



## **Productivity Commission**

# **Review of the National Agreement on Skills and Workforce Development**

**Submission from The Industry Skills Advisory Council  
NT**

**December 2019 V1.2**

# ISACNT

Level 2 The Avenue  
12 Salonika St,  
Parap, NT 0820

08 7913 7500

Productivity Commission  
GPO Box 1428  
Canberra  
ACT 2601

Dear Commissioner Roberts and Commissioner Cappel,

**RE: Skills and Workforce Development Agreement: Issues Paper.**

Thank you for including ISACNT in the Productivity Commission's Review of the National Agreement for Skills and Workforce Development (NASWD) and for meeting with us on December 18, 2019.

Though we are unable to fully respond to the review questions now, we look forward to receiving the Interim report. This will enable us to provide a more comprehensive response to you.

The NT VET context is not the same as other jurisdictions and our responses to the review reflect these different circumstances for you to consider. Our submission will provide you with a deeper understanding of this reality and is provided to you to help shape your understanding.

Please contact me should you require additional information.

Debbie Paylor

General Manager

Industry Skills Advisory Council, NT

[www.isacnt.org.au](http://www.isacnt.org.au)

Telephone: 08 7913 7500

## **Background**

**ISACNT** is an independent, not for profit organisation that provides advice to and gathers feedback from Northern Territory businesses on skills shortages.

Our purpose is to work closely with Northern Territory stakeholders to increase industry skills capacity and capability across the Northern Territory.

As the peak NT representative body on workforce development, ISACNT is a key source of advice and information to the NT Government, the main point of contact for industry and training providers and a valued contributor to national Training product reforms.

Our Industry engagement activities inform us very well of what industry's current and emerging needs are while providing us with insights into how NT industry engages with VET, training organisations and Government.

For the NT Government to support development and to provide certainty to business and industry, there is the essential requirement for a continual investment in people. This means that Territorians need to have the skills that will support development as well as providing individuals with the opportunity for lifelong learning.

Two key aspects to the VET system are covered in this response. The first is the apprenticeship system and the pipeline from school to work and the second is the existing worker training programs.

It is also important to note that larger organisation invest internally in enterprise-based training. Their training needs often exceed the standards identified in National Training Packages and their outcomes are driven by their business imperatives. How they do this should be considered as a key element of this review.

Furthermore, the National Agreement framework must go beyond a focus on funding mechanisms, processes and procedures. VET is about people and not just systems, and there should be an equal focus on delivering outcomes and not just outputs.

## **Introduction**

We welcome the opportunity to provide information to you on a number of issues that are a priority for the NT, including how governments can better coordinate their support for VET, options for improving funding and pricing arrangements, and how to ensure that government investment in VET produces the best returns for the community.

The opportunities to provide better quality courses and skills outcomes through improved co-ordination of Government support for VET and workforce development is also welcomed.

Although we are unable to respond to all the points raised in the issues paper, we do have valuable data and insights on VET in the NT that we believe will make a constructive contribution to the reform of the National Skills and Workforce Development Agreement.

---

#### *INFORMATION REQUEST 1*

*The Commission welcomes views on our proposed approach to this study, and on any other reviews that are of relevance to this study.*

---

There are several other recent National reviews noted in the issues paper that could also be reviewed and analysed to add valuable insights into the current productivity Commission's inquiry.

The recent Joyce review recommended several reforms that may facilitate the change needed to improve the governance of VET nationally. It is therefore an imperative that the Government's objectives align with those of the NT and other jurisdictions to ensure consistency in desired outcomes.

However, the unique differences in the NT's labour market conditions and the differences in our economic drivers, from other jurisdictions, will need to be clearly articulated within any proposed policy changes so that the national policy doesn't impact negatively on NT skilling and education objectives. For this to happen it is critical that the NT context is deeply understood.

The National Skills commission should have NT industry representation on its board and be jointly governed by all jurisdictions.

The review could also provide a framework on the various dimensions of quality needed to ensure that the outcomes of training meet the needs of both the individuals and industry.

---

#### *INFORMATION REQUEST 2*

*The Commission seeks evidence on how well the National Agreement for Skills and Workforce Development's (NASWD) objectives for the vocational education and training (VET) sector have been met, and the reasons for those outcomes.*

---

There is ample evidence that the goals are not being reached.

