The effects of the inclusion of literacy and numeracy competencies within Australia's food processing industry training package were examined in two case studies of training at two food processing facilities in Victoria. The first case study involved a large pasta factory that had approximately 270 employees and a contract with a registered training organization (RTO). The second case study examined a bread factory at which training was provided by in-house workplace trainers. Data were collected through a literature review and interviews with a representative of the Victorian Food Industry Training board, an industry training consultant, a company training manager, and the manager of an RTO. In both case studies, the inclusion of literacy in industry standards resulted in enterprise-based...
teachers adding value to training on a number of levels. However, trainers' literacy-related work tended to be marginalized by the constraints of the industrial context and because literacy standards were implicit rather than explicitly spelled out in endorsed components. (The bibliography lists 18 references. The following are among the items appended: outlines of core, optional, and specialist standards aligned to the Australian Qualifications Framework structure; a checklist for on-the-job assessment in electric forklift operation; and training materials for various level work practices.) (MN)
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Executive Summary

The integration of literacy within industry standards calls for literacy and numeracy to be ‘built in’ to vocational training and assessment processes. In this model, literacy and numeracy skills are regarded as skills that underpin and are implicit in the competent performance of work skills. It is the task of teachers and trainers to identify the implied literacy and numeracy skills and to work to develop those skills in conjunction with industry training.

The Victorian Centre of ALNARC has investigated the effects of the inclusion of literacy and numeracy in industry standards at two sites in the food processing industry. The food processing industry has been a leading industry in training package implementation and in particular, has addressed the language and literacy training needs of its workforce through the activities of its Industry Training Advisory Board (ITAB), through various research projects and by developing a range of literacy-related training materials.

Enterprise-based teachers (EBTs) have taken up the challenge to identify literacy needs and to deliver training in ways that will take account of and respond to such needs. Applying a broad definition of literacy (which includes language, communication skills and critical skills) the enterprise-based teachers in this study are adding value to industrial training in various ways. However, their literacy-related work is constrained by the limited time available and the productivity imperative.

The four teachers whose work is documented in this report are working to deliver quality training within the framework of training packages. They see literacy as part of learning how to learn and as a part of the organisational context of learning. The teachers use a variety of (mainly oral) strategies to provide literacy-related support and assistance for workers being assessed at AQF Level I. At the same time, they are working to broaden the training to include opportunities for the development of generic communication and organisational skills (‘soft skills’).

Worker/trainees with language or literacy needs are being provided with additional support and assistance in order to demonstrate competence in food safety and occupational health and safety at Level I. However, that support and assistance is highly targeted, in a context in which, according to the enterprise-based teachers, there is insufficient time allowed for basic training. In the drive to train and assess as many workers as efficiently as possible to the minimum requirements, opportunities for literacy support and relevant training are being lost. More research is needed into the relationship between literacy needs and how those needs are being met in pre-assessment training, at the point of assessment, and in follow-up training. Research is also needed into the extent to which the (mainly informal) strategies for literacy support that are being developed are sufficient to affect learning outcomes in the longer term.
The fact that literacy standards are implicit and not explicitly spelt out in the endorsed components means that there is no strong basis for negotiating training time for literacy-related training. While the unendorsed components of the Food Processing Training Package highlight literacy and numeracy issues, there is a need to find ways of making literacy more explicit and more visible within the endorsed components. This would be one way to bring literacy to the attention of industry training personnel and to encourage them to value and acknowledge literacy as one of the key components of training.

It seems that the only explicit, structured instruction in the language and literacy components of industry standards is that provided through the workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) program. The relationship between the WELL program and the implementation of training needs to be further investigated, especially from the viewpoint of how underpinning literacy skills are to be addressed. Literacy-related training strategies developed in the course of WELL-funded programs could be applied to AQF training more widely if adequate resources were to be made available.

Current policy links training to productivity outcomes (ANTA nd (a): 4). However, this research suggests that there is a contradiction between productivity outcomes that are accounted for in the short-term, and the provision of effective training, which is a much longer-term undertaking and could also be regarded as investment in organisational learning. The ‘bottom line’ is that it costs companies to release workers to be trained during paid working hours, so that in many cases, opportunities for effective training are minimised. Given that there is much research supporting the long-term benefits to companies of investment in training (Burke et al, 1999) there is a need for ANTA to continue to work with industry to popularise the (long-term) benefits of such investment.

One of the constraints to training identified is that funding for registered training organisations (RTOs) is based on student contact hours only and does not include resources needed to address the overall training needs and organising and consultancy work required. More flexible forms of funding that take into account the developmental aspects of their work and local needs would be more appropriate.

The success or otherwise of training package implementation rests in large part on the quality of the organisational and teaching work that enterprise-based teachers bring to it. This report shows aspects of quality training in complex organisational environments. The industrial context is different from the institutional contexts that most teachers in VET come from. Classroom teachers entering into VET training in workplaces need on-going professional development training and support. Systems of mentoring and support for the establishment of networks of EBTs (across RTOs) are recommended as an approach to supporting EBTs and increasing their skills.
1 Introduction

This is the final report of the Victorian project forming part of the national ALNARC investigation into the effects of the inclusion of literacy and numeracy standards in training packages and their impact on the quality of learning and work outcomes.

The Victorian Centre of ALNARC has investigated the place of literacy in training in food safety and occupational health and safety in the food processing industry. In particular, we investigated the ways in which support and training are provided in the literacy and numeracy competencies implicit in industry standards, and the effectiveness of that provision.

Language and literacy support provided in two separate food processing companies has been investigated at two sites in Melbourne: 'Rapello's Pasta Factory' and the 'Brunswick Bread Factory'. This report documents what is happening on the ground in relation to literacy (in the context of the implementation of training packages) at each of these sites. The perceptions of enterprise-based teachers (EBTs), workplace trainers, an Industry Training Advisory board (ITAB) executive officer, a company manager and a Registered Training Organisation (RTO) manager have been documented. The data were analysed with a view to making judgements about the achievements, and the challenges produced by the 'integrated model' of language and literacy provision, and the possible future strategies for making implementation more effective.

This report centres on how literacy is addressed at the two sites: Rapello's and the Brunswick Bread Factory. It focuses on the work of four enterprise-based teachers working at these sites and highlights a number of issues arising from their experiences in implementing training packages. Finally, it makes some recommendations as to how literacy and numeracy might be more effectively integrated into training provision.

ANTA uses the term 'literacy' to encompass 'language' (that is, English as a second language), 'literacy' (that is, the functional skills of reading and writing) and 'numeracy' (skills of calculation required in the performance of work tasks). Literacy is also understood to include workplace communication skills generally (ANTA nd (b): 7; NFITC 1996). The generic communication skills (the 'Mayer key competencies') which are explicitly included in some packages are also often categorised under the broad heading of 'literacy'.

The Workplace English Language and Literacy project (WELL), defines literacy thus:

'Literacy is the ability to read and use written information and to write appropriately, in a range of contexts. Literacy also includes numeracy, such as the recognition and use of numbers and basic mathematical signs and symbols within texts. Literacy involves the integration of speaking, listening, and critical thinking with reading and writing.' (DETYA, 1999: 26).
2  Background: the challenge of ‘contextualised’ literacy

Integrating English language, literacy and numeracy competencies into industry competency standards represents a radical change in the way in which literacy and numeracy training in the workplace has been conceptualised and practised. The introduction of the National Training Framework requires that the vocational education and training (VET) system shifts from being provider-driven to industry-driven: training is to be streamlined to meet the needs of particular enterprises and linked to productivity outcomes (ANTA nd (a): 7). Enterprise-based teachers must now assess and report against industry standards within training packages. This may mean a complete re-assessment of their role as language, literacy and numeracy practitioners (loc. cit.).

The literacy and numeracy skills that underpin the competencies should be provided in the context of industry training, rather than be taught separately. Trainees must show competence in industry skills as defined by the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and language, literacy and numeracy support and training should be provided in that context. Enterprise-based teachers and workplace trainers have to identify the language, literacy and numeracy (LL&N) competencies required to fulfil the assessment requirements at each AQF Level and provide training (or support) in those competencies.

The incorporation of literacy and communication skills into training packages raises a number of policy issues. How effective is this approach in improving learning and work outcomes, and how can the integrated approach be made to work more effectively? What are the contextual issues that impact on the implementation of training, and how could these be addressed? Are training packages an appropriate framework for providing effective training in industrial skills as well as in the skills and knowledge that underpin these?

---

2 A workplace trainer is an enterprise-based worker who has completed Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training.
3 Research questions

The question that the Victorian Centre of ALNARC asked in this study was:

*With respect to the implementation of the Food Processing Training Package, in what ways, and how effectively, are literacy skills (broadly defined) being developed and supported in training programs? What are the barriers to more effective literacy training and support, and what could ANTA do to improve literacy training in the context of implementing National Training Packages?*

This question implied the following sub-questions:

- How is ‘literacy’ realised in the implementation of the two training packages (food processing and transport and distribution) being implemented at the two sites of investigation?
- What are the relationships between ‘literacy and numeracy’ and other aspects of AQF training and assessment?
- What are the literacy-related strategies that enterprise-based teachers and work place trainers are using at work sites?
- What are the views of teachers, trainers and ITAB personnel of the constraints and possibilities of their role?
- How do enterprise-based teachers, RTO managers and industry training representatives see the need for literacy and numeracy provision in training, and what do they see as the issues and problems surrounding its provision? What do they see as the direction to be followed if literacy and numeracy are to be integrated more effectively?
4 Method

A review of recent literature on literacy in training packages was carried out. Interviews were conducted with a representative of the Victorian Food Industry Training Board, an industry training consultant, a company training manager and the manager of an RTO.

A considerable period of time was spent looking for industries and enterprises where training packages were being implemented and attention was being paid to the issue of literacy. Eventually, a member of the Victorian ALNARC Research Advisory Committee who was connected with an RTO made contact with two of its enterprise-based teachers (EBTs) and arranged for the research to be carried out at the sites at which they were working. Approval for the research was given by the RTO Manager, the Victorian Food Industry Training Board and the training personnel at each company.

Case studies of literacy provision and attitudes towards literacy were undertaken at two different sites: ‘Rapello’s Pasta Factory’ and the ‘Brunswick Bread Factory’. At each of the sites, interviews were conducted with the enterprise-based teacher (or teachers). At one of the sites, the researcher did a group interview with workplace trainers, participated in a literacy class, and spoke informally with Level I trainees on the production line. At the other site, an interview with the company training manager was carried out.

Interviews and field notes were transcribed and accounts of the work of the four EBTs and their perceptions of the issues were developed from these.

The findings are presented as accounts of the work of the four EBTs (three at Rapello’s and one at the Brunswick Bread Factory) and their perceptions of the challenges, and issues associated with the integration of literacy within training package. The other interview data is used as background in the analysis of issues and preparation of recommendations.

