeholders could see what other stakeholders had reacted. The round two survey included further questioning about round 1 questions and a new section was added where interesting statements from the qualitative sections of round 1 were listed, and participants asked to note the extent of their agreement with these statements.

It is possible that the participants, on receipt of the second questionnaire which included the responses to the first, realised that other stakeholders had taken the process extremely seriously, and this prompted the good return rate for round 2. It was also notable that in round 2 there were fewer sceptical or critical comments on the process and the questionnaire structure, which a few participants had included in round 1.

The third round questionnaire incorporated feedback from the round two survey, and asked some further related questions. The latter were of three kinds; that is, reworded questions from round two where questions failed to elicit appropriate or usable information, questions concerning statements made by individual respondents in round two.

In some cases the initial survey had been addressed to a position rather than a named person. Such surveys were sometimes completed by the encumbent and at other times delegated. This resulted in different people completing the survey in rounds one and two in a few cases. In round three the survey was addressed to a specific person, usually the person who completed the round two questionnaire.

The results of the series of three surveys is such that the individual stakeholders appear to have functioned as a group as claimed by Linstone and Turoff (1975). The fact that the group size was about 30 for rounds one and two and 21 for the final round makes it possible to claim that findings are probably fairly reliable and accurately represent current opinions of such experts. That is not to claim that the predictions made by the key stakeholders are necessarily accurate as the circumstances in which they were made are subject to change. The relatively small numbers of respondents involved, and the fact that there were some different respondents meant that it was inappropriate to use inferential statistics.

The information from the three rounds of Delphi surveys was incorporated into a further questionnaire which was distributed to a group of practising teachers/trainers in the VET sector. This was done as a form of cross-checking for consistency, and also to see whether practitioners had different views. It is argued that consistency and readily explicable differences lend credibility to the results of the information obtained from the key stakeholders. This survey was sent out in early June 1999 to 32 VET practitioners in two TAFE institutes and two private providers with a 50% return rate by October.

Teacher survey

The questionnaires were sent to two TAFE institutes and two private providers of training. The survey was answered by volunteers (only the covering letter is included in attachment 4). This group cannot by regarded as representative of the population of teachers/trainers. The fact that key stakeholders were selected in the way they were makes it difficult to draw legitimate conclusions from comparisons between the responses of this group and the group of teachers and trainers. If the groups were representative and the sample sizes appropriate, then it would be possible to use a multivariate technique to test whether the two groups were significantly different in their overall responses. If such a difference existed then it would be permissible to compare responses on various items. In the present case, all that can be done at this time is to note that:

❖ the two patterns of responses appear to be generally similar

❖ there are some expected differences between the responses of the two groups

The similarity in responses of the two groups could be anticipated to some extent as the questions asked of the teachers/trainers contained information about the survey results from key stakeholders. The differences could be hypothesised on the basis that key stakeholders would be expected to consider the VET sector from a broad perspective and one which was less reflective of the day-to-day concerns of teachers and trainers. Given the above limitations and concerns it is nevertheless worthwhile to compare the responses of key stakeholders to round three with the responses of teachers and trainers to the same questions. Such an examination suggests that teachers/trainers and key stakeholders tend to see the same challenges as important over the next five years but with teachers and trainers feeling that they are slightly better prepared for these challenges than do the key stakeholders. This outcome lends credence to the findings of the Delphi survey of key stakeholders.

CHARLES STURT
U N I V E R S I T Y

Boorooma Street Wagga Wagga NSW

Correspondence PO Box 588
Wagga Wagga NSW 2678 Australia

Telephone 02 6933 2441
Facsimile 02 6933 2888

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Professional Development of VET Teachers and Trainers
Survey of Key Stakeholders

Invitation to potential participants - the 50 Key Stakeholders

A national research project is being conducted by the Centre for Research in Education, Equity and Work, at the University of South Australia, the Group for Research in Employment and Training at Charles Sturt University and the TAFE Queensland Centre for Advancement of Innovative Learning. The project is funded by the ANTA National Research and Evaluation Committee. The project is entitled "Improving the Quality of VET Provision: The Role of Staff Development for Teachers and Trainers in VET Providers". An important focus for the project is identifying the kinds of challenges which VET teachers/trainers have faced or will face and the kind of staff development which has helped or will help them. A short survey has been developed to obtain some of this information.

We would be grateful if you would participate in our survey as a key figure in the VET Sector. The initial survey will require about 15 minutes for you to complete. The project team has elected to use a modified Delphi technique which provides an opportunity to comment on the outcomes. Thus the results of the initial survey will be analysed and sent back to you for some further comment about a month later. Those who respond to both surveys will receive a copy of the final results.

The enclosed stamped-addressed envelope should be returned by Tuesday 9th November.
Responses could also be faxed to 02 6933 2888.

Comments

Please give your own opinions which may differ from those of your organisation. Your individual responses will be confidential and comments in the feedback from the survey will not be atrribvuted to particular respondents.

Thank you for considering this request. We hope you decide to help. Remember to return the survey questionnaire by Tuesday 9th November.

Erica Smith
Doug Hill
for the Project Team.

DELPHI SURVEY OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS – Round 1

The Round 1 Delphi Survey questions are repeated in the Round 2 Survey together with a summary of the responses to the first round.

The first three questions are repeated here to show the form in which they were presented:

Question 1
Nominate five critical challenges which you believe will be faced by VET teachers/trainers over the next five to seven years:
i)
ii)
iii)
iv)
v)

Question 2
How well prepared currently are VET teachers/trainers to face these challenges?
> *Use the scale:*
> 1. *On the whole, not prepared*
> 2. *Only a minority prepared*
> 3. *Some well prepared*
> 4. *Majority well prepared*
> 5. *On the whole, very well prepared.*

i)
ii)
iii)
iv)
v)

Question 3
How useful are the following sources of training and development in helping to deal with these challenges? Give ratings of 1-5, 1 being not useful and 5 being extremely useful.
(Please tick [✔] appropriate rating)

Sources of training to be considered	RATING				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
"Initial Teacher Training at University					
Certificate IV in Workplace Training					
Nationally funded training e.g. Framing the Future					
"In-house" formal program training					
Informal on-the-job training by providers					

DELPHI SURVEY OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS – Round 2

Question 1
Nominate five critical challenges which you believe will be faced by VET teachers/trainers over the next five to seven years.

The table below indicates the categories and response numbers derived from Round 1 responses. We now ask you to select the seven most important challenges and to rank them. You have the opportunity to select one more and include it in your ranking, if you wish.

CHALLENGES	Number of responses from survey no. 1	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Operate in competitive market	11		
Pace of change	10		
Use of technology	10		
Flexible delivery	9		
Keeping up to date/understanding changes to VET	9		
Understand/work with training packages	8		
Globalisation of VET & the economy	7		
Maintaining their own employment/career pattern in insecure times	7		
Keeping up to date with industry trends	6		
Understanding of dilemmas in educator's role (such as industry needs vs. education)	6		
Understanding changing nature of work	5		
Competency-based assessment	5		
Changing client groups	4		
Changing to role of facilitator	4		
Delivering training in the workplace	4		
Balancing 'real' requirements of industry with what the VET system tells teachers are industry's requirements	3		
Greater accountability/quality issues	3		
Work intensification	2		
Learning how to develop themselves	2		
Meeting industry needs	2		
'Growing' the training market, ie increasing demand for VET	2		
Shortage of teaching skills	2		
Customer focus	2		
National market in VET	2		
Other (please specify)			

Question 2
How well prepared currently are VET teachers/trainers to face these challenges?

In their responses, participants in the first round generally indicated their belief that only a minority of VET teachers/trainers was well prepared to meet the challenges identified in question 1. Responses varied slightly between different challenges.

We now ask you to rate teachers'/trainers' preparedness for the seven challenges you have chosen.
Note: You don't need to write the challenges in; just use the seven you picked as most important, in the ranking you chose. (So, for example, if you chose 'work intensification' as your first-ranked challenge, put your rating of teachers' preparedness for work intensification opposite number 1.)

Rating scale:
1. On the whole not prepared.
2. Only a minority prepared.
3. Some well prepared.
4. Majority well prepared.
5. On the whole very well prepared.

Challenge (your choice of the 7 most important, from Question 1)	Rating of VET teachers'/trainers' preparedness
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

Question 3
How useful are the following sources of training and development in helping to deal with these challenges?

The responses to this question from round 1 are given below. Please give your rating, which you may or may not wish to revise from your previous response. We also give you the opportunity to add, and rate, up to two new sources of training/staff development. **Give ratings of 1-5, 1 being not useful and 5 being extremely useful.**

	RATING Sources of training	1	2	3	4	5	Aver.	Std Dev.
A	'Initial' Teacher Training at University	4	8	5	7	5	3.03	1.35
B	Certificate IV in Workplace Training	6	8	8	7	0	2.56	1.09
C	Nationally funded training eg Framing the Future	4	6	7	9	3	3.03	1.24
D	"In-house" formal program training	1	7	14	6	1	2.97	0.87
E	Informal on-the-job training by providers	4	6	10	7	1	2.82	1.09
	Other (please specify)							
	Other (please specify							

Question 4

What do you consider are the essential attributes, skills and knowledge currently needed by VET teachers/trainers?

In each section of question 4 we present the categories which arose from Round 1 of the survey. We ask you to tick the seven most important, in your view, and to rank them from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important). We also give you the opportunity, in each case, to add an extra category if you wish.

For each section of question 4, we ask you to say how far you think VET teachers/trainers, in general, currently possess the attributes/skills/knowledge/capabilities you have identified as the 7 most important.