- The Australian government financial support for VET created major quality and equity issues in recent years due to lack of appropriate regulation. These issues are not evident in the Higher Education sector.
- We have experienced a large drop in the number of apprenticeships being signed up over the NASWD period from 2012-2019.
- there is a growing demand for skills that are not being met,
- we have a rapidly changing workplace as a result of technological change and the boom and bust cycle of major projects,
- unequal distribution of economic benefits within the NT,
- an ageing and decreasing population in the NT
- stagnant growth in many regions.
- Complex pricing models

These features exist across Australia and more so in the NT.

## The NT context.

The NT is very different in relation to other Australian Jurisdictions across multiple dimensions.

- We have a small population that is spread over more than 1.3 million square kilometres with a large proportion of the population living in remote and regional areas.
- We experience extreme climatic and geographic conditions and the lack of economies of scale introduces multiple challenges that have impacts on all Territorians and on our economy that most Australians don't experience.
- The NT economy is predominately driven by major projects that often have significant economic, social and environmental impacts (not all are positive), natural resource development, construction activities and tourism.

A deep understanding of where training and workforce development sits within these contexts is critically important in planning to meet the future demand for skilled workers as proposed projects evolve.

- The long lead times needed to meet the emerging demand for skilled workers from our potential labour market cohort (many jobs are yet to be identified) requires a National policy framework that focuses on building future capability that can adapt to jurisdictional needs.
- Delivery needs in thin and niche markets in the NT is greater than other markets.
- Students in regional and remote locations experience social and economic disadvantages which increases the cost of delivery.
- There are too many variables in how pricing for nominal hours is arrived at confusing the notion of a contestable and competitive market

**The Australian Qualifications Framework has a base line of volume of learning that could be used to determine the market price for units of competency.**

---

### *INFORMATION REQUEST 3*

*The Commission seeks views on:*

- *whether the objectives and policy directions for the VET sector set out in the NASWD are suitable for the future and why*
  - *if currently-stated objectives and policy directions for the VET sector are suitable for the future, which should be given priority*
  - *if currently-stated objectives and policy directions are not suitable for the future, how they should be changed and evidence in support of proposed changes.*
- 

## Initial observations

With the understanding that VET is designed to help people to join or re-join the workforce, change careers, or to upskill or reskill within their chosen field, it is universally recognised that VET is a critical enabler of workforce development in the NT.

It is critical that the NT is able to operate within a flexible and responsive industry demand driven, nationally agreed system, that is not restricted in their ability to respond to rapidly emerging

demand and changes in industry. In the NT we are often recipients of the change and not the change makers.

Training packages do not fit with current job requirements being demanded by Industry 4.0. such as personal, technical and non-technical core capabilities.

Future core capabilities need to be integrated into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula.

Individuals also increasingly need upskilling in digital skills, skills that articulate to the capabilities of their employer and to the industry overall.

The operation of the training market at levels above certificate III is not effective. Accessing any type of training in regional NT is also very difficult and costly.

There are a decreasing number of people with the appropriate levels of qualification to compete for current and emerging skilled occupations in the NT.

As a result of pricing and lead times for putting additional qualifications on scope, the number of training qualifications being offered is being reduced by providers to a very narrow range.

Employers are key stakeholders in the training market and Training Providers need to have a closer engagement with them to be able to determine the outcomes of their training.

These outcomes should focus on a range of tangible quality dimensions, such as technical skill and skills and knowledge that is transferrable to other jobs.

Schools are not being measured on student's post school achievements in the VET sector and a there is a primary focus on schools providing their leaving cohort with good ATAR scores leading to university in contrast to VET careers.

Career advice needs to be industry driven so that accurate and consistent advice is articulated from priority skills occupational data.

VET Career Pathways are poorly articulated to school leavers and there is inconsistent information available in contrast to the Higher Education pathway.

There is a disconnect between Industry and Schools identifying a need for a mechanism to engage Industry and their representatives in career advisory functions.

VET does not suit a school curriculum in relation to student scheduling.

Language, literacy and numeracy and digital (LLND) skills required in the workplace are not being achieved. Industry should become a co-contributor to an investment in literacy and numeracy programs (LLND) in the workplace

The Australian Govt financial support for VET created major quality and equity issues in recent years due to a lack of appropriate regulation. These issues are not evident in the Higher Education sector.