The emerging issues are then discussed and in conclusion, a set of recommendations is given.
5 Case Study 1: Level I training at Rapello's Pasta Factory

Rapello's Pasta Factory is a large company with approximately 270 employees (including permanent, casual and part-time employees) working around-the-clock shifts.

It entered into a training agreement with a registered training organisation called here 'Eastern Training Network' in 1998. All operators (production workers) were to be given occupational health and safety and food safety training and assessed at Level I during 1999, and units of competency were to be customised for assessment and training at Level II during 2000. A workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) program was also in place, funded through another RTO.

Rapello's also has an agreement with a group training company for a certain number of trainees to join the company under the New Apprenticeship scheme. Approximately 20 trainees have come to Rapello's, subsidised under the New Apprenticeship system. They will receive their Level I and II training alongside the other employees and selected trainees and workers will proceed to Level III subsequently.

Approximately 60% of the workforce are casuals employed by an employment company. Casuals are trained by means of an induction program that has been negotiated with their employing company. The company is responsible for putting the casuals through a Level I CD ROM training program and for giving them the Rapello's induction package, which provides a basic understanding of hygiene, safety and quality. Before they commence work, the casuals are taken through a checklist of issues in a form of 'low key' assessment which takes 30 to 45 minutes. In transport and warehousing, they receive a further 30 minutes of training in power and mobile plant, then a driver/assessor accompanies them to assess their driving skills. If the casuals subsequently join as direct employees of Rapello's, they receive Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) for the training they have already undertaken.

There are three EBTs located at Rapello's and working on the implementation of the Food Processing and the Transport and Distribution Training Packages. 'Natalie' is employed by 'Eastern Training Network', an RTO which receives funds through the Victorian Office of TAFE and Further Education (OTFE). She works full-time as training coordinator. 'Corrie' is a part-time (3 days per week) EBT also employed by Eastern Training Network.

---

3 In this report, the names of the training organisations and the individual enterprise-based teachers have been altered for reasons of confidentiality.

4 OTFE has been re-named as the Office of Post-Compulsory Education, Training and Employment (OPETE).
She is responsible for training workers in transport and warehousing at level I. ‘Janine’ is the language and literacy teacher who works three days per week in a position funded by the Commonwealth WELL program. The three EBTs work closely together as a team to implement Rapellos training strategy. The strategy for 1999 centres on training and assessing all operators at AQF Level I, which consists of core units of competence (including occupational health and safety, either food safety or transport and distribution, and workplace communication) and optional or specialist units. (See Appendix 1 for an outline of the Food Processing AQF structure, levels I – III, and Appendix 2 for Quality Assurance at Level 1.)

Rapellos’ training plan provides for all workers to be trained and assessed at Level I during 1999; for a selection of workers to complete Level II during 2000; and for a selection of workers to continue to Level III during 2001 and Level IV during 2002. After that, the focus will be on the continual training of new employees and on maintaining skill standards of the entire workforce. During this time, it is expected that a new pay structure recognising training levels will be negotiated.

Natalie and Corrie

Natalie was appointed by the RTO as training co-ordinator in February, 1998. Her role is to coordinate all training at the factory and to train and work with the six workplace trainers. She is a qualified ESL teacher who has taught previously in TAFE and has worked in two other companies as an enterprise-based teacher. Apart from a short training course in consultancy skills provided by the Victorian Food Industry Training Board, Natalie had not received any specific training for her work as an EBT.

Corrie has completed a Bachelor of Education and Training, an Associate Diploma in Hospitality, Certificate IV in Food Technology and Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training.

Training the trainer

Natalie’s and Corrie’s main task at Rapellos had been to train six workers as workplace trainers and assessors who would be responsible for developing and delivering Level I units of competence and to assist in training the Level I assessors. The trainee trainers had been previously selected from the shop floor by management to take part in the training and carry out this role. All of the trainees were in their early twenties and all had passed the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE).

Natalie was mainly responsible for four trainers who were delivering modules in AQF Level I in the Food Processing Certificate to factory operators. Corrie was mainly responsible for the other two workplace trainers who did training and assessment at Level I in the Transport and Warehousing Certificate. Natalie and Corrie shared an office, as did the six workplace trainers. Sometimes
they did the training as a team and at other times they worked separately and in separate locations.

The workplace trainers (known locally as ‘CBT (competency-based training) trainers’) were trained mainly by Natalie and have been assessed by her as competent at AQF Level IV in Workplace Training and Assessment. All of them are now working on the delivery of Level I training to all production employees. By the end of November 1999, most production and transport workers at Rapellos had successfully completed the majority of Level I units of competence. Many were unable to complete Level I certificates until additional Safety Operating Procedures were set in place by the company.5

Natalie’s main task was to coordinate and monitor the work of the CBT trainers, provide additional training where necessary and create a framework of support, advocacy and further training for them. She was also responsible for training and supporting an additional group of production workers to achieve Certificate I in Workplace Assessor and Trainer.

Both Natalie and Corrie said that the confidence and the communication skills of the CBT trainers have increased significantly as the result of their training and their current work as CBT trainers.

When interviewed as a group, the six young workplace trainers appeared to be confident, highly engaged in their training tasks and highly motivated. They said they enjoyed their work, especially the challenges they have to deal with in terms of people and relationships. Their work included writing customised modules at Level II, conducting small group training sessions and carrying out assessments. Their contracts stipulate that they must carry out other work as required by management.

Despite the additional training and additional level of responsibility of the workplace trainers, they are on the same pay level as they were as untrained production workers. Corrie said that the trainers are unhappy about this:

_They have progressed so far in their individual development and the extent of work they have been asked to do... they are integral to the success of the whole system – if they are treated in this way into the future, it’s really going to affect the quality of work. It’s a serious concern to us._6

The CBT trainers will continue with their training to complete the Diploma of Training Assessment, which is the next step following on from the Certificate IV which they have already completed.

---

5 As at April 2000, the Safety Operating Procedures such as fire drills were in place and workers have been assessed in all the Occupational Health and Safety units of competency (see p. 11).

6 As at April 2000, the workplace trainers have been given a special allowance.
Pedagogy of action learning

Natalie used an action learning model to train the trainers over a six month period, linking their site-specific training work to the competencies at Level IV:

...to start giving them a bit of theory about module development, adult learning principles and then getting them to actively do things and then come back as a group and reflect on our practice and run a series of workshops.

The trainee trainers kept reflective diaries and had frequent opportunities to reflect together on what they did well or not so well, why, and how they could do it better next time. In this way, she said, the training ‘became part of the job, rather than being back at school, really integrating the learning with their work’.

Natalie assessed them using a variety of techniques that were integrated with the training itself. They developed training modules that in turn formed part of their assessment; they were observed while delivering training; their reflective diaries and self-evaluations about their own progress formed part of the assessment; and they carried out a qualitative survey of the company workforce and presented this to management.

Natalie said that her work with the trainers now mainly involves

...setting directions for them...We have weekly meetings, I help drive those. I’m also responsible to a large degree in meeting training targets, things like “X amount of people need to be trained in the Certificate of Food Processing in Level I by this date”.

Now, the trainers are working largely autonomously. Their work involves developing customised competency standards, assessing workers in the Level I Occupational and Health (OHS) competencies, helping to develop new procedures and carrying out other tasks at the request of management.

Natalie said that:

In the beginning Janine and Corrie and I were holding their hands. They quickly picked up the skills and confidence to run the training on their own.

According to Natalie, the workplace trainers were fast learners and “have developed in wonderful and unexpected ways” as a result of their training.

Inclusion of literacy in Level I training

As a trained ESL teacher, Natalie came to Rapellos with an awareness of language and literacy issues.

She said that with a high proportion (approximately 70%) of workers from NESB (Non-English Speaking Background), both trainers and managers at Rapellos knew that there were bound to be difficulties in training and assessing the operators (workers) at the required standards. Strategies for addressing issues of literacy were considered by her team of workplace trainers well before the
Level I training program had begun:

... very early on I spoke to them (the workplace trainers) but it was like preaching to the converted... two [of them] came from multicultural backgrounds and all of them came from the [factory] floor... we discussed strategies how to help a variety of people.

The introductory part of the Level I training was based on a CD ROM which gives the basics of occupational health and safety and food safety in the context of food processing. Natalie said that she and her colleagues

... identified the fact that they [the trainees] would need a lot of extra assistance and translating assistance. Even though there was a continual voice over, they didn’t necessarily have to read, but they had to comprehend.

The strategies included bringing in people who spoke their first language to be available to sit with them and take them through what was on the CD ROM; arranging for workers to take extra time if it was necessary; and see that the trainers never left the computer room unattended so as to ensure that support would always be on hand.

The rest of the Level I (pre-assessment) training was delivered to the (plant) workers in small groups. Approximately six hours work release per worker was allowed for these sessions. All three EBTs were involved, either in doing the training or in giving guidance and support to the workplace trainers who were training (and being trained) simultaneously. The training process mainly involved taking people through occupational health and safety (OHS) and food safety modules which were customised by the training team, and using these modules as the basis for developing a dialogue on issues of health, safety and workplace communication. No particular support with writing was required, as all assessment at Level I is oral in this training package.

According to Natalie, training in environmental safety (OHS), even at Level I, entailed significant communications training. It involved getting people off the factory floor in groups, providing fun-based activities, and enabling people to ask questions. The opening up of communication that occurred as a result of this group work has had a significant impact, as described in the next section.

Corrie has had a similar experience working with the Customer Services Group at Rapellos and delivering Level I training in Road Transport, Transport and Distribution and Warehousing. Whereas there is a lot of overlap between Transport and Distribution and Food Processing in workplace communications, there are some areas in which separate training is required, for example, procedures for lifting heavy items, and various sorts of numerical calculations. Eighty people have gone through Transport and Distribution training at Level 1,
but they could not (in October 1999) be awarded the Certificate until the factory Safety Operating Procedures were updated. This involved system issues which are outside the responsibility of the teachers and trainers, but have since been put in place.

The Level I training, according to Corrie, has had an impact on the level of awareness and safety behaviours of the workers:

*They are more safety conscious and careful. We will get pulled up if we walk outside the yellow lines, and they will tell us or the trainers about any issues.*

**Literacy as an equity issue**

The issue of literacy in Level 1 training (understood as the reading and writing, language, numeracy and communication skills which underpin the units of competence) is clearly a delicate issue. Corrie said that they (the trainers) are careful about what they put in writing, because while [management] would like them to produce a written manual, “our client base, even if they can read it, aren’t going to”. A manual would implicitly move training and assessment to being text-based. The manual might not be used very much by the worker/trainees and it might provide a means for discriminating against those with low literacy skills. She said that “they [factory management] keep saying that they will employ people who will have better skills”.

