



# MINUTES

## NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE

HELD WEDNESDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 2009  
COMMENCED AT 1500HRS (AEST)

### 1. OPENING/WELCOME

The meeting was conducted from 1500hrs to 1645hrs (AEST) on Wednesday 16 September 2009.

### 2. ATTENDANCE

#### 2.1 NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Craig Delahoy	National Education Manager (Chairperson)
Pamela Simon	Education Manager – SLSNSW
Brooke Irvine	General Manager Community Lifesaving - LSV
Peter Ashby	Member and Community Services Manager – SLSWA
Alex Deane	Lifesaving Development Officer – SLSTAS
Julie Snelling	Education Manager – SLSNT
Joy Fisher	Academy Manager - SLSSA
Peta Lawlor	Lifesaving Education Coordinator SE Queensland - SLSQ

#### 2.2 VISITORS

Ben Whibley	SLSQ
Ashlee Biddle	SLSSA
Shane Daw	SLSSA
John King	SLSWA
Julian Khaw	SLSWA
Rob O'Brien	Resource Development Coordinator – SLSA
Rachael Bruce	Academy Administration Coordinator - SLSA

### 3. APOLOGIES & PROXIES

#### 3.1 APOLOGIES

Peter Agnew	General Manager, Operations – SLSA
Gary Daly	IT Manager - SLSA

#### 3.2 PROXIES

No proxies required for this meeting.

#### RESOLUTION:

That the apologies as listed, are noted and accepted.

Carried

#### 4. URGENT/LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS

A late item was scheduled into the agenda to be discussed with the Action Sheet item, by Peter Ashby in regards to a National Style Guide.

#### 5. PREVIOUS MEETING

The meeting noted that the minutes and action sheet of the previous meeting, held, on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009, have been circulated.

##### RESOLUTION:

That the Minutes & Action Sheet of the meeting held 1<sup>st</sup> July 2009, are noted and endorsed.

Carried

#### 6. BUSINESS ARISING

The meeting comprehensively reviewed the status of items identified for action and/or follow-up from previous meetings.

##### RECOMMENDATION:

That business arising as per the Action Sheet is noted.

Carried

#### 7. AGENDA ITEMS

- 7.1 LETTER TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION
- 7.2 ATV AWARD (DRAFT CIRCULAR ATTACHED)
- 7.3 DRAFT RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL PROCESS (& DRAFT POLICY)
- 7.4 LEARNER RESOURCES – PRINTED NATIONALLY

#### 8. GENERAL BUSINESS

Ben Whibley posed a question regarding state representative's attendance at NEC Meetings. He felt that as the RTO Manager for SLSQ his input is often required.

A motion was put forward from the NEC, "that the NEC allow visitors within the committee policy document where relevant." Moved: Peta Lawlor Seconded: Pamela Simon.

Craig Delahoy suggested that the meeting should consider the documents under which the committee is authorised. The relevant regulation is included below:

##### **Regulation 4.13 National Education Committee (appointed)**

The National Education Committee (NEC) shall:-

- a. Comprise a Chairperson as appointed by the Council, and ten (10) representatives. One (1) appointed by each State Centre, along with one (1) representative from Development, Lifesaving, and Surf Sports

departments of SLSA.

- b. Be responsible to the Director of Lifesaving.
- c. Coordinate the operations of the Australian Lifesaving Academy.
- d. Discuss issues relating to Education and submit recommendations to the appropriate Boards.
- e. Meet a minimum of four times per year.
- f. Receive administrative support from the Chief Executive Officer of their nominee.

## 9. NEXT MEETING

The date of the next NEC meeting is to be advised.

## 10. CLOSE

The meeting closed at 1645hrs

### **MINUTES DISTRIBUTION:**

Australian council  
Board of Management  
Board of Lifesaving  
Board of Lifesaving Management  
Board of Surf Sports  
Board of Development  
National Lifeguard Committee  
National Education Committee

---

**AGENDA ITEM:** LETTER TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION  
**ITEM NO:** 7.1  
**NAME:** CRAIG DELAHOY, SLSA - NATIONAL TRAINING & EDUCATION MANAGER

---

**BACKGROUND:**

At the last NEC meeting, the committee directed the National Training and Education Manager to write a letter to The Hon Julia Gillard, MP, Minister for Education. The letter was sent on September 8<sup>th</sup> and a copy is attached for the committee's information.