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 4*

- *What evidence (other than that included in the Report on Government Services and Performance Dashboard) is available to assess performance against outcomes and targets in the NASWD?*
  - *What has affected the achievement of outcomes and targets to date, and how?*
  - *Do current indicators and targets provide the right information to assess performance? For example:*
    - *are the indicators and targets fit for purpose — are they reasonable and attainable; do they adequately reflect contemporary policy settings?*
    - *how well do the outcomes, performance indicators and targets link to each other and the objective?*
  - *How are performance data interpreted and used?*
  - *Are there other areas of performance that should be measured and, if so, why? What types of indicators should be adopted for these areas?*
  - *What should a future performance framework look like and include?*
- 

We are unable to determine how well the VET sector has prepared the workforce for current or emerging skills.

There is very limited data on the outcomes of training from enterprise-based training organisations

Informal learning is not evaluated in any way although it is often the primary mechanism in the workplace for skills acquisition.

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 5*

- *How well does the NASWD describe the roles and responsibilities of governments in skills and workforce development? Could this be improved?*
  - *How well have the Australian, State and Territory governments fulfilled the agreed reform directions and their roles and responsibilities?*
  - *How could governments better work together, for example, to improve the efficiency of tasks, or support accountability for outcomes?*
- 

**The Naval Shipbuilding initiative provides a good model of national collaboration for workforce development and skilling.**

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 6*

- *How well have the intergovernmental arrangements instituted under the NASWD worked?*
- *Is an intergovernmental agreement still required, or the best instrument, to promote collaboration on policy directions and reform, and accountability for outcomes?*

*-If not, what alternative mechanism(s) would be suitable?*

*-If so, how should its overall form and structure differ from the existing agreement?*

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 6

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 7

*Does the current division of joint and jurisdiction-specific policy approaches (and approach to managing the associated tensions) produce the best outcomes?*

*Is the current market structure efficient, and is it well-placed to meet Australia's current and future skills and training needs?*

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 8

*The Commission seeks evidence on how the issues identified in recent reviews (or other issues) have affected the achievement of aims in the NASWD, and any additional opportunities to better meet governments aims for the VET system. For example:*

*are there ways to improve VET service quality and responsiveness in addition to those already identified in past reviews?*

*how effective are consumer protection arrangements? What are the pros and cons of different models operating in different jurisdictions? How do these operate in addition to national protections under consumer law?*

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 9

*How effective are skills needs assessments as a basis for estimating demand for VET services?*

- How do governments' skills needs matching efforts alter student demand for VET?*
- Are priority skills lists the best way of signalling skills shortages?*
- How could nationally-consistent skills demand forecasting be implemented to better match training to the economy's needs?*

*Noting that the National Careers Institute will cater for students' needs, do other market players have access to information to efficiently inform their choices? If not, how could this be improved?*

---

### **Identification of Skills Shortages**

The Medium and Long-term Strategic Skill List is aimed at attracting occupations that could experience a future skill shortage. The effectiveness of this strategy is yet to be determined as it does not address current skills needs. Looking to fill future shortages through migration undermines local strategies to get young Australians trained to fill the vacant positions.

### **Methodologies**

There are many competing methodologies currently in use across government to judge skills shortages. Because of these varying methodologies different skills shortages lists are produced across jurisdictions confusing where occupational demand exists.



The reliance of multiple 'skills shortage lists' underpinned by varying methodologies, has resulted in a fragmented approach to addressing skills shortages across the national economy. There is a clear and pressing need to consolidate the various lists, and methodologies into a single robust index of skills shortages across the economy.

**It could be useful if there was a nationally agreed evidence-based methodology, to determine skills shortages across the economy.**

## **ANSZCO**

**A comprehensive and wide-ranging review of the existing Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) codes list must occur to assist in the proper evaluation of skills shortages.**

- 1 Examples of jobs that are difficult to classify according to ANZSCO include
  - Data Scientist
  - Operations Manager
  - Workshop Foremen
  - Administration Officer
  - Senior Aquaculture Technician
  
- 2 Examples of rapidly growing occupations that don't appear to have an ANZSCO classification.
  - Community engagement
  - High level cyber security and safety
  - Big Data analytics

## **Occupational descriptors**

The clear identification of industry's occupational and skills demand is often obscured by the current classifications and definitions contained in the ANZSCO series.

The classification of occupational roles and the qualifications that go with them are not being effectively captured during research into occupational demand.

The responses from industry have noted that the occupations that they identify do not accurately reflect the roles and functions of the positions.

For example, the nominated position for Sales Manager does not appear under the ANZSCO code that relates to an automotive workshop manager or workshop supervisors role in the automotive industry.

Under the ANZSCO code it relates to an occupation that is linked to a marketing specialist at a Bachelor degree level, (skill level 1) which is not appropriate to the automotive occupational role. The 'manager' envisages one is supervising staff and supervising and directing an element of segment of the business, not acting as a marketing specialist.