According to Corrie, native English speakers are currently “being missed a bit” in the attention being paid to NESB workers. Making sure that “what we do isn’t just text-based” enables the teachers to attend to their training needs and helps protect them from the embarrassment of admitting they have a problem. Whereas in theory those workers can go to Janine (the WELL-funded language and literacy teacher), they would have to volunteer themselves and to do the extra work with her in their own time. The strategy therefore is “to work with them so that they understand things – work with them to fill in forms, etc”. Most of this work is done informally, on the line, in down time, or in breaks from work.

**Constraints on improving training**

Natalie’s and Corrie’s commitment to the provision of quality training and the maximisation of learning is at times in tension with the management imperative to maintain and improve production targets. The issue mentioned by all of the

---

7 While AQF Level I is not strictly speaking a certificate, Natalie and Corrie explained that it is important for them to use a familiar jargon, rather than training package jargon, in order to make the training more acceptable to the workers.

8 The ITAB officer made a similar point in relation to the problematics of advocating for more time off the job for literacy training. According to her, some companies said, “OK, if that’s the level of support that’s needed for the delivery of all that, we will recruit differently” (that is, they will recruit workers who already have good levels of literacy).
EBTs interviewed for this project was that workers were given insufficient time off the production line for quality learning to take place. Natalie said that:

_This comes up when people come up to training sessions, and who we know would benefit from more time away from the job [ie, in off-the-job training]... You can’t extend people’s literacy skills on the line, with the machines going at whatever decibels, it’s just impossible. You need some quiet. You can facilitate some learning out there, definitely, but you know, you really need more blocks of time. It’s often a source of tension for us. We need to argue the case effectively to them... [but] Rapellos internal targets are not [the RTOs] targets._

Natalie, Corrie and Janine had recently worked with the workplace trainers to develop a training survey in August this year

_to try to evaluate how they had gone in the Level I training at that point... and to identify where we could improve and other issues that people had on the floor about training._

One of the main findings of the survey was that,

_A lot of people commented that setting up language and literacy [training and support] was a fantastic thing ...[but] they would like a little extra training time._

**The EBT as catalyst for organisational change**

Natalie said that there is a great deal of progress still to be made. The whole Rapellos organisation is:

*low in communication skills and language, literacy and numeracy skills, from front line management down ... there are areas that need more work, more effort, and we are dealing with a culture that is still embedded in the old.*

Front line managers and supervisors need training in team leadership and are not all competent at the level of literacy required to fill in reports. A group of two or so team leaders are receiving training, and many of these come to Natalie on a regular basis for help with work-related writing.

Part of the work of Natalie and Corrie at Rapellos is to advocate for training and to gradually contribute to the development of a culture of learning. However, the managerial structure does not include them in the process of planning for and developing the company’s training strategy. As a result, they, the EBTs, are presented with training targets that they often believe to be unattainable. They are sometimes able to negotiate these, but from an “outsider’s position”.

Natalie said that the Level I training carried out by the three EBTs and the six workplace trainers has had some impact on workplace culture at Rapellos. She said that that program provided the first opportunity ever in that factory for workers to get together in groups and ask questions in a supportive environment. As a result, a ‘Pandora’s Box’ was opened, and many problems, complaints and
issues were aired. It became incumbent on the trainers to respond in some way to the issues and to “follow things up” with management. In a sense, “we (the teachers and trainers) were the link between what the workforce were raising and management”. As a result, “a lot has changed here... the culture has changed” and “communication in the factory has improved a great deal”.

Natalie acknowledged that change has also been supported by a new plant manager who has brought in a new management philosophy. Once a month he calls meetings of one third of the work force, on a rotating basis, to discuss productivity, targets, safety, quality and to involve them in management concerns. According to Corrie and Natalie, these monthly half hourly meetings are an important aspect of on-going training which is directly provided by the company.

The change taking place at Rape llos is relatively recent. Natalie said that “in the past, there were no standard operating procedures in place”, and although productivity was high, the management used “old, hierarchical and oppressive way of dealing with their people”. Now, however,

...in contrast to many other workplaces, I really have to say that they have committed, and committed with a long-term vision, and really thought about how to integrate CBT with everything else that they do. You know... that’s very rare. I mean, we have helped them to think about those things as well...

However, despite the recent progress, in many ways Rape llos still has ‘a culture embedded in the old’. Natalie did not think that the changes associated with implementing training necessarily contributed to cultural change amongst the management at Rape llos (as in the development of a learning culture). She said that management are more concerned with “writing down and capturing skills and knowledge” so these don’t “walk outside the door.” The main concern of management is “how training affects the bottom line” although “we have gone some way in demonstrating to them how training affects food safety statistics.” Training is seen as “just another mechanism for making [pasta] better... but we need to prove that.”

Maximising validity and reliability in assessments

Natalie has established a system of competency-based assessment that she hopes will maximise the validity and reliability of assessment. Workplace assessors are given 16 hours off-the-job training and have to complete a number of assessments before being awarded their competencies as assessors. Natalie organises meetings with assessors and trainers every couple of months to review the process and to raise issues. She also seeks feedback about the ‘quality’ of assessments from team leaders (or supervisors).

The assessors usually work in pairs: two assessors assessing two assesses. This way, there is built-in moderation as well as built-in support for all parties. Workers are not awarded their competencies as assessors until they had
done a number of (supervised) assessments over a period of time. Occasionally workers are assessed as ‘needing more training’. In this case, one-to-one training is given before a re-assessment takes place.

Natalie would like the sharing and networking that goes on at Rapello’s in regard to assessment to extend to include other companies and training sites:

*It is important that we have an opportunity to share our assessment strategies and our assessment tasks and really have other people look at them... We need more opportunities to have assessor networks... People who work out there on the floor and assess on the floor need to have opportunities for inter-industry get-togethers [in order to look at] how they are doing it against other companies.*

As all production, transport and warehousing workers have now been assessed at Level I, Natalie and Corrie are planning to re-assess a random sample as a means of checking that the system is working, and the workers are maintaining their skills and knowledge.

### From Level I to Level II

Level II training is scheduled to begin in 2000. Corrie is “working on a hand-picked bunch at the moment that management want to go first” (into Level II training). This includes all drivers and 30% of warehousing workers. Most are keen to be involved in further training, motivated, according to Corrie by a sense of achievement and the understanding that the qualification would be helpful for other jobs. (See Appendix 3 for an outline of Levels I and II in Transport and Distribution, and Appendix 4 for a sample of training materials in Forklift Driving (Level II) and the relevant assessment checklist.)

Level II training is mainly planned according to a self-paced learning model, with some opportunity to attend classes. Training booklets now being customised by the CBT trainers will be made available to production workers who will make use of ‘lulls’ in production, down time, change-over time and other times when they are not so busy. Assessment is planned to take place during August, September and October in 2000. This will enable the teachers to “identify the gaps, do a training needs analysis, and take it down to the individual”. Those with training needs at Level II will be given additional training and re-assessed.

When asked about the literacy requirements for Level II, Natalie said that, *A person can complete Level II without necessarily having reading and writing skills. For me, that is a real worry. It’s a worry in the sense that—what does that mean? Does it mean that companies don’t necessarily need to concern themselves with literacy issues and make sure that people are picking up those skills and that they are gaining the content knowledge and technical skills? What does that mean? I’m still grappling with that one... If they are not developing those reading and writing skills in conjunction with the content area at Level II, then are we assessing them*
on just performance, and are we throwing literacy out the window?

Even though it is possible theoretically to pass Level II without actual reading and writing skills, in practice this would be difficult. This is because some interaction with the texts of competency standards would be needed in order for people to become sufficiently familiar with them to demonstrate competence. Natalie says that the Level II requires a certain level of ‘oral literacy’ competence (ie, conceptual and linguistic competence). She is therefore concerned that lack of attention to the underpinning reading and writing skills could compromise full progress.

If those people (ie, those who have passed Level I and expect to continue with Level II training) are not given the appropriate resources in terms of furthering language and literacy, they will struggle next year...

The EBT: mediating different agendas

The EBTs experience a degree of frustration in their attempts to mediate and work within the over-riding imperative of management to maintain and improve the operating efficiency of their production processes. Corrie spoke of not being able to get workers together to talk about things, being constrained to one-to-one or small group sessions and that “even getting afternoon shift and day shift assessors to talk about things is pretty difficult”.

Natalie feels that she is mediating two different agendas in her role as EBT. She says of this that:

I'm really interested in the fact that people are learning and are given opportunities to maximise their learning ability. I'm not bound by numerical targets and there's sometimes a bit of a tension with the bottom line here, so that can be a source of frustration.

However, her position as outside contractor allows her to “raise issues from an RTO perspective and they consider those very valid”. In addition, her connections with TAFE allow her to have access to a range of training resources, especially “being able to take the CBT trainers out to TAFE and other work sites and to extend their vision”.

The constraints to training seemed to lie not so much in the training packages themselves but in the context of their implementation and the imperative of factory management to maximise efficiency and profitability.

Natalie is concerned that in the drive to enable workers to show competency in work skills as quickly as possible, opportunities for language and literacy development might be lost:

...there is a danger of training being watered down...if people skip the middle bits and move straight to assessment.

With inadequate time scheduled for training and constant pressure to achieve training targets, it seems likely that such ‘watering down’ frequently occurs. On the other hand, the essence of competency-based training is precisely to facilitate
‘front-end’ assessment which does away with ‘middle bits’ altogether for those who already have the skills. In this sense, there is a problem with the competency-based logic of training packages in relation to the development of literacy skills. Competency-based training rests on the display of a checklist of performance criteria. The discourse of CBT leaves little space for pedagogical discourse about the complex contextual factors which affect literacy or numeracy acquisition. While it is up to individual teachers to apply pedagogical principles and insights in the actual delivery of training (‘the middle bits’), the pressures of productivity combine with the logic of competency-based assessment, leaving few opportunities for language or literacy teaching or support.

As educators, both Corrie and Natalie want to maximise opportunities for quality training:

We’re looking at it from a different angle. We’re looking at it from the point of view of training and education, and management is looking at it from a cost perspective – how many hours off the line, how quickly can we do it, that sort of thing. I’m a bit concerned that the performance plans that management have, and the dates that they put on things that we work to, are actually pushing them to do things quickly but not well.

Working with training packages

Clearly, the teachers are placed in a ‘Catch 22’ situation by the structure of competency-based training in training packages. ‘Front-end’ assessment with minimal prior training favours those who already have industrial skills in that they are able to progress quickly through assessment in the industry standards. The pressure is to expedite and facilitate demonstration of competence for all workers in order to minimise the need for additional training that may not be scheduled in the company’s training plan.9 Opportunities for education and training are minimised by the operation of this dynamic. As Natalie said,

They [training packages] may be too performative, and compromise the soft skill factor, particularly if you only read the competencies.

Despite these tensions, Corrie and Natalie said they are comfortable working with training packages and they regard them as a framework which allows a degree of scope and flexibility in how they carry out the training and assessments.

