

ERTO A member briefing #09/02

Activity:	Second meeting of VET Provider Peaks
Background:	<p>Earlier this year (April) we held the first formal meeting of the four peak provider groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ TAFE Directors Australia (TDA),✓ Group Training Australia (GTA),✓ The Australian Council for Private Education and Training (ACPET) and✓ ERTOA <p>The meeting was hosted by Qantas.</p> <p>The first meeting included the executive officers of the four peaks and was an initial opportunity to see if there were enough common ground and common issues for meetings to be on-going. The first meeting agreed that the forum would be of great value in pursuing issues of common concern and it was agreed to meet again to formalise the process.</p> <p>An action item from the first meeting was a joint letter to the Chair of Skills Australia. (See attached copy)</p>
Details:	<p>The second meeting was held on Monday July 27th, hosted by ACPET at their national headquarters in Melbourne. The meeting agreed on a purpose statement for the forum and on details of why and how we will meet. The meeting also teased out common issues and has proposed a number of actions. The common issues concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ The AQTF including the QIs✓ The VET Regulation Review by the NOUS Group✓ Responses to the COAG work plan for the VET sector✓ Approaches to Skills Australia to ensure the provider voice is clearly heard.✓ Some work on mutual recognition of overseas 'students' and workers. <p>The next meeting will be hosted by TDA in Sydney in late October.</p>
Action needed:	No action is needed. This briefing is for advice only.
Comment:	This forum has considerable potential to benefit ERTOA members and the VET sector more generally. There is a strong feeling at the meetings that the provider voice has not been clearly heard in decisions around VET sector structures nor VET policy. This forum is seen by all participants as a way to correct the imbalance.
Further information:	Contact Anthony Tyrrel 0433044116



Mr. Philip Bullock
Chair
Skills Australia
GPO Box 9880
CANBERRA ACT 2600

15 May 2009

Dear Philip

RE: PEAK PROVIDERS RESPOND TO 'FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE'

Australia's peak provider organisations respectively have in various forums responded to the **Skills Australia** discussion paper '*Foundations for the Future*'. However collectively we feel it important to alert the Board of Skills Australia to one particular issue that we are concerned about.

ACPET, ERTOA, GTA and TDA note that the role and structure of governance the paper canvassed for providers -- currently operating with their respective student and industry training clients, managing public expenditure of more than \$9B per annum -- runs the risk of consigning them to a secondary role rather than as one of equal and valued partners within the proposed new VET advisory landscape.

Skill development is conducted in workplaces, institutional settings and on-line by private, public and enterprise VET organizations. Australian RTOs enroll some 2.5 times more students than that of universities across the country -- in accredited and non-accredited training, and importantly, increasingly deliver strategic and integrated workforce development programs within enterprises or in partnership with them.

This size and scope of delivery of training providers forms more than 40% of our successful \$15.5B p.a. education export market. We would argue that such an impressive level of capacity and delivery, both domestically and internationally, demands a central role for training providers within any new national governance framework. RTOs, public and private and GTOs remain leaders *with* local networks of employers -- small, medium and large -- and interact *with* industry and with employers often on a daily basis, in their training needs, and dynamics. Enterprise RTOs are *both* employers and training providers.

Training providers are best placed as experts to structure training and learning. RTOs and other key community agencies are legitimate conduits for advice to the Ministerial Council.

Our peak provider groups support the proposal that industry should hold a central role in the National Training System (NTS) however, we contend that providers of education and training must be equally positioned in the governance, planning and implementation of the NTS plan. This approach will support transparency, and the establishment of mutually agreed expectations and achievable objectives.

Yours sincerely,