Most automotive industry occupations do not have specific ANZSCO classifications and are rolled into general ANZSCO classifications, such as Other Miscellaneous Labourers.

Many automotive industry ANZSCO classifications are out-dated and do not reflect the current industry job title, job role or skill requirements.

Similarly, ANZSCO classifications for higher level automotive industry occupations are combined with other industrial areas, such as engineering. These are inappropriate and do not reflect the actual levels of demand, or the appropriate skill levels, thus compounding the information needed to make a case for inclusion on the skilled occupations priority list or for the implementation of related training.

It has been noted during consultations with employers in regional areas that the occupation/s that the automotive industry defines in their job descriptions are generally linked to jobs that require the performance of tasks that are similar to occupations in other disciplines. However, individual businesses require that the worker carry out various tasks within a position that are like other occupations but are irrelevant to those other occupations. This makes it difficult for businesses to make a case for recruiting a migrant worker under a 457 visa application as the regulations may catch them out if the work that the migrant worker is asked to do does not match the nominated position.

The industry also has difficulties with several ANZSCO definitions such as technicians at level III who are increasingly required to perform managerial roles in response to changes in regulations.

Some titles can mean quite different things in an occupational sense. The skills are markedly different at each level and are not reflected in the classifications listed under ANZSCO.

The absence of a defined group of technicians, supervisors, foremen and workshop managers, more commonly seen in the industry, seems to be a serious omission across the whole ANZSCO series.

A good example of this difficulty is in the occupation of Marine Engine Driver. This is a licenced occupation at AQF Level 3. However, the role is not that of a Marine Engineer, as defined in the ANZSCO series. The ANZSCO classification is a very poor proxy for the actual occupation which is essentially a diesel mechanic on a boat.

Another classic example is afforded by the shift from the old Master Fisher terminology towards defining fishers by their licence category, e.g. Coxswain, Skipper 3, Skipper 2, Skipper 1.

The industry uses these terms and the levels to determine their skill level.

The ANZSCO 2312 group does not fit the marine industry as defined occupationally, by licence or under Fishing and Trading. The occupations other than deck crew are all licensed. They are: Master/Skipper, Coxswain, Marine Engineer, Marine Engine Driver.

Furthermore, the main fishing and marine aquaculture licensed occupations are also not effectively covered by ANZSCO. Some occupational titles differ between Australia and New Zealand (e.g. NZ Harbour Masters) but the generic occupational titles can cover both jurisdictions.

It must be stressed that a Marine Engineer is a professional level 1 person whereas a marine Engine Driver is the one that maintains most small to medium size commercial vessels. Their skills are limited compared to a Marine Engineer and lie at a much lower skill level 3.

What is missing are the appropriate terms such as Master/Skipper, ANZSCO Level 3 covering Master 5, Ship's Master ANZSCO Level 1 (covering Master 1, 2 and 3 and 4.)

The key difficulty we have in allocating occupations appropriately is the emergence of a new range of occupations, which tend to fall between the professional/managerial level descriptions and semi-skilled descriptions.

### **Migration policy impact**

The flow on effect of these limitations within the ANZSCO classification system has the potential to negatively impact on a wide range of labour market and migration initiatives as there is a lack of recognition of a number of occupations and roles at the appropriate skill levels within the industries that are reporting unmet demand.

The consequences for businesses are that skilled migrant labour requests may be refused based on incorrect ANZSCO classifications.

The current limitations of the ANZSCO system impact on the access of labour under the Skilled Occupation List (SOL). — The SOL for General Migration Purposes does not meet the needs of several industries as it is focused on occupations, which are classified at Certificate IV level and above.

As many occupations in demand by industry are below this level, as currently classified under ANZSCO, the structuring of the national migration program compounds the problem.

---

#### *INFORMATION REQUEST 10*

*How have the reforms undertaken by governments (such as the national entitlement system and introduction of income-contingent loans) shaped the operation of the VET market?*

*How well have these reforms contributed to the achievement of the NASWD's aims (such as improved access, quality and market efficiency)?*

*What lessons can be learned from past reforms?*

---

### **Attracting and retaining apprentices**

Mentoring and related apprenticeship support services within the Australian Apprenticeships Support Network lack accountability to the key stakeholders. Employers are able to terminate an employment relationship with an apprentice, bypassing mediation or support processes being accessed.

The training wage for apprentices is acting as a disincentive to sign-ups.