Like the other EBTs, Natalie sees her role as ‘value-adding’ to the framework of competencies, in order to give space to ‘soft skill’ factors and broader educational experiences. However, this ‘value-adding’ is an ‘extra’ that the EBTs themselves bring to the training: it is almost as if they are working

---

9 Whilst all production workers were assessed as competent at Level I on initial assessment, Corrie said that a number of transport and distribution workers did not demonstrate competence (in numerical calculations) when first assessed and those workers had to be further trained and re-assessed.
against’ rather than ‘within’ the logic of the CBT model, which only requires them to ‘read the competency’. The ‘soft skill factor’ is only relevant as it applies to particular industry standards, not as an overall consideration.

Janine

Janine is employed by the ‘City TAFE’ Registered Training Organisation and works at Rapellos for three days per week as the WELL (Workplace English Language and Literacy) teacher. Her program is funded 75% by the Commonwealth WELL program and 25% by Rapellos. She has a BA, a diploma of teaching and TESL teaching qualifications. The WELL program at Rapellos began in 1999.

Janine enjoys the challenge of working with people from different backgrounds, finding what the company needs “then bridging what we have to offer as a TAFE provider and what the company needs”. She feels she has good support from factory management and from the TAFE institute, which provides her with support materials and enables her to keep in touch with her colleagues who are working in similar programs in other enterprises.

In order to attract students, Janine puts notices around the factory, and the other trainers refer workers who need extra literacy assistance to her. This year 60 people put their names down to attend, although not all of those attend regularly. Janine runs four classes in the three days and the rest of her time is available to support management and the other trainers in language and literacy related issues.

Work role

Janine’s work includes providing language and literacy classes to support training and working with the other trainers to support the Level I training. This entails setting up and running the language, literacy and numeracy classes, keeping records, giving feedback to the company and supporting a variety of training strategies. Janine’s language support classes are scheduled before and after shifts and are purely voluntary. One class is at 6 am, an hour before the morning shift that starts at 7 am.

She is well known by the operators and has clearly gained their acceptance and respect. Regular attendance at her out-of-work-hours classes and easy banter on the production line suggest that she maintains a strong professional and personal relationship with the workers.

The content of Janine’s classes is directly linked to the AQF Level I training, and in particular, picks up on the words and phrases they need to know in order to demonstrate competence. Her role is to identify the underpinning language, literacy and numeracy elements and to explicitly provide instruction and support in these.

Janine’s teaching mainly involves ‘ESL literacy’ support. Her students consist of people from NESB background who have been in Australia for a long
time and can speak well but have trouble with reading and writing, as well as a
group of recent arrivals (mainly from Yugoslavia) who have problems with any
communication in English. Reading support for these groups is mainly in the
recognition of basic signage. Those who attend classes are motivated by a wish
to improve their language skills generally, as well as to grasp and be able to use
the language of the Level I OHS which entails an understanding of Rapellos
Process Control Plan. (See Appendix 5.) She works informally with a number of
operators who do not attend classes on the production line and provides them
self-paced materials which they work through at home.

Janine believes an important part of her role is to keep in touch with
management and to offer her services to them as a language specialist:

Another prong to working as a WELL teacher is working with managers
or working with people who are going to be presenting information to
people with ESL or literacy problems and helping them to simplify and to
plain English their written communications. Also when they’re doing
presentations, I also get them to run through the presentations, then fire
questions at them. What does this word mean, what does that mean, and
helping them to have a breadth of vocabulary that they may use just to
help with something.... It’s like visual plain Englishing, thinking about
who the audience are, [I explain that] it’s not dumbing down ... you still
use the terms, but at the same time explain them, so you are giving people
a chance to access different types of English...

After I’ve built up a relationship with them, they’ll often ask me back and
ask me to give them some sort of critique of how they went, or what areas
[they need to improve]...

Pedagogies of language and numeracy support

Janine’s main approach in teaching to (or supporting) the literacy/language
dimensions of training packages is to find ways of simplifying and re-presenting
the training material giving opportunities for meanings to be grasped and new
words or concepts to be practised.

The dilemma always in teaching literacy in relation to training packages
is that the level at which the training packages are written is often quite a
distance from the level that people often read. But once I reduce down to
the essence of what is necessary for people to know, then I can plain
English that information, then it’s a mixture of presenting what is written
in a way so they will understand it, changing it from a written format to
something oral, so they get the understanding of it, then choosing and
selecting areas where we will focus on the language or how it is written
and talk about that.

At Level I, most of the text they need to understand is in the form of
instructions: reading and writing procedures and in particular safety instructions:

I suppose at the lowest level of literacy, I will get people to take a piece of
paper and copy down the signs near where they work – then other signs – then looking at how they work. It's quite interesting because they then will come back. They will look at signs on the way to work – in terms of meaning or spelling patterns that we have looked at.

Numeracy support is provided to support not only the Level I competencies but to provide the workers with tools to assist them in their understanding of productivity issues and their ability to participate in the life of the factory generally:

In my specific classes, we cover numeracy in terms of reading graphs or reading percentages. When they come in there is a board that tells them, how many days since the last injury and once a month the bosses tell them about how the business is going, to see whether productivity has increased or decreased, or working out trends. So, in my class, that's been the main area that we've looked at. In the [rolling] section there is a section on calculations, so we look at the calculations they do in the size of the mix, so if they double the mix, or what percentage of the mix they have to use ...

However, Janine found that for most, what appeared to be problems with numeracy were actually language problems that were solved by offering translation:

When we do the calculations, we use a form of assessment to see how much people know... What we found was that most people's calculations or skills in numeracy were good. And it was often the language part that held them back. So we decided to run the numeracy in three or four different languages, so we were testing their calculation ability, rather than their language ability... Greek, Yugoslav and Vietnamese version... They were very capable. The people that were really rusty just needed a bit of assistance, and time constraint was the only frustration.

The numeracy support has been particularly powerful in terms of creating a 'flow-on' effect to other parts of their lives:

People were very keen, but I found that when people were looking at graphs, in terms of increases and decreases, it related to news, it related to politics, it related to things they had to read about their kid's schooling, things related to what happened in the company... Really I could see there was a genuine feeling that "this is language I hear on the news, I hear... and now I understand what it means". So it was really great to know that it was language that they could hear, and not feel stupid when the boss was giving a talk, but that they could also hear outside. A lot of them discussed that they had talked to their kids about it.
Pedagogic advantages and disadvantages of training packages

Janine sees training packages as giving opportunities for language teaching and learning which is fully grounded in the practical context of work, rather than ‘straight English classes’. This has pedagogical advantages of giving strong motivation to learn as well as constant reinforcement:

If they can use all the language that they come across when they are working... and link those words to other things they want to learn, it obviously is going to make their lives easier. But if I can link those words to other things that they want to learn, or what those sounds make, then around the place, they are learning all the time.

She focuses on:

... using everyday language around the shop floor, what they must know, or tapping into the areas that they like, like recipes... I’ve got large blown up posters of the machines, and how they work, so in the class, if lots of people, machine operators, have to do a presentation on how something works, then I will do a grammar point such as prepositions, and they have to describe what they do when something’s wrong, using the prepositions. Then I’ll switch, so somebody else has to give the instructions...

The training package format also guides her in putting together self-paced materials for people to work on independently:

... I suppose that [developing self-paced materials] is one of the major things I have to do for people who aren’t actually academic and aren’t necessarily self-motivated. Because alongside all that training that I do, I have a set of materials purely for people who want to do self-paced training and help their English. People are working through them. I have a special system where people do that work, bring it in, put it in the folder, then I correct it and if there is anything they need in that area I’ll add to that folder.

Like the other three enterprise-based teachers in this study, Janine supports the integration of language, literacy and numeracy in training packages and works hard, within that format, to enrich training by linking the competencies to patterns of language, to broader contexts and conceptual frameworks. In this way, she is supporting the AQF training both directly and indirectly. As well as giving workers structured learning experiences in the relevant language, literacy and numeracy skills, she is providing (within the constraints of the organisational context) a holistic educational experience.

Like Corrie and Natalie, Janine has found ways of directly supporting the development of language and literacy skills which underpin vocational competencies, while indirectly fostering the development of skills which are meaningful in a broader ‘life context’.

However, she too is critical of the narrowing effect of the competency-based format of training packages per se:

*I think the disadvantage can be, if language and literacy is only taught for*
those competencies to be met, it can narrow the scope, and you are not
giving people a full picture. ... I think that that's really important to have it
integrated, but I would hate to see learning language and literacy or
general learning narrowed just down to competencies, whereas that is
exactly what the certificate is about, and if it means that, it's too limited,
in what the people need, what the people really need in their lives.

Like them, she is frustrated by the context which takes away from consistency of
training – the ability to offer a consistent, continuing program when the factory
shuts down, when shifts change or when the demands on the lives of full-time
working people interfere with regular attendance at classes.

In advocating for, and encouraging management to offer more resources
and time for training, she is aware of the delicate balancing act she is playing. If
too much pressure is brought to bear on the enterprise, the workers who lack the
requisite skills might potentially be discriminated against on that account:

That's why its such an interesting job to be in, because you have to walk
this fine line between exposing all of these people who don't have these
skills, by saying 'you need all of these skills', and pushing the company to
what they really need [but] you don't want to disadvantage people, so we
never point the finger at individuals ... everything is always in terms of
percentages and trends rather than individual people.
6 Case Study 2: The Brunswick Bread Factory

Sylvia

Sylvia has a background in school teaching, adult ESL teaching and industry training. She is currently employed by the Eastern Training Network and began working at the Brunswick Bread Company in 1999, working for three days per week in a program funded through the Office of TAFE and Further Education (OTFE).

As at Rapellos, the training is at AQF Level I in OHS in the areas of food processing, warehousing and transport. (See Appendix 6.) This involves recruiting production workers to be trained, training workplace trainers, organising training sessions, liaising with management, developing customised support materials, delivering the sessions and working one to one with those who require additional support.

Marrying ‘the two understandings’

Sylvia sees the overall rationale for the training as meeting the company’s needs for productivity. Language and literacy training have a potentially significant role within that framework:

As far as the [Food Processing] Certificate and training packages are required, they are designed to support productivity in the workplace. Companies will train to that. Many of the operators have a great deal of pride and interest in that. But training is not likely to move far outside of that. Training in language and literacy and numeracy is understood by some of the significant stake-holders as being necessary to support that training, so if they want the current employees to be able to have those career paths and be more productive they actually have to have that basic training, so they do understand that necessity.

...So training is very much to meet what the companies needs and to address what the operators need to meet what the company needs. If the operators have needs of their own, if that doesn’t necessarily key into what the company needs, then the company will not support that sort of training. So language and literacy can be seen to support productivity because it allows people to actually understand and access training packages.