---

**The Hon Julia Gillard MP**  
**Minister for Education**  
PO Box 6022  
House of Representatives  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600

Tuesday, 8 September 2009

Dear Minister,

I am writing to express my organisation's on-going frustration and concern over the Quality Indicators requirements for Registered Training Organisations – in particular, the Learner Engagement survey.

As a not-for-profit, largely volunteer-based organisation, Surf Life Saving Australia is responsible for the training and deployment of around 140,000 members, including around 40,000 patrolling volunteer lifesavers. Over the past few years we have progressively increased the introduction and alignment of nationally accredited units of competency into our existing surf award structure, and to this end we operate six state RTO's and one national RTO.

Our concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Whilst we have been keeping a close eye on all announcements regarding the introduction of the Quality Indicator tools, we continue to receive contradictory information from various states, and even received contradictory information between two information sessions run by the same state RCAB. This was especially the case in the number of Learner Engagement surveys that we are required to send out for completion, and the number we are expected to have returned.
- The use and interpretation of the Competency Completion data remains unclear. While we are keen to see our significant contribution to the vocational education of Australians recognised, we are told that the completion data is to remain confidential and is unlikely to be included in national figures.
- We also have concerns about how this data will be interpreted by our various RCABs to determine our RTO risk status. No two RTO's are the same, and the same completion statistic may be a success for one RTO and a failure for another. We do not have sufficient confidence that RCABs will be able to make these subtle distinctions.
- Despite the Quality Indicator tools being a national requirement with a national rollout, we continue to find that different states are placing different requirements on their RTO's regarding the implementation of the Quality Indicator tools. For example, despite the fact that the tools themselves clearly specify that the Employer Satisfaction tool is not compulsory for enterprise RTO's, Western Australia has decreed that it will require all of its RTO's – including enterprise RTO's - to utilise the tool.

- As enterprise based RTO's dealing with volunteer learners in a predominantly non-classroom learning environment, most of the questions on the Learner Engagement survey are worded so as to be unclear, irrelevant or not applicable to our learners. Asking our volunteers to spend time completing a survey that is largely irrelevant is insulting, and is likely to lead to very low return rates.
- Collection and administration of a large number of surveys could be a severe administrative burden on all of our RTO's, in national and state organisations that are constantly struggling to raise the funds required to run our organisation. For example, we have estimated that in NSW alone – based on the number of qualifications and units of competency issued by that state RTO – the collation and processing of returned surveys could take as many as 62 days. Even at a return rate of only 50%, that would account for at least one month's work for one individual. Even if we were to sub-contract the scanning and processing of these surveys, at the quoted \$1 per sheet that would cost our NSW office more than \$28,000 – a huge cost for a volunteer organisation reliant on the charitable generosity of the public. That does not take into account the cost of identifying appropriate members to send the survey to, and mailing the surveys out – an additional estimated \$15,000 for NSW alone. Every dollar in our organisation is precious, and it would be more than difficult for us to try to justify this expense to our donors and members. The cost of the Quality Indicator Learner Engagement survey alone could be enough to force Surf Lifesaving to close our RTO's and to disengage from the national VET system.
- The data collected through the Learner Engagement survey will add no value whatsoever to our organisation. As the questions are largely irrelevant or not applicable, there is no useful information being gathered that will inform our continuous improvement processes. The tools are therefore prohibitively costly, with no benefit.

We have consistently voiced our concerns over these tools, primarily through our membership of the Enterprise RTO Association (ERTO), but it seems our concerns and protests have fallen on deaf ears. If there is no change in the content of the tools, and the collection and reporting requirements – especially for the Learner Engagement survey – the administrative costs involved will force our organisation to have to reconsider whether or not the issuing of national qualifications and units of competency to our members is something we will be able to continue to support.

Sincerely  
**CRAIG DELAHOY**  
 National Training and Education Manager  
 Surf Lifesaving Australia  
 Locked Bag 2  
 Bondi Beach  
 NSW 2026

**MEETING COMMENTS/DEBATE:**

Peter Ashby commented that SLSWA is classed as a community organisation, not as an enterprise RTO which is causing the state problems. They are still waiting on further information.