For example, incentivising apprenticeships with a training wage that is 20% below the minimum wage paid to a qualified person, in the second or third year of an apprenticeship, would enhance attraction and retention of apprentices. This may also require a review of Australian Government and jurisdictional entitlement funding.

**A HECS type policy that is linked to a higher-level qualification, Diploma and above, could be introduced to the VET sector.**

## **Retention and workforce development**

Employers who want to take on an apprentice should require accreditation and be provided with an incentive for their apprentice supervisor to either hold or achieve at a minimum a trainer assessment skill set or qualification. This could be subsidised.

The Group Training model has proven to be very effective in achieving high levels of apprenticeship completions.

### **A level playing field (price points)**

There is little information available about the full cost of training in the NT (or anywhere else) and who is paying for it. Funding arrangements and their pricing beyond apprenticeships is opaque.

Fee for service markets may be disrupted by Government intervention especially in the NT context.

Geographic isolation results in higher operating costs overall in the NT training market.

VET choices in regional areas of the NT where block training isn't required in Darwin, are minimal.

The number of training qualifications being offered in the NT is being reduced to a very narrow selection primarily due to the cost and low participant numbers. The removal of additional regional funding in Katherine in the NT reduces the viability of an RTO to deliver at an affordable price to students.

The ongoing impacts of Training Package edits have a negative impact on Training Providers as compliance and upgrading costs remove their incentives to deliver at an affordable price especially in regional NT.

Existing workers in the NT are reluctant to access upskilling training through the subsidised public provider due to the lack of flexible delivery.

Furthermore, those workers don't want to pay many times the subsidised price with a private provider, even though they are able to deliver to meet their working timeframes. This results in a skills shortage especially in trade specialisation.

Not for profit organisations (often Indigenous community based ones) cannot afford to pay co-contributions costs (*generally 20% of the qualification cost*) especially when they require several employees to participate in highly priced qualifications. This drives training into lower level qualifications to build Indigenous workforce capacity. However, these qualifications are generally unfunded resulting in no workforce development activities.

---

### *INFORMATION REQUEST 11*

*To what extent do (and should) users (students and employers) determine VET offerings?  
How are users' preferences influenced by government incentives and programs (including information programs)?*

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 11

*To the extent not covered elsewhere in this paper, the Commission seeks additional evidence on how well the VET market is operating, for example in terms of:*

- services being of the quantity, type, quality and location that users and the community most value*
- its efficiency in meeting users' needs, including as they change*
- prices usually reflecting efficient costs, or this amount adjusted to achieve other policy objectives.*

*How can governments best ensure the market develops to support policy goals?*

- How do (and should) governments coordinate and manage the interactions between different types of interventions and initiatives to support market development?*
- Is there a preferred model for market stewardship? Why?*

*If agreed by governments, how would implementation of the recommendations of recent reviews (for example, the Joyce and Noonan Reviews) improve:*

- the operation of the VET market?*
- choices and pathways between schools, VET and higher education?*

*Are there any issues not identified by previous reviews that materially affect the operation of the VET market?*

---

## **Existing demand for training**

Our research (ISACNT 2018 Defence maritime Maintenance and 2019 Aviation insights) shows clearly that the Governance arrangements for financing VET in the NT work effectively at the apprenticeship entry level but not at higher levels of qualifications. Funding arrangements, post apprenticeships, do not effectively respond to Industry demand or emerging needs.

There are a decreasing number of people with the appropriate levels of qualification in the NT.

With the recent proposed public provider restructure there is a clear demand to prioritise future VET delivery to address the demands of industry.

The lack of choice will impact an individual's career choices. If the VET qualification of choice isn't available, then it is likely that person will not pursue the job.

Teachers continue to guide students towards HE in lieu of supporting VET

Attracting and keeping skilled training staff is also very difficult making it hard for private providers to make a profit.

We do not have a clear understanding whether incentives are the driver for short term productivity outcomes by employers (the recent removal of traineeships incentives collapsed this market) or whether investment in an apprenticeship is for a longer-term employment outcome.

Research activities are necessary to determine what drives employers to invest in apprenticeships.

The Australian VET system is geared to meet employer needs, reducing the focus on those of the individual.

Existing workers in the NT cannot easily access training when and where it suits them.

Often public training providers do not offer the courses needed by industry.

Funding for short courses and skills sets is where both the need and demand exists in the NT workplace.

There is always high demand for qualifications where there is a mandatory licence or regulation attached to the occupation. It may be timely to review if any workplace mandatory requirements should be funded by the public.