4.1
Attributes

Attribute	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Accept/cope with/predict change		
Flexibility/adaptability		
Tolerance/sensitivity to student needs		
Professionalism (includes taking responsibility for updating knowledge)		
Problem solving/lateral thinking		
Passion for teaching		
Entrepreneurial		
Commitment to equity and social justice		
Willingness to work with others		
Customer focus		
Reflective		
Leader/facilitator		
Able to take initiative		
Critical attitude to government policy		
Explore/be curious		
Creative		
Other (please specify)		

Question 4.1a
Do VET teachers, in general, currently possess that characteristic?

Rating scale:
1. No
2. Possibly
3. Yes

Characteristic (your choice of the 7 most important, from Question 4.1)	Rating
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

4.2: Skills

SKILL	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Delivery/teaching		
Technology		
Develop customised programs for industry		
Assessment		
Industry/subject expertise		
Operate confidently in workplace setting		
Facilitation		
Organisational/managerial		
Marketing		
Flexible delivery		
Negotiation		
Searching/research skills		
Other (please specify)		

Question 4.2a   Do VET teachers, in general, currently possess that characteristic?

Rating scale :
1. No
2. Possibly
3. Yes

Characteristic (your choice of the 7 most important, from Question 4.2)	Rating
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

Question 4.3   Knowledge

KNOWLEDGE	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Learning principles/learning styles		
Industry knowledge		
National Training Framework/Training Packages		
Competency standards		
Political/economic factors that could impact on VET (bigger picture)		
Labour market and where it links to VET		
Lifelong learning		
Knowledge of educational theory in order to evaluate policy changes		
Other (please specify)		

Question 4.3a Do VET teachers, in general, currently possess that characteristic?

Rating scale :
1. No
2. Possibly
3. Yes

Characteristic (your choice of the 7 most important, from Question 4.3)	**Rating**
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

Question 4.4
What do you consider are the essential competencies and capabilities currently needed by VET teachers/trainers?

This question gave respondents the opportunity to answer questions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 in an holistic manner instead of answering each of questions 4.1 to 4.3. Some participants chose to answer 4.4 in addition to 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. We are aware that there is some overlap between the four parts of question 4, but nevertheless hope you will answer all parts, as there do seem to be differences in the categories.

Competencies and capabilities	Tick the seven most important (in your view)	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Industry experience/knowledge		
Teaching/delivery skills (including flexible delivery)		
Deal with students as individuals		
Analytical/critical/lateral thinking		
Change management		
Self-management skills		
Flexibility		
Management/leadership skills		
Higher industrial qualifications		
Provide support to students i.e. listening, counselling, mentoring		
Learn in an ongoing way		
Communication skills		
Teaching embedded generic skills		
'Dual professionalism' (content area and teaching)		
Other (please specify)		

Question 4.4a   Do VET teachers currently possess that characteristic?

Rating scale:
1. No
2. Possibly
3. Yes

Characteristic (your choice of the 7 most important, from Question 4.4)	**Rating**
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

Question 5

What additional attributes, skills and knowledge do you think will be required over the next five to seven years?

This question was designed to get at respondents' views about the new and developing competencies and capabilities that VET teachers and trainers might need in the near future. As you see, a number of slightly different categories emerged in this question. We now ask you to choose the 7 most important, rank them, and then, in question 5a, to say whether you believe VET teachers/trainers currently possess each of those characteristics.

Attributes/skills/knowledge for the future	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Technological knowledge		
Adaptability		
Project management		
Working in partnership with industry		
Marketing		
Creativity/imagination		
Responsiveness to individual students' needs		
Tenacity		
Access & manage information		
Brokerage		
Range of delivery methods		
Communication skills		
Other (please specify)		

Question 5a   **Do VET teachers currently possess that characteristic?**

Rating scale :
1. No
2. Possibly
3. Yes

Characteristic (your choice of the 7 most important, from Question 5)	Rating
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

Question 6

What do you consider are the main barriers to the development of the attributes, skills and knowledge currently needed by VET teacher/trainers?

In this question, we ask you to choose and rank the seven most important barriers from the categories proposed by respondents in Round 1.

BARRIERS	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Lack of time		
Funding for staff development		
Lack of management support or expertise		
Aging VET workforce/resistance to change		
Teachers' problems with working with CBT and training reform		
Lack of funding (general)		
National or organisational lack of vision		
VET workforce casualisation/contracts		
Organisational culture does not facilitate staff development		
Constant change		
Lack of incentive/career structure		
Lack of access to staff development		
Lack of access to technology		
Lack of national/State staff development		
Lack of encouragement/incentive for university teaching qualification		
Other (please specify)		

Question 6a (New question)

Do you have any views about how any of these barriers (choose up to 3) might be overcome?

Question 7

[This question was asked only in Round 1. It asked respondents to nominate a professional development program that they believed had contributed to the improvement of practice of VET teachers/trainers.]

Question 8

Thinking about the quality of VET provision, what do you think will contribute most to the improvement of the quality of VET provision over the next five to seven years?

As with previous questions, we would like you to choose and rank the seven you regard as most important. The categories are those identified by respondents in Round 1.

CATEGORIES	Tick the seven most important, in your view	Rank your chosen seven from 1 (most important) to 7 (least important)
Support for staff development/training		
More general funding		
Better management practices		
Management/team vision		
Better qualified VET teachers		
Research		
Recognition of importance of teaching skills		
Quality of teachers		
Funding for staff development/training		
Better wages/conditions		
Training packages		
Increase in status of VET		
Better links between VET & industry		
Quality endorsement		
Clear policy directions		
Rethink relative status of industry/ community/individuals as VET clients		
Accountability based on outcomes		
Availability of new technology		
Other (please specify)		

Question 9

Any further comments

A number of respondents supplied extra comments in this section, some quite detailed.

The following statements were drawn mainly from responses to Question 9, but also from responses to other questions. We would like you to say the extent to which you agree or disagree with these statements.

SA   - **strongly agree**
A   **- agree**
U   - **undecided**
D   - **disagree**
SD   - **strongly disagree**

STATEMENT	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. The diversity of VET teachers means it makes no sense to aggregate VET teachers in a survey of this nature					
2. VET teachers need to develop a 'dual professionalism' - industry and education					
3. Centres for Teaching and Learning should be established in VET providers					
4. We need to maximise and build on teachers' personal strengths					
5. Professional development should be put into the universities because VET teachers should be allowed to stand back from the tensions and confusions of the workplace					
6. Teachers need to be good 'bullshit detectors' to see behind the policy rhetoric					
7. Teachers are having to develop their own human capital through professional development, especially casual staff					
8. Teachers have to balance their own local industry's needs and wants with curriculum derived from ITABs, which don't represent 'real industry'					
9. Many PD programs are about getting teachers to toe the policy line					
10. Few people have any conception of what VET will be like in the future - even the short-term future with RTOs and Training Packages					
11. There will be a move from teaching to assessment					
12. We need more opportunity for teachers to share their practice with each other					
13.					

Question 10

Yes/No

Would you be willing to participate in a Third Round of this survey?

Name ....

Question 11

Any other comments

Please add any other comments you wish relating to VET teachers/trainers and their development.

DELPHI STUDY OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS – Round 3

Thank you to those people who responded to one or both rounds of the Delphi survey which is part of an NREC-funded project about the professional development of VET teachers and trainers. We hope you will be able to participate in this third and final round. We are also sending this to people who may not have responded to either round, but who are nevertheless invited to participate in this round.

This round:
1.   Provides feedback on the results of Round 2 (shaded questions)
2.   Asks you to respond to some of the outcomes of Round 2 ('white' questions)
3.   Seeks your opinion about participating in this method of research (in the section 'Questions about the Delphi process'), and
4.   Provides an opportunity for making further comments about the issues under investigation in the research project.

Although the questionnaire looks quite long, most of the length consists of feedback on Round 2. There are not very many questions for your to answer. To make it easier for you to find the bits you have to fill in, we have shaded the feedback sections, so the only parts for you to answer are those in the 'white' sections.

The survey should be returned to: (envelope enclosed)
Erica Smith
School of Education
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 588
Wagga Wagga NSW 2678

Or faxed to Louise Jacobson on: 02-6933 2768 (email: esmith@csu.edu.au).

We presented a paper on the results so far at the AVETRA (Australian VET Researchers' Association) conference at RMIT in Melbourne in February, and were pleased to see several Delphi participants in the audience. Some of the points raised at the conference session have been incorporated in this Round. Thank you to everyone who offered suggestions and comments. As suggested, we are also going to trial the questionnaire with some groups of VET teachers and trainers. If you would like a copy of the conference paper, please ring Louise or email her at: ljacobson@csu.edu.au

Erica Smith   Doug Hill
On behalf of the project team
22 March 1999

Professional Development of VET Teachers and Trainers

Survey

Invitation to teacher participants

A national research project is being conducted by the Centre for Research in Education, Equity and Work, at the University of South Australia, the Group for Research in Employment and Training at Charles Sturt University and the TAFE Queensland Centre for Advancement of Innovative Learning. The project is funded by the ANTA National Research and Evaluation Committee. The project is entitled "Improving the Quality of VET Provision: The Role of Staff Development for Teachers and Trainers in VET Providers". An important focus for the project is identifying the kinds of challenges which VET teachers/trainers have faced or will face and the kind of staff development, which has helped or will help them. A short survey has been developed to obtain some of this information.

We have administered this survey to 50 'key stakeholders' in the VET system: national and State policy and staff development personnel; teacher union representatives; representatives of public and private providers. Now we want to see whether teachers' own views are consistent with those of these 'key stakeholders'.

The 50 people who have responded have replied to a series of three questionnaires, each slightly different from the previous one. We have amalgamated these questionnaires for the teacher survey; and the teacher survey includes some feedback from the 'key stakeholders'. Although the survey looks long it should not take you more than 20 minutes to complete. We will send you a summary of the outcomes from this survey.