Ben Whibley felt that this letter may have a negative impact on SLSQ funding opportunities.

**RESOLUTION:**

That the NEC notes this letter sent to The Hon Julia Gillard MP, Minister for Education.

**Carried**

---

AGENDA ITEM:       ATV AWARD  
ITEM NO:            7.2  
NAME:                CRAIG DELAHOY, SLSA - TRAINING & EDUCATION MANAGER

---

**BACKGROUND:**

- The NEC previously requested that resources be developed for a national ATV Award.
- SLSNSW developed these resources, and they were circulated for comment to states on July 6 2009.

**DISCUSSION:**

While the NEC requested the resources be developed for a new award, it did not explicitly approve the adoption of such an award in preference to the existing ATV Induction. The requested resources were developed by SLSNSW and distributed to states for comment. Some feedback was received, and the final draft of these resources should be available for states for approval before the end of September.

A proposed implementation circular is attached that describes the implementation plan for an ATV Award.

It would be preferable to have only one official award related to ATV users.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the NEC agrees to the adoption of a national ATV Operator Certificate according to the implementation plan in the draft circular.

***MEETING COMMENTS/DEBATE:***

Feedback from states is that the new ATV resource has not been accepted well at branch level. There are concerns over hours required, amount of testing and detail involved for the purpose of the resource.

It was felt there was a lack of consultation in drafting stages, and that this feedback should be taken back to the content expert panel to continue with development.

**RESOLUTION:**

The NEC requests SLSNSW to reconvene the ATV working group & reconsider the ATV resource in light of feedback received, and that the release of an ATV award be postponed until a redeveloped resource is approved.

Moved: Pamela Simon

Seconded: Alex Deane

Carried

---

**AGENDA ITEM:** DRAFT RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL PROCESS  
**ITEM NO:** 7.3  
**NAME:** CRAIG DELAHOY, SLSA – TRAINING & EDUCATION MANAGER

---

**BACKGROUND:**

At the last NEC meeting, a draft "Resource Development and Sign-off Policy" was presented for discussion. At that meeting the NEC resolved "That the NEC agrees to the adoption of a 'Resource Development and Sign-off Policy' in principal, however continued discussions are required." The draft policy is here presented again to allow those discussions.

---

**DRAFT RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND SIGN-OFF POLICY**

17 June 2009

**Purpose**

The Resource Development and Sign-off Policy is designed to improve the effectiveness of national resource development, ease the process of state sign-offs on nationally-developed educational resources, and to provide more efficiency and certainty to the outcomes of the process.

The issues this policy seeks to address include:

- There is no clear policy determining which resources are selected for review and redevelopment. As a result, selection is either ad hoc or all-encompassing.
- Many resources are supposed to be used in both member education and commercial training operations, but there is no formal avenue for commercial users to provide feedback on resources or contribute to development.
- The current formal feedback mechanisms (especially online feedback) are underutilised or ignored.
- The current consultative process is cumbersome, expensive, inefficient, exclusive and unsustainable. There is also no guarantee that appropriate subject matter experts are involved or invited.
- Without the required sign-off responses and approvals, it is not clear if SLSA can proceed with the finalisation of developed resources with confidence.
- Should silence (in response to a request for sign-off) be taken as passive agreement? What are the implications for the rest of the country if one or two states choose not to sign-off on a resource?
- As a general principal, the NEC has agreed that the adoption of a national, standardised set of tools and resources is preferred.
- The current (2009) program of resource review and consultation has placed a significant burden on SLSA's resource development capabilities, and on states' consultative groups.

---

**Policy**

1. Providing initial feedback on existing resources
  - a. The online feedback tool is the principal and primary mechanism for providing feedback on resources in use. This is SLSA's first point of resource feedback, especially relating to content and fitness for purpose of existing (in-use) resources. This reduces the need for protracted and expensive national consultation processes for reviewing existing resources unnecessarily or in isolation. If a state (or branch, or club, or individual, or commercial unit) wishes to trigger a resource review, providing feedback in this way is the accepted formal method.
  - b. Informal conversations DO NOT constitute formal feedback. Requests and feedback MUST be in writing. The preferred method for this is through the online feedback tool.
  - c. The feedback register will be reviewed in late January to early February of each year to determine that year's resource development timetable. The purpose of this timing is to allow resources to

undergo some real world, hands-on application in a club environment during a summer season (acknowledging that seasons will vary across the continent).