Within that framework, she sees training packages as a potential means for providing training that both fulfils the industrial criteria and gives a measure of empowerment to workers:

The CBT system has the potential to give the operator ownership. They may have to work six days per week, 10 hours per day, and this is it – all
they have – but it is a chink in the armour. It’s giving guys contact with empowerment that they otherwise wouldn’t have, and trying to make open and accessible to them the opportunity is there if they want to make that choice. For example, if procedures are inadequate, then directing them to go back to the system and say “this is missing – let’s do something about it”.

She sees her role in relation to this as an ‘educator’ as well as ‘a trainer’: education for her is about “trying to clarify current beliefs and understandings ... and to clarify how to develop those on site – it’s about awareness raising rather than instruction”.

The key to working with training packages in this way lies in ‘linking criteria’, and attending to the ‘underpinning’ knowledges. In this way, she feels that EBTs have a role in humanising CBT from within:

We have to humanise it (CBT) from within. Linking criteria means you can break out of strict, behaviourist ‘push button A’. The competencies have underpinning knowledge – here is the potential to address underpinning conceptual and critical aspects.

Sylvia has had to work hard to “marry the two understandings” in the context of her work at the Brunswick Bread Factory. These are, training people in order to meet the AQF criteria, and communicative, student-centred teaching. Now, however, she is “at peace with those differences”. She feels she is able, in small group and one to one training sessions, to
... draw parallels between some of those issues of work and strategies and learning styles and strengths they have got, progressing those, and drawing parallels with what they do outside.

By deliberately grouping the criteria, rather than approaching them singly, she is able to create a problem-solving orientation which broadens rather than narrows the focus:

Yes, it’s very dangerous to just look at a criterion as a criterion within that particular of concern. I’ve started to link across competencies by taking it from a problem-solving point of view and within that particular area of concern, OHS is not just OHS – that basically a lot of it is being able to deal with the problem when the ... machine breaks down, and addressing it from that point of view, and starting to link across ... [I] remind them they have already talked about how to address problems in industrial competencies or modules and that they can utilise those to deal with other issues that might arise...

Within those policies and procedures there are indications of what to do if there’s a problem, so that’s another hidden link between all their activities.

On the other hand, the worker/trainees are adults, and therefore bring their own agendas to their training. They may not wish to be provided with anything more than the ‘bare bones’ of competency-based training and assessment:
First of all, you have to realise, that working with adults, they very much have their own agendas, and it may well be that all they want is the criteria within that competency, and they don't give a damn about anything else... so not only may I be wasting what managers and head of departments see as wage time, but I may also be wasting the guy's time.

In this case, the broad communicative approach needs to be supported and endorsed by company policy for it to have legitimacy with worker/trainees.

**Practical constraints**

Sylvia has experienced several constraints to developing training in this way, and bringing it into the 'culture' of training in relation to training packages. One is that although she might have developed those skills, as a trained and experienced educator, the workplace trainers do not have the same educational orientation or backgrounds:

> ... You can link those across. You can use your creative writing piece, you can link all of this and draw out skills across. I feel that this is possible within the competencies, but how can I get the workplace trainers to do that, without sending them out for three years training and into schools?

Linked to this is the overall problem of time constraints. “Linking and creating a grid that shows where things go” takes time and is not feasible because of the other major projects she must do, such as writing customised modules. That sort of linking and raising awareness takes time. Clearly, the amount of time that workers can be released for training is also limited. (Last year, for example, the agreed minimum training hours were not met because of management changes unrelated to the training.)

As well, the problem-solving approach advocated by Sylvia requires extended training times and a philosophical commitment from management to go beyond the minimum training outcomes defined by the criteria.

> While people understand and value training and learning, the concepts are different – they have a more behaviourist view of what training is about, and therefore that limits their idea of how long training needs to go on for. I have a more process based, learning how to learn approach.... Which calls for more extended training times, and more commitment to training than just the face to face with the trainer stuff. [It is supporting workers] to do stuff on their own, utilising resources around them. This is good for on the job training but it does stretch it out over a long time.

**Professional development needs**

Six years ago Sylvia found herself teaching for the first time in an industrial context, without any professional development or training for that role. She said that the situation is essentially the same today, with experienced classroom teachers going into a completely different and challenging context with little or no preparation. She takes advantage of the meetings organised by Eastern...
Training Network between EBTs working in different industries. The value of these meetings is that they give opportunities to

...hear what people are doing well, have a bit of a whinge, hear when they have overcome obstacles, hear some of the methods they have used.

Such networking between EBTs is vital, according to Sylvia, but it is constrained by limitations of time.

Sylvia suggested that the ideal sort of training and professional development for EBTs would be a system of mentoring. Just as teachers in schools basically learned how to teach by being mentored by senior teachers, first-time EBTs could be linked with experienced EBTs who would work with them in a supportive role over a period of time.
7 Emerging issues

Aspects of ‘good practice’ in providing training in complex environments

Training, supporting, negotiating, advocating

The experiences of Natalie, Corrie, Janine and Sylvia demonstrate various aspects of the complex demands and the educational and ‘political’ challenges faced by teachers in the workplace. Together the four teachers illustrate elements of ‘good practice’ in training and in providing literacy support in the enterprise context. The work involved in training workplace trainers and workplace assessors, organising Level I training programs, meeting training targets, networking between teachers and trainers, coordinating the different programs and negotiating with management requires high level planning, organisational, training, educational and communication skills. That work also requires a professional commitment to training as potentially empowering and motivating in its own right.

The training program is developed through a process of negotiation of the agendas of different stake-holders while meeting the targets and priorities of company management. The EBTs are advocates for training, although they are aware of the risks to individual workers and to the company’s commitment to literacy training as a whole, if they are over-zealous in their advocacy. Whilst their explicit job roles are to implement training package training within the company’s training targets, they in fact have a broader vision of the possibilities of training for individual workers and for the organisation as a whole.

Implementing a variety of strategies

The teachers have developed a number of strategies for ensuring that language, literacy and numeracy support is made available when and where it is required. These strategies include:

- training workplace trainers in skills of training and assessment (Certificate IV) and raising their awareness to issues of language and literacy;
- using action learning approaches to train workplace trainers and providing a framework for on-going support and learning;
- organising group discussion sessions or one-to-one work to facilitate skills and confidence in workplace communications and the ‘oral literacies’ needed to take part in AQF training at Level I;
- ensuring that help is ‘on hand’ when it might be required for those with problems;
- organising for the translation of key terms, or (in some cases) for interpreters to be present at training and assessment;
- attempting to include a ‘whole language’ approach by developing ‘problem-solving’ approaches and linking competencies.
These strategies are low key and may not always be identified explicitly as 'language and literacy' strategies. They reflect a multi-faceted understanding of 'literacy' and the potential role of literacy in making training packages more effective as a framework for industry training.

**Adding value to training**

Clearly, the teachers are working to add value to the AQF framework and the training experienced by the workers in their particular companies. They are attempting to do this by 'marrying' two different perspectives: the broad educational understandings that they bring to their work as language, literacy and numeracy teachers, and the requirement to train and assess in an industry-specific competency-based framework. For Natalie and her CBT trainers, it is about allowing spaces, in the course of Level I training sessions, for the worker/trainees to make the connections between the OHS issues at hand and other issues affecting them. For Sylvia, it is about the possibility of linking the criteria to generate a framework for problem-solving and critical thinking that goes beyond individual competencies.

All of the teachers are trying to create opportunities for facilitating the development of 'generic' or 'soft' skills in the course of delivering training packages. In many cases, however, time constraints and managerial priorities allow little space for such efforts. Their attempts to broaden the training within the constraints are a reflection of the differing understandings and values attached to the notion of 'literacy' in the training context and the different agendas (RTO, company, the National Training Framework) they are constantly attempting to balance.\(^{10}\)

**The professional development and support needs of EBTs**

The two case studies demonstrate that EBTs are working in complex industrial and organisational settings to deliver quality training in the appropriate AQF modules. As well, they are working with a broad educational agenda of empowerment, awareness-raising, and teaching how to learn. The effect of this kind of educational work is to feed into the organisational and training culture of the companies and to be catalysts for change.

This is sophisticated work that calls for a high level of knowledge about the VET system, the ability to analyse the multiplicity of factors and agendas that influence decisions about training at any one site and high level

---

\(^{10}\) At the ALNARC National Forum on February 17, 1999, Rhonda Raisbeck, an enterprise-based literacy teacher from the Holmesglen Institute of TAFE, said that working in industry as a literacy teacher is fraught with difficulty because there are so many stake-holders, 'it is like working out a Venn diagram'. The RTO has an agenda while being reliant on the funding body; the ITAB has an agenda; the union has an agenda; and the enterprise has an agenda. They (the RTO) come somewhere in the middle and have to ensure that all the stake-holders get something out of it. (Sanguinetti 2000: 8).
communication and listening skills. As well it calls for professional teaching skills - pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical skills of language, literacy and skills training. The work of EBTs is qualitatively different from that of teachers working in the TAFE system.

The work of these four teachers also suggests the need for teachers to do additional training (for example, the graduate diplomas and other qualifications now available for teachers entering the VET system) and for on-going professional development for those already in the field.

There is also a clear need to develop networks of EBTs, not just within RTOs but across RTOs and including a wide range of training sites. Both Sylvia and Natalie spoke of this need. In an area where innovative practices are developing quickly and there is the potential for EBTs to be isolated from bases of professional support, it is vital that the teachers be encouraged to learn from, and support each other.

**Meanings of ‘literacy’ in the context of training package training**

**Oral and textual literacies**

The imperative to train and assess workers at Level I implicitly constructs ‘language’ and ‘literacy’ in terms of basic functional skills: the underpinning language/literacy/numeracy skills that workers might lack, and whose lack might prevent them from acquiring and demonstrating competence. The focus at Level I on oral competency, in the context of a high proportion of the workforce coming from NESB backgrounds, has the further effect of constructing ‘literacy’ very much in terms of the oral language (or ESL) competence of people of NESB.

In this context, the work of teachers is to give specialised language instruction, to explain, or to ‘plain English’ the language of the Level I units of competency. Alternatively, as we saw at Rapeillos, translation assistance, or interpreting assistance at the point of assessment might be given. All of these activities come under the heading of ‘literacy’, and are seen as the practical outcome of the integration of literacy within competency standards in training packages.

At Levels I and II, assessments are normally done orally, and it is not necessary to show any reading and writing competence. At Rapeillos, trainees were supported by trainers making themselves available in the computer room to assist their understanding of what was required and the texts of the screen-based training program. ‘Assistance’, ‘support’ or ‘translating’ was provided, but there is little or no reference to ‘teaching’ or ‘providing training’ in literacy (except in the context of the WELL-funded program). The WELL teacher gives support in the form of ‘plain Englishing’, talking through, explaining, developing understandings of the words and concepts in an oral mode. While literacy is not being ‘taught’ in the traditional sense of involving learners in text-based,
structured or semi-structured processes of practice and feedback, there is a distinctive pedagogy of oral literacy that is being developed. The work that EBTs are doing in developing literacy and numeracy concepts, skills and understandings in an oral form in the context of training package implementation should be further researched and support given through processes of peer teaching and professional development.