Comments

Please give your own opinions which may differ from those of your organisation. Your individual responses will be confidential and comments in the feedback from the survey will not be attributed to particular respondents.

Thank you for considering this request. We hope you decide to help. Please return your survey to the contact person who will collect the surveys and return them to us. If you have any queries please ring Doug Hill on 02-6933 2442.

Erica Smith
Doug Hill
for the Project Team

Telephone survey of human resource personnel in public and private registered training organisations

The size of the sample of registered training organisations (to be approximately 400) was determined by a number of factors including cost and recommendation from the National Research and Evaluation Committee.

The surveyed population comprised:

• all public providers (n=70) listed on the OZJAC database as at February 1999, and

• a stratified random sample of private providers (n=346) drawn from a customised NTIS database developed for this project by the Curriculum Corporation (n=3,435 excluding 415 schools, bible colleges and State/Territory Training Authorities). The numbers of private providers chosen randomly within each State/Territory by the interviewers were in proportion to the total numbers in each State/Territory whose registration was listed as current on the NTIS database as at 13 April 1999. Table D1 sets out the *proposed* sample and its distribution by State/Territory.

Table D1: Proposed sample for telephone survey, by State/Territory

State/Territory	Total number of private RTOs in the State/Territory	Proportional number of private providers	Total number of public providers (TAFE)	Total number of RTOs for the State/Territory
ACT	118	12	1	13
NSW	709	71	9	80
NT	79	8	3	11
QLD	867	87	16	103
SA	335	33	8	41
TAS	132	13	1	14
VIC	776	77	18	95
WA	427	43	14	57
TOTALS	3443	344	70	414

The telephone interviews were conducted using the MS CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system at the University of South Australia. Trained interviewers conducted all interviews using a standardised interview schedule. The data collection process was monitored to ensure the quality of the data collected.

Interviews were held with the person nominated by the provider as the one who had particular responsibility for managing human resources and was in a position to provide information on staff numbers, employment details and staff development arrangements. These persons reported various job titles to the interviewers, including Director (n=40), Manager (25), Managing Director (22), Human Resource Manager (17), Principal (16), Training Manager (14), Training Coordinator (12), General Manager (10), CEO (9), Coordinator (8) and many others.

Table D2 sets out the *realised* sample for the telephone survey.

Table D2: Distribution of *realised* sample, by type of provider and by State/Territory

	TAFE	Commercial provider	Community-based provider	Enterprise-based provider	Total number of providers
South Australia	6	17	9	6	38
Victoria	12	29	37	15	93
New South Wales	4	32	25	15	76
Northern Territory	3	4	4	1	12
Western Australia	9	22	12	8	51
Queensland	13	47	22	15	97
Tasmania	1	7	5	2	15
ACT	0	9	3	0	12
TOTAL	48	167	117	62	394

In the sample of 394 RTOs were 42% (n=167) commercial providers, 30% (n=117) community-based providers, 16% (n=62) enterprise-based providers and 12% (n=48) TAFE colleges/institutes.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

ORGANISATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

PART A
This section of the survey is asking you about the teachers and trainers who work in your organisation.

1.
What was the total number of teachers and trainers working in your organisation as at 30th June 1999?

> *Teaching and trainers are here defined as those persons who have responsibility for teaching and developing education and training programs. They include program coordinators, curriculum development officers, etc.*

2.
Estimate the numbers of teachers, trainers and consultants working in your organisation in each of the given categories as at 30th June 1999.

> *Permanent staff are all staff employed on an ongoing continual basis*
>
> *Contract staff are all staff employed on a fixed term contract*
>
> *Casual/sessional staff are all staff employed on an hourly basis (they are not entitled to sick pay or paid holidays)*
>
> *Self-employed independent contractors are self-employed staff recruited for a specific period of time to undertake a specific role such as curriculum development, research etc.*
>
> *Agency-employed staff are those employed by a labour hire firm or an employment agency who are then subsequently hired out to organisations*

Permanent staff		Contract staff		Casual/Sessional staff		Self-employed contractors		Agency-employed staff	
Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females

3.

When your organisation recruits teachers or trainers, from where do you <u>usually</u> recruit them? Please rank as many sources as are relevant for each category of staff, 1 being first source, 2 being second etc.

• from industry					
• from public VET providers					
• from private VET providers					
• from recent university graduates					
• from staff already employed within your organisation					
• from secondary schools					
• from employment agencies/labour hire firms					
• other (please specify)					

4.

What minimum level of skills and qualifications does your Registered Training Organisation currently require for each of the following categories of teachers and trainers?

> *Initial skills and qualifications could include:*
> * *Workplace Trainer Category I or II*
> * *Other Train the Trainer programs*
> * *National Teaching and Learning (NTL)*
> * *Workplace Assessor Qualification*
> * *A teaching qualification such as a degree or diploma*
> * *A prescribed period of experience in industry*
> * *Certificate/diploma or degree in industry/content area*
> * *Membership of specific professional bodies/associations*
> * *Postgraduate qualification (Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma Masters, PhD)*

	Initial skills and qualifications
Permanent staff	
Contract staff	
Casual/Sessional staff	
Self-employed contractors	
Agency-employed staff	

5.

How do you determine the minimum qualifications for each category of staff that you listed in Question 4?

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

6.

How useful do you believe the following <u>teaching / training qualifications</u> are for your staff?

Please note: with the introduction of the Training Package for Assessment and Workplace Training, some of the names of qualifications have changed. Where this has happened, older qualifications (relating to the competency standards in use prior to 1999) have been designated "pre 1999". The unit "Train in small groups" appears in the new Workplace Assessor and Trainer Training Package and replaces the Workplace Trainer Category 1 qualification. The Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training and the Diploma in Training and Assessment Systems are new qualifications in the new Training Package.

Please circle one response for each item.

	Very useful	Useful	Only useful to some extent	Not useful	Not applicable to my organisation
Workplace Trainer Cat. 1 (Pre 1999)	4	3	2	1	0
(Train in Small Groups – Certificate of attainment)	4	3	2	1	0
Workplace Trainer Cat. 2 (Pre 1999)	4	3	2	1	0
Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training	4	3	2	1	0
Workplace Assessor qualification	4	3	2	1	0
National Teaching and Learning	4	3	2	1	0
Diploma in Training and Assessment Systems	4	3	2	1	0
Teaching qualification such as a diploma or degree	4	3	2	1	0
Post graduate qualifications in education (eg Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters or PhD)	4	3	2	1	0

7.

How useful do you believe the following <u>qualifications in industry / content specific knowledge</u> are for your staff?

Please circle one response for each item.

	Very useful	Useful	Only useful to some extent	Not useful	Not applicable to my organisation
Certificate/diploma in industry / content area	4	3	2	1	0
Degree in industry / content area	4	3	2	1	0
Post graduate qualifications in industry / content area (eg Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma, Masters or PhD)	4	3	2	1	0

PART B

This part of the survey is asking you about staff development for teachers and trainers in your organisation.

Staff development includes activities undertaken by your staff to enhance their performance at work. They are designed to develop employment-related skills and competencies. They can be offered in a variety of modes (face-to-face, using flexible delivery strategies). For the purposes of this survey, staff development activities can include any of the following:

- *Workshops, lectures, tutorials, seminars, conferences and training courses, video/audio conferencing, action learning sets*
- *Staff development programs offered under the auspices of a national group (eg Framing the Future) or provided by state-based organisations using state or federal grant money*
- *Study at TAFE, University or some other tertiary organisation*
- *Industry release (that is, spending time in industry to update skills and knowledge)*
- *Interstate or overseas study tours*
- *Staff exchange programs*
- *Programs provided by professional associations*
- *Mentoring programs*
- *Peer appraisal programs (such as those that involve staff members observing each other facilitating learning and then discussing outcomes)*

8.

Does your organisation have:
(Please tick relevant boxes)

	Yes	No
a. a specialist staff development unit or section?	☐	☐
b. a staff development/HR manager?	☐	☐
c. an officer with specific responsibility for staff development?	☐	☐
d. a staff development committee?	☐	☐

9.

How are staff development needs predominantly determined for each of the following groups of staff?

Please rank as many boxes as are relevant for each category of staff, 1 being most frequent, 2 being second etc.

	Permanent staff	Contract staff	Casual/sessional staff
Skills audit			
Training needs analysis			
Performance appraisal or work plan interview			
Workplace agreement			
State/national policy			
Responses to client satisfaction surveys			
Informal methods			
Individual teachers/trainers decide what they need			
Other, please specify			
…………………………………………………………			
…………………………………………………………			
…………………………………………………………			

10.

Which of the following strategies does your organisation currently use to determine the types of staff development activities that teachers and trainers undertake?

(Please tick relevant boxes)

	Yes	No
a. a list of staff development activities is circulated to staff and they nominate what they want to attend	☐	☐
b. a list of staff development activities is circulated and supervisors/managers nominate which staff they want to attend	☐	☐
c. teachers and trainers decide what staff development they want to undertake and they negotiate with the appropriate staff	☐	☐
d. teachers and trainers are assessed in a formal way (eg against competencies, staff development plan etc.) and a staff development plan is prepared	☐	☐

f. other, please specify

11.

Do you have any specific programs in place to assist teachers and trainers in keeping up-to-date in their industry?

Yes ☐   If yes, describe these programs in the space below (please include details of the groups of staff (permanent, contract, casual/sessional) that have access to these programs

No ☐   If no, go to question 12

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

12.

What factors are taken into account when deciding to support staff development activities for the various categories of staff in your organisation?