- d. Where no feedback has been received on an existing national resource, SLSA will take that as tacit agreement that the resource is working as required (is fit for purpose) and that the content contains no errors and requires no revision to retain currency.
  - e. SLSA may still choose to review and/or redevelop a resource even if no feedback has been received via the online feedback tool. This may be prompted by a number of different factors, including:
    - Changes to national accredited training packages
    - Changes to best practice or national standards
    - Changes to SLSA policy
    - Changes to national or state legislation
    - Other formal internal changes, requests or recommendations
    - Formal requests through the National Education Committee or the Business Development Team
2. Determining scope of reviews and development
- a. Where feedback has been received or there has been some other formal input, SLSA will decide on the scope of review and/or redevelopment according to the scope of the feedback and any other factors (such as those in 1.d). Such scope will be one of:
    - i. No review or redevelopment to be done
    - ii. Minor review or redevelopment
    - iii. Major review or redevelopment
    - iv. Complete development / redevelopment
  - b. Where no review or redevelopment is to be done, the existing resource will continue to be considered the current resource.
  - c. Where minor review or redevelopment is to be done, a summary document – itemising and detailing the proposed changes / corrections / additions / deletions – will be circulated among the states (member education and commercial) for consultation **and sign-off (approval)**. *This will be the only planned consultation phase for these resources.* The purpose of using a summary document is to allow states and their consultative groups to focus on the proposed modifications, without having to review the entire resource. The resource will then be redeveloped in the light of any feedback received on the summary document sign-off consultation process and released.
  - d. Where major review or development is to be done, the following process will be followed:
    - i. The resource will be listed on the Resource Development Timetable for that year, with clear dates assigned to each step in the standard distributed consultation process (3.b below). States will be encouraged to submit any and all feedback through the normal process while the resource awaits its scheduled time.
    - ii. If/where appropriate, key stakeholders and/or subject matter experts may be consulted, and may be invited to participate in further consultations;
    - iii. the full resource, any feedback received, and any other relevant information (such as itemised in 1.d or received in 2.d.i) will be referred to the National Education Resource Panel for **consultation only** (see below);
    - iv. the resources will be reviewed in the light of the recommendations of the Panel, key stakeholders, and/or subject matter experts;
    - v. The standard distributed consultation process (below) will then be implemented;
  - e. Where complete development / redevelopment is required, a Resource Development and Consultation Plan will be written and distributed to the National Education Resource Panel, key stakeholders, selected subject matter experts and to states (member education and commercial) before the end of March (where appropriate) of that year. This will include a development and consultation timetable, with dates for consultations and approvals. This timetable will include the standard distributed consultation process (below) as a minimum, but may go further. The purpose of this planning is to provide states with the ability to plan well ahead for the required consultations and approvals to ensure that they are able to meet the requested deadlines. SLSA will proceed with initial draft development on the basis of feedback, expert consultation or other source as appropriate, to provide a starting point for initial consultations.
  - f. Complete developments may also occur where a resource does not currently exist (for example, for a new program) and needs to be created from scratch.

