



Review of the Australian Qualifications Framework

Discussion Paper

DECEMBER 2018

The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Review Panel wishes to draw on the considerable expertise and experience that has developed across a broad range of organisations and individuals in relation to the Review's [Terms of Reference](#).

In its discussion paper, the Panel has opted to provide to organisations and individuals some of the Panel's initial thinking about the case for change to the AQF, but invites differing analysis, conclusions and proposals.

To make a submission to the Review, please email this form to AQFReview@education.gov.au by **15 March 2019**.

Please note that the Australian Government Department of Education and Training will not treat a submission as confidential unless requested that the whole submission, or part of the submission, be treated as such.

Please limit your response to no more than 3000 words.

Respondent name

Natalie Bramble

Respondent organisation (where relevant)

iClick2Learn.com.au

iClick2Learn provides learning moments and need to know knowledge courses for 1/3 of Australia's workforce being staff, board and volunteers in community organisations.

Volunteering is often seen as a pathway to employment and our purpose is to build sustainable communities by providing knowledge and education to those in our communities who are at the forefront of community development.

They desire the recognition of achievements and learning, however don't have the time or the funds to complete the range of development courses they need in order to deliver their services; programs or social activities.

Only 30% of those in our sector have small professional development budgets and this, as well as location for regional and remote areas create barriers of access to professional development.

1. In what ways is the AQF fit, or not fit, for purpose?

We are currently using the AQTF to map our micro-credentials and badges. We are not a registered RTO at this stage as there is a financial barrier for us to undertake this, given we are a social enterprise who uses profits from eLearning contracts to develop accessible and free courses for our sector. We have undertaken this mapping project as a best practice approach to delivering quality learning outcomes.

What we are finding through this process that mapping to units, performance elements and knowledge evidence is far too comprehensive to be flexible enough for micro-learning moments.

For example, looking at Manage Meetings, it has 8 performance elements and 4 knowledge evidence pieces. Each of these, as we all know have multiple knowledge pieces within these and the level of information/learning to achieve these can be 1hour + for each performance element.

This depth of content required to address these areas to be deemed competent in this unit is a far greater time commitment than micro-learning was designed, and allows for.

In our short courses and micro-learning lessons, we are fortunate if we are able to achieve one full performance element within a unit.

To best meet the balance of micro-learning v depth of content, we've applied Blooms taxonomy in a framework, mapped to each unit and each performance element so that they either achieve an awareness; understanding; application or critical thinking credential.

We have found it difficult and a time-consuming process, as we are making subjective judgements on the content and their achievement within these elements, however the framework we developed does currently suit our needs.

2. Where the AQF is not fit for purpose, what reforms should be made to it and what are the most urgent priorities? Please be specific, having regard to the possible approaches suggested in the discussion paper and other approaches.

I would think that the performance elements and knowledge evidence pieces can be broken up to provide micro-learning moments that can be achieved through micro-credentials. You could then have students 'collect' micro-learning credentials and then provide some evidence (not too much – RPL can be an exhaustive process!); such as an assessment / assignment and then provide for them to be accredited either in the performance element of the unit, or the unit itself.

3. In relation to approaches suggested by the Panel or proposed in submissions or through consultations, what are the major implementation issues the Review should consider? Please consider regulatory and other impacts.

In relation to the recommendations / options for integrating microlearning across AQTF, I quite like the proposed skill set and supplementary provisions. I do think that being able to gather badges/credentials for a performance element also gamifies the learning experience for the types of learners we cater to.

Other

The biggest concern I have with regulating micro-credentials in Australia is that you need to consider entry level start-up organisations like ours who have a social purpose to provide learning pathways that lead to further qualifications or employment. This means our goal is not to make money, but to make knowledge accessible.

The ability to be able to pay a large sum to be able to participate in such a valuable program as this would be prohibitive for many like us who are trying to support individuals, many of whom with medium to low-socio economic profiles. The same could be said for any business or commercial entity who is not an education provider who offers on-the-job skill based education.