Factors affecting staff development support for <u>permanent</u> staff:

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

Factors affecting staff development support for <u>contract</u> staff:

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

Factors affecting staff development support for <u>casual/sessional</u> staff:

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

13.

Which of the following types of support does your organisation currently provide, and how often, to the different groups of teachers and trainers for their staff development activities?

Please circle one response for each group of staff using the following scale
1 = Never
2 = Sometimes
3 = Always

	Permanent Staff	Contract Staff	Casual/sessional Staff
A fixed amount of paid time	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3
Assistance with HECS fees (for university courses)	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3
Assistance with the cost of books or materials	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3
Assistance to cover the cost of attendance fees, registration fees	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3
Assistance to cover cost of travel to staff development activities	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3	1..….2…...3
Other support (please specify) …………………………………………………. …………………………………………………. ………………………………………………………	1..….2…...3 1…..2…..3 1…..2…..3	1..….2…...3 1…..2…..3 1…..2…..3	1..….2…...3 1…..2…..3 1…..2…..3

14.

What are the most important factors influencing the decisions your organisation makes about staff development for its teachers and trainers?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

15.

This question is asking for some background information about your organisation. Please tick one response for each question.

(a) Which one of the following categories best describes your organisation?

TAFE ☐

Commercial provider of VET (delivering training to private individuals on a fee-for-service basis, eg business college) ☐

Community-based provider of VET (funded by government or community-sponsored organisations, eg adult education centre) ☐

Other (please specify) ☐

_____

(b) In which state/territory is your organisation?

_____

(c) Is your organisation located

	Yes	No
a. within a capital city?	☐	☐
b. within a major provincial city?	☐	☐
c. within a region classified as rural/remote?	☐	☐

(d) What level(s) of qualifications does your organisation provide to its clients?

Please tick as many boxes as are relevant.

Certificate I	☐
Certificate II	☐
Certificate III	☐
Certificate IV	☐
Diploma	☐
Advanced Diploma	☐
Degree	☐
Graduate Certificate	☐
Other (please specify)	…………………………………………………………

(e) What is the title of your position in the organisation?

…………………………………………………………

Questionnaire survey of teachers/trainers in public and private registered training organisations

The sample

From the telephone survey of 394 human resource personnel (Appendix D), 311 registered training organisations agreed to forward questionnaires to small samples of their teachers and trainers. The following table sets out the distribution of these by State and type of provider.

State/ Territory	Providers who agreed to distribute questionnaires to teachers/trainers						Refusals	Out-of-scope	N
	Commercial providers	Community-based providers	Enterprise-based providers	Total Public	Total Private	Total no. of providers for each State/ Territory			
TAS	6	4	2	1	12	13	2	1	16
ACT	5	3	0	0	8	8	3	1	12
SA	11	9	4	6	24	30	8	1	39
VIC	21	30	12	11	64	75	18	0	93
NSW	28	19	11	3	58	61	16	0	77
NT	4	3	1	3	8	11	1	0	12
WA	13	9	5	8	27	35	16	2	53
QLD	38	20	9	11	67	78	22	4	104
Totals	126	97	44	43	268	311	86	9	406

The following table details the number of questionnaires sent to public and private training providers by State / Territory.

State/Territory	Number of questionnaires sent to private RTOs	Number of questionnaires sent to public RTOs	Total
TAS	67	90	157
ACT	65	0	65
SA	143	263	406
QLD	403	403	806
WA	163	284	447
NSW	732	510	1242
NT	70	99	169
VIC	756	434	1190
Totals	2399	2083	4482

Response rate

A total of 4,482 questionnaires were sent to 311 registered training organisations for distribution to their teachers/trainers.

Responses were received from 809 teachers/trainers. Of these, 123 were not useable (questionnaires were returned by human resource officers or individual teachers who decided not to distribute questionnaires because they felt they were not relevant).

In total, therefore, 686 responses were usable, giving a response rate of 16%. This response rate is low and can be attributed to a number of factors including:

- The timing of the survey (November–December). Many RTOs would have been preoccupied with end of year procedures which would not have predisposed them to spend time on a questionnaire.

- Anecdotal evidence from teachers/trainers and some organisational contacts suggested that RTOs were becoming weary of responding to surveys and hence declined to participate because of this.

- It was very difficult to determine the exact numbers of questionnaires to send to each RTO. In many instances our calculations to determine the number of questionnaires to send to a RTO were based on their estimates of the numbers of teachers/trainers they employed. This may have resulted in too many questionnaires being distributed and therefore not returned because they were not needed.

- The mechanism used to distribute questionnaires to teachers/trainers was not direct. Some organisations may, on receipt of the questionnaires, have decided not to proceed with the process. In addition, the time taken to distribute the questionnaires to the teachers/trainers in some instances was quite lengthy. In these cases, the due date for the return of the questionnaire had long past. This would have resulted in a number of teachers/trainers deciding not to participate.

However, the resulting number of returned questionnaires to be included in the analysis still represents one of the largest surveys of VET teachers/trainers undertaken in Australia in recent times.

Distribution of respondents by State

State/Territory	Frequency	Percentage
Australian Capital Territory	3	0.4
New South Wales	65	9.5
Northern Territory	13	1.9
Queensland	74	10.8
South Australia	89	13.0
Tasmania	32	4.7
Victoria	100	14.5
Western Australia	53	7.7
Not known	257	37.5
Total	686	100.0

Distribution of respondents by mode of employment

Mode of employment	Frequency	Percentage
Permanent	361	52.9
Contract	159	23.3
Casual/sessional	135	19.8
Self-employed contractors	28	4.1
Missing	3	-
Totals	686	100.0

Number of years teachers/trainers had been employed in their current organisation

The mean number of years teachers/trainers had been in their organisation was 8.0 years (SD = 7.2017). The minimum amount of time was 0 years, and the maximum amount of time was 36 years.

The following table sets out the distribution of the sample by years with their current organisation.

Number of years with current organisation	Frequency	Percentage
2 years or less	181	26.9
3 - 5 years	149	22.2
6 - 10 years	152	22.8
11 - 15 years	70	10.4
16 - 20 years	69	10.3
21 + years	50	7.4
Missing	15	-
Total	686	100.0

Just under one half of all teachers / trainers (49%) had been working in their current organisation for five years or less.

Number of years teachers/trainers had been in their current position

The mean number of years teachers/trainers had been in their current position was 5.1 years (SD = 5.2081). The minimum amount of time was 0 years, and the maximum amount of time was 28 years.

Modes of delivery that teachers/trainers were predominantly working within their organisation

Mode of delivery	Frequency*	Percentage
Predominantly institution-based	356	51.6
Predominantly flexible	196	28.4
Predominantly workplace-based	124	18.0
Combination of modes	202	29.3

* Some respondents gave more than one answer

Employment with more than one VET provider

141 teachers/trainers reported that they worked with another VET provider

Main occupation of teachers/trainers

163 (23.6%) of respondents reported that their main job was not that of a VET teacher/trainer

Fields of education teachers and trainers predominantly teach/train in

Field of education*	Permanent	Contract	Casual/ Sessional	Self-employed contractors
Arts, humanities, social science	33	12	15	0
Architecture, building	19	9	5	12
Business, administration	78	21	22	6
Sales and marketing	13	6	12	4
Computing	37	14	27	0
Economics, law, legal studies	15	2	0	3
Surveying, engineering (civil, electrical, mechanical)	33	6	5	6
Health, community services	54	29	19	1
Agriculture, horticulture and related fields	14	12	5	3
Service, hospitality	29	21	12	3
Transport industries	16	4	2	4
Science, veterinary science, animal care	5	1	3	0
Education	37	8	17	1
Multi-field education (ESL, literacy, numeracy, etc.)	55	38	29	3

* Some respondents gave more than one answer

Gender

	Frequency	Percentage
Male	316	46.6
Female	362	53.4
Missing	8	-
Total	686	100.0

Age

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
20 – 24 years	11	1.6
25 – 29 years	29	4.3
30 – 34 years	46	6.8
35 – 39 years	91	13.5
40 – 44 years	149	22.0
45 – 49 years	154	22.8
50 – 54 years	119	17.6
55 + years	77	11.4
Missing	10	-
Total	686	100.0

Type of organisation that distributed questionnaire to teacher/trainer

Type of organisation	Frequency	Percentage
TAFE	373	54.9
Commercial provider of VET	72	10.8
Community-based provider of VET	135	20.0
Enterprise-based provider of VET	35	5.2
Other	62	9.1
Missing	9	
Total	686	100.0

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

TEACHER/TRAINER PERSPECTIVES

This questionnaire is part of a large nation-wide survey examining staff development for teachers and trainers employed in the VET sector. Please answer all questions with reference to the organisation that asked you to participate in this survey.

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

In this section we would like some background information about yourself and your employment as a teacher/trainer.

Please tick the appropriate box or place a brief written answer in the space provided.

1.1

What is the status of your current employment?

Permanent staff are all staff employed on an ongoing continual basis

Contract staff are all staff employed on a fixed term contract

Casual/Sessional staff are all staff employed on an hourly basis (they are not entitled to sick pay or paid holidays)

Self-employed independent contractors are self-employed staff recruited for a specific period of time to undertake a specific role such as curriculum development, research etc.

Agency-employed staff are those employed by a labour hire firm or an employment agency who are then subsequently hired out to organisations

A. Permanent ☐

B. Contract ☐

C. Casual/sessional ☐

D. Self employed, independent contractor ☐

E. Agency-employed staff ☐

1.2

How many years have you worked   a) in your current organisation? _____

b) in your current position?   _____

What is the title of your current position in the organisation?   _____

1.3

Which of the following modes of delivery are you involved with in your work as a teacher/trainer?
Please tick as many as are applicable to you.