- g. Having determined the scope required for the various resources, and with due consideration for its operating budget, SLSA (in consultation where appropriate) will prioritise the state of review and / or redevelopment for that calendar year. This may mean that not every resource requiring review or redevelopment can be addressed in a single calendar year.
  - h. Development of both major reviews (2.d above) and complete redevelopments (2.e above) may be outsourced at the discretion of SLSA. This may be to other SLS state offices, or to external developers and will be on a contract (or MOU) basis.
3. Standard Distributed Consultation Process
- a. This process applies only to major reviews (2.d above) and serves as a minimum consultation standard for complete redevelopments (2.e above).
  - b. This process will follow these steps:
    - i. The redeveloped draft resources will be distributed to states for consultation and feedback, with a requested turnaround of 30 calendar days;
    - ii. Where no feedback is received at the end of this period, SLSA will take that to imply approval of the draft resources;
    - iii. Any feedback received after this close off date will be referred to the following year's feedback register.
    - iv. The draft resources will be finalised in the light of any feedback received during the consultation phase and sent to states (either in finished form or in manuscript form) for sign-off (approval), with a requested turnaround of 30 calendar days;
    - v. Where no response is received by the end of this period, SLSA will take that to imply approval of the finalised resource;
    - vi. Any feedback received by states after this close off date will be referred to the following year's feedback register.
    - vii. States are permitted to sign-off (approve) a resource on a conditional basis, but only where
      - The condition is to change very minor elements such as spelling or grammatical errors, and where these elements are clearly itemised, or
      - The condition is to change a gross error in content such that the resource would not be able to be used unless the change was made, and where the error is clearly explained and an alternative is provided;
    - viii. States who respond that they cannot sign-off on the resource will be consulted to investigate the depth and breadth of their concerns, and a decision will then be made as to whether or not these concerns can be accommodated;
    - ix. As a general principal, if only one state has responded that they cannot sign-off on a resource, the resource will be finalised and distributed without further modification;
    - x. If more than one state responds that they cannot sign-off on a resource, the reasons provided will be investigated and the matter will be referred to the National Education Committee for a decision. This decision may be (for example):
      - To approve the resource as developed
      - To recommend specific changes
      - To recommend redevelopment
      - Something else
4. The National Education Resource Panel
- a. The National Education Resource Panel is a *consultative reference group* only. It is NOT the purpose of the panel to perform any resource development, nor contribute directly to content production, though this may occur from time to time on a limited basis, at the discretion of SLSA resource development personnel.
  - b. The National Education Resource Panel replaces the NERD panel.
  - c. The panel will be composed of:
    - i. A small standing group (between 4 and 6 people) of membership representatives with specialist skills in education (including member education) nominated by state and territory Education Managers. Where the number of nominations exceeds 6, the state and territory Education Managers will be requested to reduce the list of nominees by a method to be determined. (Vote?)
    - ii. A small representation (2 to 3 people) representing all state and territory Academies, if required and as appropriate (only where the BDT has declared that the resource being



---

**AGENDA ITEM:** LEARNER RESOURCES – PRINTED NATIONALLY  
**ITEM NO:** 7.4  
**NAME:** PAMELA SIMON, SLSNSW – EDUCATION MANAGER

---

**BACKGROUND:**

Last season, a number of learner resources were printed by SLSA and distributed to the states/territory for on selling to the membership. These resources were:

- Received well by the membership
- Provided a very professional and standardised look
- Were cost effective for the members
- Made the process more straightforward and timely for members

**ISSUES:**

SLSA have advised me that at this stage they have no plans to produce any of the resources in bulk except the First Aid Manual.

**DISCUSSION:**

All States (except QLD and SA) have indicated that they would purchase resources again which have been professionally printed.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. SLSA arrange for the printing and distribution of the resources as they do for the 33<sup>rd</sup> edition. Clubs/branches order these online as they will be doing with the 33<sup>rd</sup> edition.
2. SLSA arrange for the printing and distribution of the resources to the states/NT, who look after the distribution to the clubs/branches.
3. Another state/NT manages the printing of the resources instead of SLSA, and distribute to the states/NT for on selling to the clubs/branches.
4. No action

***MEETING COMMENTS/DEBATE:***

SLSWA, SLSNT, SLSQ all support national annual resource development and printing of the following core resources:

- Advanced Resuscitation Techniques (ARTC) Learner Guide
- Silver Medallion IRB Driver Learner Guide
- IRB Crew Learner Guide
- Spinal Management Learner Guide
- Bronze Medallion Learning and Assessment guide
- SRC Learning and Assessment guide
- TOC Learner Guide
- Assessor Learner Guide
- Senior First Aid Learner Guide
- Senior First Aid Flexible Delivery Learner Guide
- Pain Management Learner Guide
- Silver Medallion Basic Beach Management

**RESOLUTION:**

SLSA to investigate national print run, gather quotes & subsequently orders from States for these resources.

**Moved:** Brooke Irvine  
**Seconded:** Pamela Simon  
**Carried**