The oral teaching and learning that takes place in small groups, one to one and on the production line is clearly effective and appropriate in supporting the training packages. However, it cannot replace entirely the text-based work that Janine is doing as EBT at Rapellos, and that Sylvia does at the Brunswick Bread Factory, in re-writing and re-presenting the (customised) competency standards in simplified form. The learning of new words and concepts, especially for second language learners, is supported by text: reading and writing and spelling the words are a key strategy in learning how to recognise and use them. This suggests the need for structured, text-based language and literacy instruction to be built into training where possible, to more effectively support those whose language, literacy and numeracy levels might jeopardise their ability to show competence at assessment. Ideally, the ‘text-based’ approaches should be used in conjunction with ‘oral’ approaches. In the context of training packages and time constraints however, there is a clear rationale for focusing on oral, rather than text-based approaches.

**Literacy and assessment**

The teachers have developed a number of strategies for assisting workers to develop their oral and textual literacy skills prior to assessment and for giving literacy/language support, if necessary, at the point of assessment. These measures aim to ensure that assessment is equitable in that those with the industrial skills or knowledge of food safety and occupational health and safety will not be discriminated against because of low literacy levels.

However, there are other issues in relation to literacy and assessment which need to be further researched. For example, how is the reliability of assessment affected by the support and assistance given by assessors who are also fellow workers? Given that the criteria construct minimum requirements for the demonstration of competence, how can literacy training be ‘built in’ for those who do have literacy and language needs? How will those people gain the additional skills necessary to progress to higher levels of training?

**Literacy and ESL**

A large proportion of workers at both sites speak languages other than English and literacy needs are often understood in terms of the English language or needs of those workers. However, this issue does not seem to be explicitly described in terms of ESL needs or ESL methods. This seems to be something of a ‘blind spot’ in the provision of support, particularly given the oral nature of
training and assessment at Level 1 and the need for a minimum proficiency in English speaking and listening skills to access training.

Fraser (2000) in her report on oral communication in VET, points out that the emphasis on 'literacy' in the National Training Framework has led to de-emphasis on issues of 'language' (i.e., ESL) on shop floors. She calls for a renewed emphasis on ESL provision and in particular, training in pronunciation in order to address the needs of NESB workers who constitute a large proportion of industrial workers (Fraser 2000).

**Literacy as a 'generic' or communication skill**

The four enterprise-based teachers whose work is highlighted in this study have shown that they have a multi-faceted understanding of the potential benefits of integrating a broad-based approach to 'literacy' into competency-based training. The aspects of training that they value include communicative competence, problem-solving, the ability to ask questions and to think critically. Their working definition of literacy is a generic definition: literacy as a broad set of communication, conceptual and textual skills that are resources for effective participation in work and in social life.

Natalie and Janine spoke of the potential to contribute to organisations by developing generic literacy/communication skills at all levels of the organisation, including management and middle management. Sylvia sees her work as being about awareness raising, helping people to clarify their beliefs and understandings on site. All of the teachers are working to create a training culture that values and supports training as a longer-term undertaking with potential long-term benefits for companies and individuals. They are aware, however, that such an approach demands greater investment in time and resources than is currently possible.

Both management and EBTs are under a great deal of pressure to implement the new training system, and to meet training targets and maintain productivity. In this context, and given the degree to which literacy is contextualised (or hidden) within training standards, it is not surprising that literacy, numeracy and communication skills seem to have a low priority in training processes overall.

The decision to integrate literacy and numeracy into training packages without specifically 'naming' them (a decision which has been supported in the field of practice) has tended to make literacy into a 'hidden agenda' which all too easily disappears from view in the practicalities (and pressures) of day-by-day training.

Here, the challenge seems to be to find new ways of 'naming' and including literacy skills (including oral literacies) in the endorsed components of training packages so that they are given a greater prominence in training overall. One approach might be to re-visit the National Reporting System (NRS). Whilst attempts to include NRS competencies in the endorsed components have been
unsuccessful in the past, there may be other ways of utilising this framework to make underpinning literacy and numeracy competencies more explicit.

**Literacy and AQF training in the development of workplace culture and improved communication**

As discussed, there are many indications in this study that while the focus on assessment tends to construct a functional notion of literacy, the training provided gives opportunities for literacy (understood more broadly in terms of 'generic skills', 'soft skills', 'communicative competence' or 'literacy as social practice') to develop. For example, the Level I training program was the first time ever in that factory that workers were given the opportunity to get together in groups and ask questions. This had “opened up a Pandora’s box”. Many issues and complaints were aired and according to Natalie, this experience was a morale and confidence booster for many of those involved. The teachers and trainers in that case were in a sense “the link between what the workforce were raising and management”, thus providing a vital element of feedback and communication across the traditional divide between management and workers.

The same is true of Natalie’s Certificate IV training program in Workplace Training and Assessment. She said that as the result of their training, which was organised along the lines of ‘action learning’, the CBT (workplace) trainers quickly gained practical skills in training and an understanding of competency-based training and adult education principles. The trainers are now able to take on a high level of responsibility in organising their own work, writing customised modules, running Level I training sessions, doing assessments and training assessors. The workplace trainers “have developed in wonderful and unexpected ways” and in particular, have risen to the challenge of handling the issues and complaints that arose in the Level I group training sessions.

These vignettes suggest that the training opportunities afforded by the implementation of training packages may be having a positive impact in developing generic skills and feeding into workplace culture. This ‘ripple effect’ seems to be taking place despite the performativity of competency-based training and the constraints of time and the organisational context. At the same time, the effects of those constraints should not be under-estimated, as discussed later.

**Literacy, training packages and ‘empowerment’**

The teachers interviewed regarded training packages as a useful framework for developing training in the context they were in. As already discussed, they have brought a good deal of creativity to training packages and have made them ‘come alive’ in the actual implementation. The constraints they are experiencing appear to be more a result of contextual factors, rather than the training packages per se. There is a certain paradox in that while the training packages give scope for the inclusion of broad, communicative approaches, the assessment-driven system tends to narrow the focus and to conjure up a narrow ‘functional’
approach to literacy and numeracy. At the same time, there is little time, or reason (given the implicit, hidden nature of underpinning literacy competencies) to give adequate training in either the functional literacy and numeracy competencies or the generic competencies.

At the point of assessment, the focus is inevitably on the industrial skills and/or the underpinning skills the worker/trainee might lack in order to demonstrate competence. The model here seems to be to give subsequent one-to-one training in the specific skills relevant to the particular standard in question. While this approach to supporting workers is effective in achieving the immediate assessment purpose, it appears to be a minimalist model which allows little scope for the teaching of underpinning literacy or communications skills in a more organised way.

The teachers in this study are attempting to attend to literacy needs on the functional, the communicative and the 'critical thinking' levels. However, the possibility of giving more organised and more broad-based training to those with low levels of language, literacy and numeracy is constrained by limits on time and financial resources. As Natalie said, in the drive to enable workers to demonstrate competency in work skills as quickly as possible, opportunities for language and literacy development as such might be lost.

The effectiveness of self-paced learning that is taking place in periods of lull on the factory floor, with some one-to-one support from teachers and trainers, needs to be investigated. The outcomes of such learning and training that are taking place on the shop floor need to be further researched.

There is a good deal of incidental language and literacy learning that takes place while trainees are being assisted and supported to understand the competencies and are being coached in the assessment requirements. In that sense, any form of training would have a 'spin-off effect' of feeding into processes of conceptual and linguistic development generally.

However, the practice of these four teachers seems to indicate that through their pedagogical efforts the AQF training framework is capable of becoming not just a “narrow behavioural framework”, but a framework which potentially could be used in empowering and more broadly educational ways. This is the “chink in the armour” which Sylvia spoke of, the small window of educational opportunity which the training offers, but which is constrained in other ways.

The interface between WELL-funded language and literacy programs and AQF training

The two enterprise-based teachers at Rapellos (employed by the 'Eastern Training Network' RTO) work closely with Janine, who is employed for 3 days a week by a different RTO to run the Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) program. The WELL classes are scheduled before and after shifts and are not held in paid working hours. In effect, they are an ‘optional extra’ and many of those who would benefit are not able to attend.
The relationship between the WELL-funded program and OTFE-funded program provided by ‘Eastern Training Network’ raises a number of issues. Clearly, the WELL-funded program provides opportunities for more structured language, literacy and numeracy learning and offers effective support to workers preparing for Level I and Level II assessment. The WELL teacher provides language and literacy instruction (in the classroom and on the production-line) which enables worker/trainees to acquire some of the theoretical basis upon which their (otherwise incidental) learning rests. The existence and the success of the WELL-funded program at Rapellos serves to highlight the fact that only a minority of enterprises implementing training packages have access to that program. The majority of enterprises are not funded to offer structured language, literacy and numeracy training.

While the WELL teacher and the other EBTs collaborate closely in developing their respective programs, there may be potential for more effective integration of the WELL program with the AQF training. If some language and literacy classes were to be made available in paid hours, more Level I workers with language and literacy needs would be able to benefit. However, as most Level I assessment is oral, it is not strictly necessary for those being assessed to develop any textual skills at all to demonstrate competence. While the majority of workers at Rapellos have successfully demonstrated competence in Level I (with or without having had access to the WELL classes) those who do participate in WELL classes benefit from additional training that will potentially assist their advancement to Level II and their participation at work generally.

The EBTs at Rapellos said that the lack of time made available for organised training to take place at Level I might have the effect of minimising learning outcomes, and that this could become significant when Level II and Level III training is made available at the factory. While Level II assessment can be fully oral, it involves understanding quite complex technical texts. Many of those who have shown competence in their oral Level I assessments, but who have received minimal language and literacy support in the course of their training, might experience difficulty in moving on to the next level.

It seems that the WELL program at Rapellos has contributed significant support to the Level I (and potential Level II) trainees who have taken advantage of it. Janine’s work has also clearly contributed to literacy practices amongst managers and middle managers, and hence to the ‘training culture’ of the company. The question remains as to how enterprises (especially small businesses) which are unable to access WELL funding can find ways of providing this type of support to enhance the provision of literacy training allowed by current funding arrangements. Could WELL funding be more effectively deployed to support the language and literacy aspects of training in the context of training packages? Could the AQF training incorporate more of the language and literacy strategies that are being utilised in WELL programs?
Contextual and policy issues

Tensions between productivity aims and training aims

The teachers and trainers are working in an enterprise context which entails a continuing pressure to fulfil productivity targets and achieve efficiencies. All four EBTs interviewed for this project said that they did not think workers were allowed to have sufficient time off the production line for adequate training to occur. Natalie said that she was often presented with training targets (determined by management) that she thought were unrealistic. She had some leeway to negotiate these, but in that context is very much regarded as ‘an outsider’.