A. Predominantly off-job (institution-based) ☐

B. Predominantly on-job (in a workplace) ☐

C. A combination of on and off-job training ☐

D. Predominantly flexible modes of delivery ☐

1.4

Are you <u>currently employed</u> as a teacher /trainer for any VET provider(s) other than the one that gave you this questionnaire to complete?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If yes, please go to question 1.5
                    If no, go to question 1.6

1.5

When you work for these providers, what is the nature of your employment with them?

A. On a permanent basis ☐

B. On a contract basis ☐

C. On a casual/sessional basis ☐

D. As a self employed, independent contractor ☐

E. As labour hire / employment agency staff ☐

1.6

Is your main occupation as a teacher /trainer?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If no, what is your main occupation?

                    …………………………………………

1.7

Which of the following fields of education best describes the types of programs you most often are involved in delivering?
Please tick one box only.

A. Arts, humanities, social science ☐

B. Architecture, building ☐

C. Business, administration ☐

D. Sales and marketing ☐

E. Computing ☐

F. Economics, law, legal studies ☐

G. Surveying, engineering (electrical, civil, mechanical etc) ☐

H. Health, community services ☐

I. Agriculture, horticulture and related fields ☐

J. Service, hospitality ☐

K. Transport industries ☐

L. Science, veterinary science, animal care ☐

M. Education

N. Multi-field education (eg ESL, literacy, numeracy, ☐
    Pre-employment, adult basic education)

1.6

Gender   Male ☐   Female ☐

1.7

Age group   20 – 24 years ☐   25 – 29 years ☐

                30 – 34 years ☐   35 – 39 years ☐

                40 – 44 years ☐   45 – 49 years ☐

                50 – 54 years ☐   55 + years ☐

1.8

Which one of the following categories best describes the RTO that gave you this questionnaire?

TAFE

Commercial provider of VET (delivering training to private individuals on a fee-for-service basis, eg business college)

Community-based provider of VET (funded by government or community-sponsored organisations, eg adult education centre)

An enterprise-based provider of VET

Other (please specify)

_____

1.9

Is the RTO that gave you this questionnaire:

	Yes	No
a. a single site RTO?		
b. a multi site RTO?		

SECTION 2: FORMAL QUALIFICATIONS

In this section we would like some information about your formal qualifications.

Formal qualifications are courses where an award is conferred upon successful completion. They can include postgraduate and graduate qualifications (in a discipline/trade, or a specific teaching qualification) and/or Workplace Trainer/Assessor Certificates.

2.1

What formal qualifications have you acquired?

Please
a) list these in the space given below
b) indicate (by ticking the relevant box) whether you acquired these qualifications before or after you commenced employment with the RTO that gave you this questionnaire and
c) rate each of the qualifications you have acquired in terms of their relevance to your current work where

1 = very relevant,	2 = relevant
3 = somewhat relevant	4 = not relevant

	Acquired before employment	Acquired after employment	Rating (Relevance)
A. ……………………………………	☐	☐	☐
B. ……………………………………	☐	☐	☐
C. ……………………………………	☐	☐	☐
D. ……………………………………	☐	☐	☐
E. ……………………………………	☐	☐	☐

2.2

Are you CURRENTLY completing a formal qualification?

Yes ☐   No ☐   If yes, continue onto to question 2.3
                             If no, go to question 2.6

2.3

What qualifications are you currently studying for? Please list these in the space below and indicate the type of educational institution that is delivering these qualifications.

Deliverers of qualifications can include a university, TAFE institute, a combination of a university and TAFE institute/other private provider, a professional association or union, a community provider, a commercial private provider.

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

2.4

Are you receiving any support from your employer to assist you with the formal studies you are currently completing?

Yes ☐　　　　　No ☐　　　　If yes, please continue onto question 2.5
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　If no, go to question 2.6

2.5

Which of the following types of support are you receiving?
Please tick as many boxes as are relevant to you.

A fixed amount of paid time ☐

Assistance with HECS/course fees ☐

Assistance with the cost of books/ materials ☐

Other support (please specify)

…………………………………………….……………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

2.6

Why did you complete/ or are you completing these formal qualifications?
Please rank as many reasons as are relevant to you, 1 being the most important, 2 being second etc.

A. To acquire qualifications ☐

B. To enhance qualifications already achieved ☐

C. To keep up with current job ☐

D. Requirement of employer ☐

E. To learn/update industry knowledge and skills ☐

F. To increase job satisfaction ☐

G. To get promotion in the short term ☐

H. To assist long term career prospects ☐

I. To maintain place in the job market ☐

J. Other, please specify: ………………………………………………………………

SECTION 3: STAFF DEVELOPMENT OTHER THAN FORMAL QUALIFICATIONS

In this section we would like information about the structured education and training activities (EXCLUDING formal qualifications) that you have undertaken in the last 12 months whilst employed with the organisation who gave you this questionnaire to complete.

Structured education and training activities are work-related activities that could be initiated by your employer or yourself. They are designed to develop employment-related skills and competencies, but which do not lead to a formal qualification. Structured education and training activities can include workshops, lectures, tutorials, training seminars, conferences, industry release, interstate or overseas tours to observe best practice, new developments etc., action learning programs (such as Framing the Future), flexibly delivered programs, self-directed learning packages.

3.1
In what areas did you undertake structured education and training activities **in the last 12 months (excluding the formal qualifications you listed in Section 2)?**

Please tick as many items as are relevant to you and then for each item you have ticked
a)   rate each of the qualifications you have acquired in terms of their relevance to your current work where

1 = very relevant,	2 = relevant
3 = somewhat relevant	4 = not relevant

b)   indicate the approximate number of hours (contact and study time) you spent undertaking staff development on each topic

	Ranking (Relevance)	No. of hours
A. Leadership and management skills	☐	_____
B. Industry liaison	☐	_____
C. Project management	☐	_____
D. Quality assurance	☐	_____
E. Computing/IT	☐	_____
F. Interpersonal skills, team work	☐	_____
G. Research skills	☐	_____
H. Occupational Health and Safety	☐	_____
I. Training Packages	☐	_____
J. User Choice	☐	_____

		Ranking (Relevance)	No. of hours
K. New Apprenticeships	☐	☐	_____
L. Updating teaching/training skills	☐	☐	_____
M. Updating knowledge of discipline/field	☐	☐	_____
N. Assessment	☐	☐	_____

O. Other, please specify (include an indication of the relevance of these topics and the number of hours spent in staff development on each)

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

3.2

For the structured education and training activities you indicated in 3.1, if there was a cost involved, how were these activities funded?

Funded totally by me	☐
Funded totally by my employer	☐
Funded jointly by me and my employer	☐
Funded by other sources (please specify)	☐

_____

If the costs were shared, approximately what percentage of the costs were covered by you and your employer?

_____% funded by employer   _____% funded by me

Who provided these structured education and training activities?
Please tick as many boxes as are relevant:

Public VET provider other than the RTO you work for	☐
The RTO that employs you	☐
University	☐
Industry/enterprise	☐

Other organisations (please specify)
………………………………...

3.3

Why did you participate in the structured education and training activities you have listed in 3.1?

Please rank as many reasons as are relevant to you, 1 being the most important, 2 being the second etc.

A. To enhance qualifications already achieved ☐

B. To keep up with current job ☐

C. Required by employer ☐

D. To learn/update field/disciple knowledge/skills ☐

E. To increase job satisfaction ☐

F. To get promotion in the short term ☐

G. To assist long term career prospects ☐

H. To learn/update teaching/training skills ☐

I. Other, please specify: ……………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION 4: GENERAL ISSUES

This section is asking for your opinions about some general issues relating to staff development for VET teachers/trainers.

4.1

Have any of the following factors prevented you from undertaking formal qualifications or attending education and training activities in the last 12 months?
Please tick as many factors for each type of activity as applies to you.

	Formal qualifications	Structured education & training activities
A. Approval to attend was not given	☐	☐
B. Available places already taken	☐	☐
C. No relief teachers/trainers available	☐	☐
D. RTO does not have enough funds for staff devt.	☐	☐
E. Insufficient information	☐	☐
F. I do not have enough money to fund staff devt.	☐	☐
G. Location and timing difficulties	☐	☐
H. Dissatisfied with previous education & training undertaken	☐	☐
I. Lack of encouragement from employer	☐	☐
J. Pressure of work prevented attendance	☐	☐
K. Family commitments prevented attendance	☐	☐
L. Child-care facilities not available	☐	☐
M. Activities not relevant to my needs	☐	☐
N. I'm not interested in education and training	☐	☐
O. I am not eligible to attend		
P. Negative reports about education & training activities discouraged me from attending		
Q. I was reluctant to take time off without pay		

Other factors, please specify: …………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………...

Case studies of staff development sites and programs

Protocol for site visits

Introduction

Case study sites will be selected as examples of 'good practice' in relation to the provision of staff development for VET teachers and trainers. Case study visits will require members of the research team to:

❖ view each organisation's staff development policies, documentation

❖ speak with personnel who have responsibility for SD

❖ talk to teachers/trainers about their experiences of SD within that organisation

Setting up the site visit

Before the visit, the manager of each site will be contacted to confirm the site visit and to make arrangements for access to staff development personnel, relevant documentation and teachers/trainers.

In establishing the visit it will need to be made clear that the case study will be written up and a draft sent to the key contact person in each organisation for comment and information. Permission will be sought to publish the name of the provider, or alternatively, the identity of the site could be disguised.

When discussing the visit, the manager will need to be asked to set up interviews with approximately 8–12 teachers and trainers. They can be interviewed individually or in small groups. Teachers and trainers to be interviewed need to be selected so that they reflect the staff profile of the institution in terms of the following 8 categories. Employment mode and experience should be given the highest priority.