Employers are often reluctant to invest as there are no guarantees of a positive outcome (less than 50% of apprentices succeed).

Employer satisfaction with training outcomes is declining, employers require evidence of training qualifications and yet don't have access to this information, employees think they do.

LLND needs to be in schools; a common theme is that apprentices don't have the math level to be able to complete their training. Individuals are increasingly needing to upskill in digital skills, skills that articulate to the capabilities of their employer and to the industry.

Digital literacy and Foundation skills training should be publicly funded as short courses.

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 12*

*The Commission seeks the following information for each jurisdiction:*

*governments' objectives in relation to their pricing and funding approaches*

*the methodologies for assessing the cost of providing qualifications and the rationale for the methodologies*

*the methodologies used to set prices, government subsidies and/or student fees for qualifications and the rationale for these methodologies*

*current and historic estimated costs, prices, subsidies and student fees for qualifications*

*how funding and pricing arrangements affect the decisions of VET players (for example, whether they encourage providers to operate at least cost or employers to provide wages at market rates).*

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 13*

*The Commission also seeks input on the following questions.*

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 13

*What is the rationale underpinning each jurisdiction's funding and pricing approach? How well have governments' objectives in relation to their funding and pricing approaches been met?*

*What are the pros and cons of the specific pricing and funding approaches used by the State and Territory governments?*

*How well do current funding and pricing arrangements support governments' shared goals for the VET sector?*

*What aspects of funding and pricing should be undertaken on a nationally-consistent basis, and how should this be achieved?*

*What aspects of funding and pricing administration or supervision can be improved (within VET and across VET and higher education)?*

*What alternative models for funding and pricing government services could the VET system draw from?*

---

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 14

*If governments agree to a new national funding agreement for co-funding VET in schools, what should be part of this new arrangement?*

---

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 15

*The Commission seeks:*

*evidence of how funding (and other) settings affect learning and career choices*

*views on options for achieving greater consistency in funding and loan arrangements between the VET and higher education sectors, and the likely benefits, costs and impacts of these options.*

---

---

INFORMATION REQUEST 16

*Are the contributions by government (on behalf of the public), industry and individuals towards VET proportionate to the benefits that each of these groups receive?*

*Is direct estimation of public and private benefits as a means to direct government funding feasible and desirable? What would be the implications for other sectors (e.g. Higher Education) if such an approach was taken in VET?*

*How should governments judge priorities for funding and effort, and why?*

*How should employers and industry contribute to funding the skills training of their workforce? Are there any barriers or disincentives to private funding of VET?*

*Should the level of government funding vary for different course or student types, and if so, how should government decide the relative amounts?*

---

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 16*

*What approaches are most useful to assess the effectiveness of government investment in VET?*

*Should government investment in the VET system seek increased participation in training by all Australians? How should this goal be achieved?*

---

*INFORMATION REQUEST 17*

*How effective and accessible are data collection and reporting arrangements?*

*How can data and information-sharing arrangements be further improved to facilitate assessments of the effectiveness of VET investment and delivery?*

- What additional data (if any) or improvements in data quality are required to effectively monitor the performance of Australia’s training system?*

*How significant are current compliance requirements relating to the provision of data to authorities?*

- Can some data collections be ceased?*
  - How can data be collected in a way that minimises reporting costs?*
- 

*INFORMATION REQUEST 18*

*Can the apprenticeships system and data collection by governments be better coordinated, or streamlined? If so, how?*

*What other areas of the VET system are unnecessarily complex or inefficient? Are there any additional opportunities for governments to better streamline or coordinate their initiatives to improve the VET system?*

*To what extent will fixing these issues improve the operation of the VET system?*

---

**Further VET research could focus on:**

- Identifying opportunities to increase VET participation in traditional and emerging industries.
- Identifying the skills needed by industry in a changing workplace that is driven by Industry 4.0 changes.
- Identifying the dimensions of quality that are needed to improve courses and applying appropriate regulatory focus on them.
- Outcomes should focus on a range of tangible quality dimensions such as technical skill, skills and knowledge that are transferrable to other jobs.
- Training packages often don’t align with current job requirements being demanded by Industry 4.0; such as personal, technical and non-technical core capabilities.



- Steps need to be taken to firstly gain an insight into the future world of work here in the NT and how should we integrate our training system with these transforming technologies.
- Identifying the challenges that RTOs face in meeting industry's needs?
- Identifying what is stopping or diverting young people from taking up an apprenticeship
- Apprentice and trainee wage structures.
- Costs impacts to local business to employ, retain and qualify