As an employee of ‘Eastern Training Network’, but working within Rapellos management structure, she feels that she is mediating two different agendas. She is sometimes frustrated that her interest which is to give people “opportunities to maximise their learning abilities” is in tension with “the bottom line”.

One aspect of the ‘bottom line’ is the vulnerability of workers with low levels of literacy who are at risk of being dispensed with if their training needs are perceived as potentially too expensive.

Appropriateness of RTO funding on the basis of student contact hours

These case studies show that enterprise-based teachers carry out a wide diversity of tasks and are developing networks and relationships within companies in order to improve training and to bring about changes in the way training is understood and organised. In many ways, the changes associated with training packages represent a challenge to long-held views and entrenched organisational cultures. The current mode of implementing training packages by funding according to nominal hours and student contact hours (SCH) might not be the most effective way of funding that implementation.

The view that more flexible forms of funding were needed in order to make the training more ‘sustainable’ was put forward by the RTO and ITAB informants to this study. The SCH form of funding does not give enough leeway to take into account the work that EBTs need to do in advocating, negotiating, establishing relationships and setting up the training arrangements. More flexible forms of funding might allow RTOs to work across companies and match companies together for the purposes of achieving more efficient training.

According to the ITAB officer:

... when you go into a company – as opposed to devoting money to delivering it to 15 people in a class because that’s the most effective way – they may be better off not having to count bums on seats, but looking at appointing a coordinator to go around and try to bring these small companies together, match them with the large companies and so forth. Set up monitoring arrangements. But, unless they can show they’ve got people enrolled, you know, economies and scales of economy, they don’t get
funding for that. They've got to do that completely out of fee-for-service or, you know, sneak money across from here to there.

One approach might be to make an initial grant to RTOs in order for them to do the initial investigations and to set up training arrangements:

Now, you know, to invest and to make something sustainable, sometimes you have to commit at the beginning, knowing that something that will trail off in the end and you've got to, you know, build sustainability within it. But that initial investment of capital may be necessary.

You've got to look at the total training needs, ... as an RTO there could be economies of scale if you look at what their office training needs are, what their warehousing needs are, what their management training needs are. So, ultimately, it shouldn't be standing out as these people having special needs – it's all part of their training culture. And that's why the funding model needs to be more flexible, and that there shouldn't just be one, you know, funding model. And if we've truly got quality RTOs, surely we should allow it up to them to have some sort of benchmark for funding but then the discretion of being able to use that funding in the best way that will suit the company in the longer term.

There is a contradiction between CBT (which facilitates front-end assessment) and funding according to student contact hours. Fully applied, CBT should make it impossible to judge in advance the student contact hours that any one company would require to train up its workforce to the desired AQF levels. However, RTOs are obliged to calculate student contact hours in advance and to deliver a certain number of training hours to fulfill their contracts with OPETE. This funding model seems to be anomalous in terms of the logic and the intent of national training packages.
8 Conclusions

The inclusion of literacy in industry standards has resulted in enterprise-based teachers adding value to training on a number of levels. However, their literacy-related work tends to be marginalised by the constraints of the industrial context and by the fact that literacy standards are implicit and not explicitly spelt out in the endorsed components.

Those with language or literacy needs are being provided with the additional support and the assistance they require to demonstrate competence in food safety and occupational health and safety at the appropriate level. However, that support and assistance is highly targeted, in a context in which, according to the EBTs, there is insufficient time allowed for training in underpinning skills and knowledge.

It appears that literacy in the context of assessment is understood mainly in terms of functional reading, writing, numeracy, or English language skills. There is a strong emphasis on oral communication as the main means of providing training and conducting assessments. On the other hand, there are signs that the implementation of training packages is providing workers with opportunities to develop broad communication ('soft') skills and competencies and an opening up of communication across the company (the Level 1 and the Certificate IV training at Rapellos). The teachers were working to support and provide for literacy understood in both of these ways.

The only explicit, structured instruction in language and literacy at Rapellos seems to be that provided by the WELL program. However, there is obviously a great deal of self-paced and incidental language and literacy learning that takes place when people are being supported and assisted to understand the competencies and prepare themselves for assessment. This incidental learning would also have a useful 'spin-off effect' to learning in other contexts. The relationship between settings and styles of instruction and incidental literacy and numeracy learning in the industry training context needs to be further researched.

Current policy links training to productivity outcomes. However, this research suggests that there is a contradiction between productivity outcomes that are accounted for in the short-term, and the provision of effective training, which is a much longer-term undertaking. The 'bottom line' is that it costs companies to release workers to be trained during paid working hours, and in many cases, this leads managers to minimise the opportunities for effective learning to take place. Given that there is much research supporting the long-term benefits to companies of investment in training (for example, Burke et al 1999) there is a need for ANTA to continue to work with industry to popularise the (longer-term) benefits of investment in training.

One of the constraints identified has been the form of funding which is based on student contact hours only and does not include resources needed to address the overall training needs and organising and consultancy work required.
More flexible forms of funding that take into account the developmental aspects (and which do not commit RTOs in advance to fulfilling a certain number of student contact hours) would be more appropriate.

The teachers who have contributed to this study demonstrate ‘good practice’ in addressing literacy whilst implementing training packages. The role of qualified and experienced teachers in industry training is central to successful outcomes. The workplace context is qualitatively different from the institutional contexts that most teachers in VET come from. Classroom teachers entering into VET training in workplaces need on-going professional development training and support.

Other research (for example, Schofield, 2000) has shown wide discrepancies in the quality of training provision across industries and across providers. Properly organised networks of EBTs would ameliorate that discrepancy and allow EBTs at different sites to share experiences and learn from each other. Assessor networks also need to be established to support moderation and development of skills in making assessments. Systems of mentoring and the setting up of networks of EBTs and assessors would be another approach to supporting EBTs and increasing their skills.
9 Recommendations

Literacy in training packages

This research has shown that:

- The implicit inclusion of literacy within literacy standards brings with it a risk that the literacy and numeracy will be over-shadowed, if not lost, in the struggle to implement training packages and the imperative to train and assess workers as quickly and efficiently as possible. Ways need to be found to give literacy and numeracy a more explicit presence within the endorsed components.

- Literacy is understood both as a set of functional skills (reading, writing and numeracy) and as a broad set of generic communication skills. However, these two understandings of literacy need to be clarified and the relationship between them needs to be unpacked and theorised, so that the training practices associated with each can be more clearly specified.

- At AQF Level I, literacy is understood mainly in terms of oral communication skills, especially in relation to workers from NESB backgrounds. However, on a theoretical level, the focus is on ‘literacy’ and there is little attention paid to the pedagogical aspects of the ‘language’ needs of workers from NESB.

It is therefore recommended that:

1. The issue of how the underpinning literacy aspect of training could be made more visible, and more explicit in the endorsed components should be a central focus in the coming ANTA review of training packages.

2. Further research is needed to clarify the relationship between literacy in training packages as a set of functional skills, and as a broad set of generic communication skills, so that training practices associated with each can be more clearly specified.

3. More research is needed into ‘oral literacy’ and the oral aspects of literacy in training package training. The focus on ‘oral literacy’ must include an explicit focus on the language needs of NESB workers.

4. There is obviously a great deal of incidental language and literacy learning that takes place when people are being supported and assisted to understand and acquire the competencies and prepare themselves for assessment. This incidental learning has a useful ‘spin-off effect’ on learning in other contexts. The relationship between settings and styles of instruction and incidental literacy and numeracy learning in industry training needs to be further researched.
Literacy and assessment

This research project identified a series of questions related to the place of literacy in assessment. It is recommended that:

5. ANTA consider developing research projects to contribute to answering the following questions: How do literacy and numeracy issues affect the validity and reliability of assessment? How do literacy and language needs affect the demonstration of competence at assessment? What sort of supports do assessors give to people with literacy and numeracy needs? How can language, literacy and numeracy needs identified at the point of assessment best be addressed in follow-up training?

Literacy in training packages and the WELL program

WELL-funded programs seemed to have been effective in supporting language, literacy and numeracy needs in training package training. It is recommended that:

6. ANTA fund research that explores the relationship between WELL-funded language and literacy programs and AQF training; the contribution that WELL programs make to the effective implementation of training packages; and whether or not literacy training strategies used in WELL programs could be applied to support literacy in AQF training generally.

Professional development

This research has revealed that training packages are the context for the emergence of new pedagogies of CBT training. It is recommended that:

7. More case studies of how teachers are addressing literacy in the context of training package implementation need to be written, so that approaches and strategies that teachers are currently developing in mediating different agendas can be made known and included in on-going professional development.

8. Teachers entering VET from classroom settings should be encouraged and supported to take advantage of professional development through participating in Framing the Future projects, enrolling in post graduate study or VET teaching courses available in the TAFE system. Mentoring relationships between experienced and novice EBTs could be set in place and formalised as a professional development strategy.

9. Support should be given to the development of EBT networks across industries and RTOs.

10. Oral literacy, oral communication and ESL techniques be included as a focus in professional development for EBTs.
**Funding**

11. In the light of the broad, developmental and consultancy role played by EBTs, further research is needed about the appropriateness of funding their work as student contact hours. Alternative, more flexible forms of funding of RTOs, better suited to the context of training package implementation, should be investigated.

12. This research has highlighted the tension that is played out in the implementation of training packages between productivity outcomes and learning outcomes. Given that there is much research supporting the long-term benefits to companies of investment in training, there is a need for ANTA to continue to work with industry to popularise the (long-term) benefits of such investment.

**Equity**

13. There is a need for an analysis to be made of the equity issues surrounding the inclusion of literacy in training packages. It is necessary to ensure that experienced workers who are already skilled in the relevant industry competency standards are not disadvantaged by forms of assessment that require higher levels of literacy than those required by the job. At the same time, those with language, literacy or numeracy needs should be given opportunities to receive on-going literacy support and instruction to enable them to progress to higher levels of training and to participate more effectively in the long term. Currently, these two principles of equity lie uneasily together.
References

ANTA (nd)(a) Ten Fold Returns: Information kit for HR and training managers on incorporating language, literacy and numeracy into Training Packages, Australian National Training Authority, Commonwealth of Australia.

ANTA (nd)(b) Built in not Bolted on: Information kit for language, literacy and numeracy coordinators on incorporating communication skills into Training Packages, Australian National Training Authority, Commonwealth of Australia.


Bibliography


## Appendix 1

Outline of core, optional and specialist standards aligned to the AQF structure (Food Processing)

(Specialist units which may identify the company have been deleted.)