1 Employment mode (permanent, contract, casual/sessional, self-employed independent contractors and agency employed staff)

2 Years of experience (new: up to three years; experienced: 4–10 years; very experienced: + 10 years)

3 Nature of position held in the organisation (tutor, trainer, teacher, etc.)

4 Industry area

5 Gender

6 Age

7 Teacher education (certificate IV; diploma, bachelors degree, higher degree)

8 Vocational training (certificate or equivalent; associate diploma; diploma; undergraduate degree, postgraduate degree)

These personnel will be contacted by the research team to confirm the place and time for contact during the visit. Questions to be discussed with these personnel will be sent to them prior to the visit. Permission will be sought to audiotape interviews. Staff will also be asked whether they wish to receive a transcript of the interviews.

Conducting the site visit

Each site visit will last for approximately 3 days. Over this time it should be possible to interview up to 12 teachers and trainers, in addition to examining policies/documentation and interviewing SD/HR staff.

The **first part of the visit** will involve an examination of policies/documentation in relation to staff development. The documentation will be ranked against the following criteria:

- ❖ degree to which policies/documentation accommodate the mix of staffing modes within the organisation
- ❖ responsiveness of policies/documentation to emerging VET issues
- ❖ linkages between policies/documentation and emerging issues in relation to VET policies at the national, State, regional and local levels
- ❖ degree to which policies/documentation address not only enterprise but also personal and career needs of teachers/trainers
- ❖ practices in place to evaluate SD practices
- ❖ place of SD in overall management and strategic planning processes for the organisation
- ❖ specific details on what PD is provided at different levels (institute, campus-specific, faculty/teaching program etc)
- ❖ content and processes used in recent PD initiatives
- ❖ who bears the cost of PD
- ❖ links (if any) between PD and industrial awards, promotional opportunities, career development

It may also be necessary to speak to specific personnel about the policies/documentation to clarify any issues that arise.

The **second part of the visit** will involve an interview with the HRD/PD personnel. Attachment 1 contains the draft interview schedule to be used.

The **third part of the visit** will involve interviewing the teachers and trainers. Attachment 2 contains the draft interview schedule to be used with teachers/trainers. Depending on the circumstances, these questions could be used either with an individual teacher/trainer or in small groups (3–5 persons). The small group interviews should take about 1 hour, the individual interviews up to 45 minutes. The assumption has been made that the teachers/trainers selected for interviews will have already completed a questionnaire. Hence questions relating to staff development undertaken in the last 12 months and payment/support to undertake staff development will have been already answered. (If this is not the case, this data will need to be collected at the time of the interview.)

After completing the site visit
A report will be required. Details will be provided.

Protocol for examination of programs

Introduction

Programs to be examined are recognised examples of 'good practice' that have been implemented either at an individual, work team, institutional, regional, state or national level.

The case studies will involve examining these initiatives in depth using a number of strategies including:

- ❖ developing an in-depth description of the program including what type of program it is, who developed it, how was it developed
- ❖ analysis of documentation about the development and implementation of the program including its antecedents, rationale, objectives, key strategies etc.
- ❖ analysis of any evaluations (where they exist) of the program
- ❖ interviews (by phone or face-to-face if appropriate) with key stakeholders (participants in the program, managers)

Questions for developers/key stakeholders

1   Why was the program developed in the first instance? What gap/need was it developed to address?

2   To what extent did the development of the program take into account the different employment modes of VET teachers and trainers? How is this evident in the program?

3   What barriers might:
    – permanent staff
    – contract staff
    – sessional/casual staff
    encounter when they attempt to access this program of SD? How can these barriers be decreased?

4   What are the characteristics of this program that contribute to its recognition as 'best practice' SD for VET staff?

5   What contribution does this program make to the goal of assisting teachers and trainers to address the following emerging issues?
    – training packages
    – New Apprenticeships
    – user choice
    – flexible delivery
    – operating in a competitive market
    – dealing with the pace of change
    – using technology
    – keeping up to date with changes/understanding changes to VET
    – developing knowledge in teacher's content/discipline area

6   To what degree does this program of SD contribute to improving the quality of VET provision by teachers and trainers? What other factors contribute to the quality of VET provision? Where would you rate the contribution of this particular form of SD compared with these other factors?

7   How might other organisations/individuals go about implementing this sort of program? What particular factors do you think other organisations/individuals might need to take into account in order to successfully use this program?

Questions for program participants

(Seek some background information about the participants including employment mode, years of experience as a teacher/trainer, type of work they are currently undertaking, industry area, any teaching/vocational training qualifications that they have or are completing)

How did you become involved in this program?

What has your participation in the program required you to do?

Have you received any support (financial, other) from your employer to undertake this program? If yes, describe this support.

What, for you, have been the most significant features of this program?

What features/aspects of the program appealed to you most? What features/aspects did you dislike?

What significant advantages/disadvantages does this program have compared with other staff development programs you have undertaken.

In your opinion, how does this program cater for the needs of casual/session and contract VET teachers/trainers?

How do you think your participation in this program has contributed to improving the quality of your practice as a VET teacher/trainer?

Did this program address some of the following policy initiatives/key issues in staff development for VET teachers/trainers:

- ❖ training packages?
- ❖ New Apprenticeships?
- ❖ user choice?
- ❖ helping you to keep up with changes in the sector
- ❖ helping you to keep up with your content (discipline) area
- ❖ helping you to learn about flexible delivery
- ❖ helping you to use technology in your work

If yes, what did the program do to address these issues and how well were these issues covered? If no, should they have been covered and how might this have been done?

Were there any barriers that prevented you from getting the most from your participation in this program? If yes, what were these barriers and how might they be overcome?

Would you recommend this program to other teachers/trainers? To whom? Why would you make this recommendation?

What major changes do you think VET teachers/trainers will face in the next 5 years? If you were given a chance, how would you redevelop the program you have participated in to take into account these changes?

This program has been selected as an example of 'good practice' in the provision of staff development for VET teachers and trainers? What characteristics of this program do you think set this program apart from other programs of staff development you might have undertaken in the past?

Profiles of the 15 case study sites and programs

These profiles, in alphabetical order, are summaries of ten-page reports compiled by researchers around the various States and Territories. The full reports remain with the research team.

Bartter Enterprises

Bartter Enterprises is located near Griffith and is an integrated producer of poultry products employing 1500 people. Some years ago the company decided to invest in competency-based training to change the culture of the organisation and to improve performance. This case study site was chosen because of the success of this training and the associated staff development in the context of a very competitive industry.

The approach to training and staff development is quite pragmatic. New employees usually begin as trainees with a one-week induction program. Pay rates are linked to skill levels. Those at floor level who are seen as expert are trained to develop training manuals which are specific to production requirements and are used with new employees or employees moving to new jobs. The Training and Development unit has a small number of general trainers who are responsible for a variety of required courses such as induction to the workplace and OH&S. Those shop floor trainers who aspire to become general trainers can usually obtain most of the necessary training on site. Recently the two groups of trainers developed the industry standards for poultry processing. This required considerable staff development.

All staff at Bartters have opportunities for staff development and training. Workplace trainers and assessors are recruited from the workplace. Company policy is that staff development is a partnership whereby both the employee and the employer contribute. Training staff reported that time was a significant barrier to participation in staff development which would advance their career. Such staff development is discussed as a part of the performance appraisal and development process. The actual opportunities for the development of the training and development staff is generally less, and less formalised than that for production staff. The relatively isolated location of the plant means that training and development staff have to consider a range of options in accessing education and training. Finding the necessary information is sometimes difficult as is keeping up with current developments in the vocational education and training sector. The training and development staff say that it helps if they work as a team on such matters. Leadership is also a key issue for trainers.

Canberra Institute of Technology

Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT) is the sole public provider of vocational education and training in the ACT and offers a very wide range of courses to 20 000 students. CIT has an admirable record in the provision of a very comprehensive and innovative range of developmental opportunities for its staff. It was nominated as a case study because it was a large, single public training provider with a highly regarded program of staff development.

At the time this case study was conducted CIT had re-organised arrangements for staff development for a number of reasons.

Staff development is available for all staff irrespective of position or mode of employment. However, in practice there are many barriers to participation including the nature, time, timing and cost. For permanent teaching staff the availability of relief may be critical but for part-time or sessional instructors there may be difficulty in arranging to swap classes, reschedule other commitments or costly to complete a course at a time when the person could be earning. The form in which staff development activities are enacted also presents barriers to participation to some people, especially in the case of on-line and print-based programs.

The staff development program at CIT has many features which appear to be associated with good practice. These include, strong links with strategic goals of the provider, appropriate support such as mentoring in the workplace, accredited award for substantial courses, staff development as partnership between employee, institution and choice of delivery mode and duration and a culture which values learning.

Charles Sturt University (VET courses)

The goal of this program is to produce graduates who are competent, critical and reflective practitioners. The program seeks to equip its students with the knowledge and skills to understand and work effectively within the VET sector. Changes in the training market in the last decade have resulted in greater diversity in training providers and training opportunities. With this has developed a demand for new, more flexibly delivered courses with greater relevance for teachers and trainers. Charles Sturt University has responded with a broad-based, but industry-focussed, distance education program without the usual strong adult education emphasis to cater for the needs of both new and experienced teachers and trainers. Numbers in the program have increased since its inception in 1993 to a point where, in 2000, it had become one the largest providers in Australia. Charles Sturt University has strong links with TAFE, as the major provider of vocational education and training, and this is the case for the VET program. The specific focus on VET, the print-based delivery with on-line support, the emphasis on improving practice, the growth in numbers and positive evaluations were the main reasons for including this program as a case study.

The case study outlines the development of the course, describes its main features and summarises the outcomes of a number of evaluations. The results of interviews with five students and the course coordinator are presented. The student interviews highlighted the

relevance, flexibility, and practical focus of the program and drew attention to difficulties associated with study by distance education and the need to forge work-based links and the importance of feedback and support. Evidence of the contribution of the program to longer-term staff development and improvement of VET provision is cited. Features of the program which represent good practice include its currency, its focus on well-structured teaching practice and practical assignments, its broad treatment of the whole VET sector, its close contact between students and lecturers, and the way in which it accommodates the needs of students with different backgrounds, especially those who did not complete their secondary education.

Colony 47/Productivity Plus Tasmania

Colony 47 is a relatively large and diverse community organisation which has 70 staff providing a range of housing, support, training and employment services in the community sector. Colony 47 is the lead tenderer and direct employer of staff in the Productivity Plus Tasmania (PPT) consortium (*Colony 47, Northern Joblink and MST Workplace Solutions)* contracted to deliver training programs to community service organisations as part of the State-funded health and human services initiative, the Community Sector Skills Development Program (CSSDP). In addition to conventional training PPT also assists organisations in their self development including the boards of management.

It was selected as a case study because it has a highly regarded staff development program in a sector which has not traditionally given a high priority to such programs. Staff development is necessary for Colony 47/Productivity Plus staff to understand the organisations with which they will work, to acquire the understandings and skills to meet the emerging and future training needs within those organisations and to keep up with changes in the community services sector. Productivity Plus adopts a consultative approach when assisting other community organisations in self-development and draws on its own experience as a learning organisation.

For each full-time member of staff there is a notional $500 training budget. Informal learning experiences on-the-job, mentoring and formal courses may be involved. Part-time staff are treated on a pro-rata basis but sessional staff are not. Staff development is used strategically and involves a partnership between the organisation and the employee in terms of cost and commitment. Staff are subject to individual performance appraisals at which staff development needs, both individual and corporate, are identified.

Framing the Future

Framing the Future is a national staff development program for VET practitioners funded by ANTA. The project promotes work-based action learning as a means of translating new concepts and principles into everyday practice and thus keep staff up to date with emerging changes within the VET system. Framing the Future provides funding for projects identified by groups and organisations within a framework which requires applicants to identify their own staff development needs, develop a project proposal to meet those needs, plan and implement the project and thus take responsibility for managing their own learning. Projects are designed to address an organisation's staff development needs at a particular point in time. This program was widely reported as significant and effective in surveys conducted as part of this research and also in many of the site-based case studies. It was for these reasons that Framing the Future was included as a separate case study.

Framing the Future has many important features which contribute to the positive outcomes reported in many evaluations. These features include an advisor network, negotiation between project advisors and successful applicants ongoing support and monitoring during a project and project evaluation. The model makes use of a number of learning strategies such as work-based learning, technology-based learning, action learning sets and sharing and reflection among groups of practitioners. The activities involved in projects connect directly with the work of those involved and help them solve real work problems and challenges with increase knowledge, understanding and confidence. It is claimed that the use of work-based learning helps create a learning culture.

Participation in projects seems to have resulted in ownership and encouraged the development of new ideas and co-operation. Evaluations of Framing the Future projects point to what can be considered good practice in staff development.

LearnScope

LearnScope is an ANTA-funded national staff development program which has been widely used, well-received and appropriately evaluated. For these reasons it was selected as a case study. The project provides a framework in which training providers can put forward staff development projects related to new learning technologies that will address their particular needs for flexible delivery. The key features of the LearnScope program include assessing project proposals using a series of risk and good practice indicators, selecting successful applicants, negotiating a project action plan, monitoring and supporting the project and arranging for self and external evaluation of the project. The latter is a critical success factor. Few staff development programs collect evaluation data beyond the immediate reactions of participants which makes this project different. This evaluation has helped in identifying the indicators of good practice in staff development.

The use of collaborative, work-based action learning, commonly with volunteers, has resulted in considerable success and a high reputation among those who participated. Other factors which have contributed to these outcomes include the involvement and support of major stakeholders in the organisation, the availability of the essential expertise, good planning and adequate resourcing including the relief of participants from some normal duties.

Martin College

Martin College, Sydney, is a member of Study Group Australia which is a member of Study Group International. Martin College is the largest private provider of education and training services in Australia. There are more than 1000 students at this site, many of whom are from overseas. The college has been operating for over 20 years and has developed a sound reputation for delivering quality courses and for its approach to staff development. The college employs a small core of permanent staff and a cadre of contract, part-time and sessional staff. The latter are valued for their recent or current industry experience and are employed on the basis that they already possess suitable teaching qualifications. Martin College was included as a case study because it was a large, well established private provider in good standing with a highly casualised workforce.

Martin College takes a pragmatic commercial approach to staff development where clients come first. The clients are the students and the employers who hire them. The college must charge higher tuition fees than public providers and must therefore be seen to add value to command this premium. The added value appears to be the quality of the curriculum which is centrally developed, the current industry experience of staff, and the mechanisms which ensure uniform quality in delivery. These factors influence the nature of staff development required and set limits on the responsibility of the provider. The college does not have a need for the kind of general staff development activities found in many TAFE institutes.

Martin College staff development program includes a comprehensive staff induction program, supervision and support often through teaming up experienced teachers with new staff, regular staff sharing meetings, monthly review sessions where a staff member meets with his or her supervisor, a performance appraisal process which identifies training needs preferences and other activities designed to enhance training quality. Time is a significant barrier to participation in staff development particularly for those for whom training is not their main source of income.

Northern Territory University (VET Section)

It was apparent that the situation in the Northern Territory (NT) was different from the rest of Australia, in terms of the size and scope of and arrangements for vocational education and training, and that this had important consequences for the provision of appropriate staff development opportunities. In NT, TAFE is closely linked with the school and university sectors of education. The NT University is a major provider of professional education for VET staff and is an RTO. The number of faculty members responsible of the VET program is relatively small (10). The extent to which these staff are able to access suitable professional development is thus likely to have a critical influence on the quality of much of the staff development activities for VET practitioners in NT. This was the main reason NTU was selected as the case study site for this research project.

The relative isolation of NTU is a major reason why it has a firm commitment to the professional development of its own staff and its policies and practices provide for the recognition and encouragement of individuals, regular performance assessment and career development planning and the provision of support for such development. Emphasis is placed on effective communication and appropriate resourcing. However, the cost of travel to other parts of Australia for staff development activities which are not available in the NT are high, and require a major part of the 6% of salaries set aside for staff development. Staff development is the responsibility of cost centre managers and all staff must undertake an annual performance review at which time staff development needs are identified, partly by the use of a skills inventory, and plans are made to address these needs. NTU is small and must adopt a proactive stance to ensure that its staff are sufficiently multi-skilled to respond to emerging issues and trends in an appropriate way and in an acceptable time frame. It has proved difficult to provide ongoing, structured training programs for short-term contract and sessional staff. It is often difficult to identify and arrange to participate suitable staff development activities. In general permanent lecturing staff undertake further university studies. Many of these courses are taken from other universities in Australia by distance education. There are few courses which are directly relevant for VET teacher educators. Even where such courses are identified the workloads of staff are high and this is a barrier to effective participation.

NTU VET lecturers are expected run training programs over 50 weeks of the year and work up to 800 hours per annum. There has been a strong emphasis on keeping up with VET initiatives. Good staff development in these circumstances requires choice and flexibility in mode and timing of delivery. Staff commented on the benefits of on-line delivery of appropriate staff development programs. The issue of leadership in staff development in VET in NT is critical as is the need to learn how to provide high levels of support to students, for example, indigenous off-campus learners. The development of staff in these areas is a challenge.

Riverina Institute of TAFE

Riverina Institute of TAFE (RIT) services a diverse region which stretches from the Southern Alps to the South Australian border with the Murray River at the southern boundary. It has 1200 staff with one in five permanent. RIT is faced with a range of challenges which have implications for staff development. These include a diverse range of training needs, thin training markets and limited resources. The most common concerns identified by staff were related to obtaining a workplace assessor qualification, technical currency, IT skills, training packages and changes in teaching and training.

Responses to the above challenges, and concerns included arrangements designed to make staff development more cost-effective; for example, by bringing experts to RIT, annual staff reviews and activity reports, promoting a greater range of alternative staff development activities to achieve the same end, a supported independent learning program, a stronger corporate focus, a program of desktop tutorials and greater emphasis on workplace learning, collaboration and

sharing. Responsive innovation with a high level of consultation with and satisfaction by staff were the prime reasons for including RIT as a case study.

Staff experience a number of barriers to development: individuals may not be able to be supported for their preferred way learning, costs may have to be borne by staff, and the requirement that a significant proportion of staff development, including travel, has to be completed by staff in their own time. Many staff give development a low priority because they are just too busy while others are not able to resolve the conflict between the demands of their immediate work and longer-term benefits. Still others are not strategic in their own career development. Communication concerning staff development is not always effective. For example, sessional staff who spend only a short time on campus are often not aware of available opportunities. While they have access to email the time needed to sort through the mass of material can be daunting. Further casualisation of the teaching staff may be a barrier to future participation in staff development.

Staff made favourable references to programs which helped them to perform their job more effectively; the arrangements for identifying their own developmental needs and preparing a professional plan to meet them; the way in which staff development provided concrete demonstrations of and opportunities for practice; links to RIT strategic plan; and the quality of staff development activities.

From this case study, it appears that good practice must involve people at the highest level in the organisation so that staff development becomes an integral part of strategic planning and the necessary processes to identify training needs put in place. Using a combination of using local expertise and resource-based programs proved positive. It was essential to focus on assisting staff to learn on the job and helping them to deal with the issue of change in their practice The notion of choice for staff in the ways in which they could meet their specific developmental needs is critical in coping with the diversity in complex organisations. Staff development programs need to be well rounded and balanced so that they address personal, group, organisational and sectoral issues and do so in a cost effective way.

Teaching and Learning Program (SA TAFE)

Teaching and Learning is an institute-based program specifically developed for beginning TAFE instructors in South Australia. It provides a set of suitable materials to help ensure consistency and quality in training. This program was included as a case study because it has been running successfully in various forms for many years, meets the specific requirements of a major institution-based training provider and represents an alternative initial preparation program to the Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training which has become the industry standard. It is available for both permanent and non-permanent staff.

The program consists of five modules, is organised in two stages and has a nominal duration of 110 hours. The flexible, responsive and learner-centred manner in which the program is delivered using experienced and skilled facilitators and mentors, is seen as means of promoting the organisational culture and values of the institute and ensures a commitment to continuous improvement. The course facilitators model the behaviour they seek to promote. Mentors are selected on their expertise as practitioners and have the task of guiding and supporting the development of good practice in new lecturers in their specialist area. New lecturers, regardless of their employment mode, claim that time is a key barrier to accessing and continuing with this staff development program. The program facilitates ongoing staff development through appropriate articulation arrangements. The Teaching and Learning program has the following attributes which make for good practice in staff development—management support, sufficient quality resources, a network of competent facilitators and mentors, and sound links to key human resource functions.

Tropical North Queensland Institute of TAFE

The Tropical North QLD Institute of TAFE is based in Cairns in a region that is relatively isolated, sparsely populated and remote. The institute management has to provide a more or less independent program of staff development suitable for its own members and unique situation, a situation which includes a high proportion of indigenous, NESB and people with disabilities in the population. The institute enjoys a high reputation for servicing the needs of the region and overcoming many of the problems associated with keeping staff up to date with developments in industry and in the reform of training. The institute has also actively explores innovative ways of organising and delivering training services. It is for these reasons that this institute was selected as a case study site.

The institute recognises the value of staff development in fostering the creation of an entrepreneurial and innovative culture. Staff development funding is allocated to faculties or business units according to the priorities identified in the institute strategic plan. The funding of individual staff members involves a performance-planning process which takes account of individual needs and preferences and operational priorities, such as the need to increase flexible delivery. In general permanent and fixed term staff receive priority for funding over casual staff. Staff interviewed valued those staff development activities that allowed them to maintain their currency in their field and improve their teaching practice in and understanding of vocational education and training. Institute staff development programs demonstrate a strong commitment to action learning principles and lifelong learning. Staff were critical of staff development activities which were not relevant, poorly organised or failed to take account of the background knowledge and needs of the audience. They valued the help of more experienced staff through coaching and mentoring. Those responsible for staff development have had to be creative in generating cost-effective alternatives to traditional activities. The institute also sought to attract a diverse high quality staff in order to be able to respond in such ways. In summary the case study 'paints a picture of a vibrant and responsive staff development culture amongst teachers and trainers that maximises the knowledge of its staff to benefit the workplace'.

VET Initial Teaching and learning (VITAL)

The VET Initial Teaching and Learning (VITAL) program was developed for use with new teachers, both full- and part-time, who are employed by NSW TAFE and have limited classroom experience. It is equivalent to five of the eight units of competence in the Certificate IV in Assessment and Training. VITAL can be used with experienced staff as a refresher course or to provide credit towards a Certificate IV in Assessment and Training. It replaced the National Teaching and Learning program and is now used widely within NSW TAFE. VITAL is organised into more self-contained sessions each with its own outcomes, focus questions, key concepts, activities and reflection exercises. It is designed to be delivered in modes ranging from all face-to-face through to totally independent study, print-based or on-line.

VITAL has been well received, particularly by sessional and casual teachers. It has a number of features which reflect best practice. These include (i) immediate relevance to the TAFE context including contemporary classroom teaching practices (ii) flexible arrangements for delivery which model this process (iii) a design which seeks to actively involve participants in group-based learning in ways which reflect the process of facilitation (iv) quality resource materials with concise and accurate information about issues and developments in the VET sector (v) guidance and training for facilitators and (vi) follow-up support to develop competence in teaching. The immediate outcomes of using this staff development program in the most common face-to-face mode seems to depend mainly on the quality of the local facilitator rather than the quality of the centrally prepared materials. Effective facilitators take into account the background of the participants and use their experience as a basis for further learning.

West Coast College of TAFE

The West Coast College of TAFE in Perth has 640 staff and provides a wide range of training. It was selected as a case study for the proactive and strategic way in which this college addresses, individual, local, state and national needs in staff development. The performance management policy of this college links individuals to its corporate goals through a process of review and discussion with supervisors. Staff development is the responsibility of two units, Professional and Career Development and Organisational Learning. The former is more concerned with individual needs and operational programs while the latter is more concerned with group and organisational needs addressed through projects with a strategic focus and funded through initiatives such as Framing the Future.

All staff have access to staff development but barriers to participation include time, timing, availability, relevance, support and appropriateness. Availability of relief is a major barrier for permanent staff. Contract and sessional staff are often employed for short periods and this reduces opportunities to identify and organise suitable staff development.

Successful staff development is seen as requiring (i) an appropriate organisational structure (ii) a supporting culture and (iii) open communication. The professional development projects, in particular, have contributed to the development of quality VET provision by supporting staff in implementing sectoral reforms and developing a more open culture which supports organisational change. The project management model used is critical in achieving these outcomes as is the support of management.

Wide Bay Institute of TAFE

Wide Bay Institute of TAFE (WBIT) is based in the Queensland centres of Maryborough, Hervey Bay and Bundaberg. WBIT was awarded Queensland Training Provider of the Year and was joint winner of the Australian Training Provider of the Year award in 1999. It has a Centre for the Advancement of Innovative Learning (CAIL) which has been influential at the State level in terms of staff development. An Australian Quality Council review recently identified opportunities for professional development as a strength of the Institute. For these reasons WBIT was selected as a case study site.

The 1999–2002 business plan identified four key outcome areas: quality product; customer service; capacity-building; and business performance. Capacity-building involves the enhancement of the ability of the organisation to function in the future and has important implications for innovation and the development of a creative, highly skilled and high performance workforce. Staff development is central to this vision especially in the areas of leadership, information technology and management.

At WBIT teachers have a total of two weeks per year allocated for staff development. According to the training plan, staff development aims 'to ensure that staff have the skills so that they can respond to client demands and be confident in working together to achieve goals using innovation, responsiveness and flexibility'. A staff development week is held early in the year to which all staff, including contract and sessional staff, are invited. Contract and sessional staff are not compensated totally for their attendance time. The conference deals with strategic organisational matters and professional development.

The institute has a limited formal process for appraising staff development needs and outcomes. Individuals have to submit reports on staff development activities undertaken and make suggestions for the staff development week program and other staff development needs. Much of the emphasis of recent staff development has been designed to assist teachers change from delivery of content to managers of learning, and to make them aware of recent developments such as training packages, and is enhanced by ongoing support and mentoring. Staff value activities which are relevant and directly applicable to their current situation. Special support is provided for new instructional staff. CAIL, which formerly had a State-wide

responsibility for providing support for the National Training System, has retained its special support role and focus on innovation within the Institute.

The institute director claimed that staff development was a key factor in determining the quality of VET provision and that it was critical in times of rapid change and changing roles for teachers. Quality delivery is essential in the training market and must become the focus of the organisational culture. Staff need the opportunity to be at the cutting edge of practice.

From this case study the following propositions about good practice in staff development emerged: it is supported by management, teachers and industry; it is the result of collaboration between management and teachers; it is focussed on institute outcomes; it is viewed in a broad context and timeframe; its management is important for the success of the Institute; it is important to have a focus; a wide variety of developmental activities should be available; its processes should encourage participation; it should be immediately applicable and relevant; it should have a future perspective; genuine feedback must be included; it must be well-organised and delivered; and timing must be appropriate. The barriers to participation in staff development activities identified included: time restraints; costs; travel/distance; general nature of programs rather than specific; poor quality/delivery; and organisational restrictions. The organisational factors which support good practice in staff development were found to include: vision and commitment by management; availability of specialist support; and an environment in which staff development is seen as a partnership between the organisation and the individual staff member.

Case study: Work-based learning

This case study involved two Melbourne sites using work-based learning, as part of the Framing the Future initiative, to achieve practical outcomes related to training packages. The first site, Workplace Learning Initiatives (WLI), involved managers, administrative and teaching staff in all employment modes; the second, Northern Melbourne Institute of TAFE (NMIT), involved volunteer sessional staff working in the office administration department. The first site was chosen for its general reputation for work-based action learning and the second for its focus on the sessional staff.

Both sites were faced with the same real issue and used the same approach to staff development involving a series of action learning set meetings. At NMIT the project was centred on the development of teaching/learning/assessment materials and at WLI projects included the development of a website, the analysis of frontline management and workplace values.

These two staff development programs were highly valued by participants. The outcomes were seen to be a product of a number of factors, including relevance to the workplace, collaborative team-work, the appropriateness of the learning processes, the quality of the facilitation/interactions, mutual support, the immediate value of the final products of the projects and the knowledge gained in their development together with an opportunity to reflect upon practice. The sessional staff particularly valued the opportunity to work with colleagues, receiving recognition of their needs and support through mentoring. Professional isolation is a critical issue for such staff. Time and timing were critical issues for all involved, particularly sessional staff where the opportunity cost in participation is often high. This case study highlighted the importance of context and learning processes for staff development.