Table 3.3 Core, optional and specialist standards aligned to the AQF structure (Food Processing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function/Activity</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 8 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 9 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 8 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial communication</td>
<td>Communicate in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect, present and apply workplace information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse and convey workplace information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Apply basic mathematical concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational health and safety</td>
<td>Apply safe work procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement occupational health and safety principles and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the implementation of occupational health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>Apply basic quality assurance practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement the quality system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the implementation of the quality system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety</td>
<td>Apply basic food safety practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement the food safety plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the implementation of the food safety plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIONAL</td>
<td>As required to gain a total of 8 units at AQF 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in a team to achieve designated tasks</td>
<td>Use information technology devices in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manually clean and sanitise equipment</td>
<td>Participate in teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate a container washing process</td>
<td>Measure and calculate routine workplace data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct minor routine preventative maintenance</td>
<td>Apply sampling techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use basic product and stores knowledge to complete work operations</td>
<td>Conduct routine tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift materials safely</td>
<td>Clean and sanitise equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use manual handling equipment</td>
<td>Implement environmental procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One enterprise-specific unit of competency approved by the NFITC may be included as an optional unit</strong></td>
<td>Operate a waste treatment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct routine preventative maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operate the steam generation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to meet work requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handle dangerous and hazardous goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Load and unload bulk materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Load and unload goods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

**Competency checklist for AQF Level 1 Apply Basic Quality Assurance Practices**

**Competency Checklist**

*Apply basic quality assurance practices/Quality Assurance A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Job:</th>
<th>Shift:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor/s:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessees Signature:</td>
<td>Assessors Signature:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C = Competent</th>
<th>NYC = Not Yet Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Identify key quality personnel in your work area (complete worksheet 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify internal suppliers and customers (complete worksheet 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstration</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify &amp; monitor control points in your work area.</td>
<td>a. What quality checks do you need to perform in your job (refer to worksheet 2)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correct completion of workplace checksheets (start-up, in-process, metal detector log book, Quality Audit Sheet, etc)</td>
<td>b. What could happen to product quality if checks are not done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete attached sheet for quality checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtain representative samples to instructions. (Take samples correctly)</td>
<td>a. What is a sample?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare samples in format required for transfer to designated location. (Carefully take samples to lab for testing)</td>
<td>b. Why is it important that the product is sampled?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sampling data is recorded correctly.</td>
<td>c. Who is responsible for taking samples in your work area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. What samples are taken in your work area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Where is sampling data recorded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform inspections/test required in work area to assure product quality</td>
<td>a. What checks are performed on the product in your work area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operator is able to follow correct procedure to rectify out of standard situation</td>
<td>b. What is the required result for each check?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completion of attached work sheets 2 &amp; 3 Visual Checks Performed correctly</td>
<td>c. If the product is out of standard, what should be done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Product is correctly traced by operator.</td>
<td>a. How can the company trace when and where the product was produced in your work area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Why is it important that products can be traced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Sheet 1: People Responsible for Quality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Co-Ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Technical Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Systems Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Work Sheet 1: Customers & Suppliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Internal suppliers: Who do you receive work (product, materials) from?</th>
<th>Your work area</th>
<th>Your Internal customers Who do you pass work to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3

Outline of competencies in Certificate I and Certificate II Transport and Distribution (Warehousing)

TDT 101 97 CERTIFICATE IN TRANSPORT & DISTRIBUTION (WAREHOUSING)

Characteristics of the Qualification

Title: Certificate I in Transport and Distribution (Warehousing)

Rationale: A general qualification for the Warehousing Industry. Successful completion will require competency in units that relate to work defined as aligned AQF Level 1.

"Breadth, depth and complexity of knowledge and skills would prepare a person to perform a defined range of activities most of which may be routine and predictable."

Qualification Contents:

Units may be selected from the following units of Competency aligned to Certificate I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Manual Handling</td>
<td>TDT D1 97A Shift Materials Safely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D2 97A Use Manual Handling Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Communications &amp; Calculations</td>
<td>TDT E3 97A Participate in Workplace Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT E5 97A Carry Out Workplace Calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Occupational Health and Safety</td>
<td>TDT F1 97A Follow Occupational Health and Safety Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT F2 97A Conduct Housekeeping Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT F9 97A Conduct Cleaning Operations in Enclosed Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Teamwork</td>
<td>TDT G197A Work Effectively with Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT G4 98A Undertake Workplace Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Resource Management</td>
<td>TDT L1 97A Complete Induction Procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements for completion of the Qualification:

A successful assessment outcome for 7 of the units listed above aligned with this qualification consistent with the Transport and Distribution Training Package Assessment Guidelines.
THE LITERACY FACTOR: ADDING VALUE TO TRAINING

TDT 201 97 CERTIFICATE II IN TRANSPORT AND DISTRIBUTION
WAREHOUSING

Characteristics of the Qualification

Title: Certificate II in Transport and Distribution (Warehousing)

Rationale: A general qualification for the Warehousing Industry. Successful completion will require competency in units that relate to work defined as aligned AQF Level 2.

"Performance of a prescribed range of functions involving known routines and procedures and some accountability for the quality of outcomes?"

Qualification Contents: Units may be selected from the following units of Competency aligned to Certificate II. Certificate I units (7), are prerequisites for this qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Handling Stock</td>
<td>TDT A9 97A Complete Import/Export Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A11 97A Package Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A12 97A Pick and Process Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A13 97A Receive Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A14 97A Use Product Knowledge to Complete Work Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A20 97A Replenish Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A21 97A Dispatch Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT A22 97A Participate in Stocktakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Equipment Checking &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>TDT B1 97A Check and Assess Occupational Capability of Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT B9 98A Check Conveyor Operational Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Load Handling</td>
<td>TDT D3 97B Handle Dangerous and Hazardous Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D4 97A Load and Unload Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D7 97A Prepare Cargo/Goods for Transfer with Slings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D10 97A Operate a Forklift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D12 97A Operate Specialised Load Shifting Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D21 98A Use Specialised Bulk Transfer Equipment (Dry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT D22 98A Conduct Weighbridge Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Occupational Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>TDT F6 97A Apply Emergency/Accident Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Customer Service</td>
<td>TDT I2 97B Apply Customer Service Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Quality</td>
<td>TDT J1 97A Apply Customer Service Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT J3 98A Apply Grain Protection Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT J4 98A Implement Grain Monitoring Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Computing &amp; Technology</td>
<td>TDT K1 97A Use Computer Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT K2 97A Use Infotechnology Devices in the Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Resource Management</td>
<td>TDT L8 98A Complete Routine Administrative Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Financial Management</td>
<td>TDT Q7 98A Prepare and Process Financial Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Records</td>
<td>TDT T1 98A Capture Records into a Records Keeping System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT T4 98A Maintain Control of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDT T5 98A Provide Information from and about Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements for completion of the Qualification:

Certificate II requires a successful assessment against 14 units in total of which 7 units are aligned at AQF level I, and 7 units aligned at AQF level II consistent with the Transport and Distribution Training Package Assessment Guidelines.
## Appendix 4

### Checklists for on the Job Assessment in Electric Forklift Operation (Level II)

**On the Job Assessment**

**Underpinning Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee's Name</th>
<th>From:</th>
<th>To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Being Assessed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Underpinning Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Competent</strong></th>
<th><strong>Needs Training</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explain the Arnott's permit System (PMP) and what its purpose is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the first thing that must be done at the beginning of the shift before you operate the forklift?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explain what must be done if repairs or maintenance is required on an Electric forklift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outline how a “Do Not Start” tag is used including when it can be removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explain what plugging is and how it can be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outline the reasons why you must at all times keep all of your body parts within the Electric forklift operating station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is the speed limit that applies to the site? This should be maintained at all times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. State what you should be doing if you are operating in an area that requires you to move through doors and/or negotiate corners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. State what safety factors must be considered when handling loads with regard to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The way your load is secured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Pedestrians and Pedestrian Walkways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Name the responsibilities of the Electric Forklift Operator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Why should you inspect your work area before you operate the forklift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If you can’t see where you are going what should you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What direction should the load face if the fork is travelling downhill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What must you do before reversing the forklift?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are passengers allowed on the forklift?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessor's Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Assessor's Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Assessor's Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________
Assessment Checklist

Performance Criteria

Employee's Name ________________________________  From: ______  To: ______
Work Area: ______________________________________  Shift: ______
Module Being Assessed: _____________________________
Team Leader: ______________________________________
Assessor: _________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Instructions</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Needs Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WI 1</td>
<td>Demonstrate a pre-operating Safety Check according to the check sheet.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 2</td>
<td>Demonstrate driving the forklift using the controls in a smooth manner while carefully maneuvering around obstacles.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 3</td>
<td>Demonstrate retrieving a load from the floor.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 4</td>
<td>Demonstrate retrieving a load from the racking.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 5</td>
<td>Demonstrate placing a load on the floor.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 6</td>
<td>Demonstrate placing a load in the racking.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 7</td>
<td>Demonstrate a load assessment in relation to load capacity.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI 8</td>
<td>Demonstrate correct battery charging and/or changing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessor's Signature: _____________________________  Date: _____________________________
Assessor's Signature: _____________________________  Date: _____________________________
Assessor's Signature: _____________________________  Date: _____________________________
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## Electric Forklift Pre-Operational Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machine Part</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battery Charger &amp; Lead (if attached)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free from damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected from the charger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery charger is turned off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Charge (minimum one bar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery plug connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency power disconnect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walk around Check</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyres and wheels free from damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body of machine free from damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mast Lift, chain &amp; carriage rollers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free from oil leaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Checks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignition Switch On/Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift/tilt function (side shift)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat braked or Cut off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbrake/Footbrake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerator Pedal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward and reverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operators Name:** __________________________  **Forklift No:** __________________________

---

**Signature:** __________________________  **Hours Meter Reading:** __________________________

**Shift:** __________________________  **Date:** __________________________

**Team leader:** __________________________

---
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Appendix 5

Training materials for Level I
Apply Basic Food Safety Practices

Process Control Plan

What is a control plan?
- It is a written plan describing our processes.
- It highlights what is needed to make our products meet specification.
- It tells us what is needed to make our products safe.
- Process control is involved with nearly everything you do in the job.
Process Control Plan

The four components are:

- Food Safety – HACCP
- Food Quality
- Hygiene/sanitation
- Work Instructions
Process Control Plan

cannot work without:

- Good manufacturing practices (Gmp)
  - Personal Hygiene
  - Good Housekeeping
  - Cleaning Schedules
- Calibration Schedules
  - Scales
  - Ph Meters
- Competency Based Training (Cbt)
- Pest Control
Appendix 6

Training Materials and Training and Assessment Record for Level I

Apply Safe Work Practices

(Words and sentences which may identify the company have been deleted.)

Occupational, Health & Safety Apply Safe Work Practices

Introduction
You can use this training to be assessed for occupational health & safety in the first level of the Food Processing Industry Training Package.

When you complete your training and assessment you will be able to receive a statement that shows you have completed one nationally accredited unit.

What do you do?
1. Now. You can arrange assessment in the criteria below. These are from the unit: ‘Apply Safe Work Practices’.
   - Explain the roles, rights and responsibilities of self and employer.
   - Explain the importance of OHS to self and others.
   - Know where to find advice on OHS issues.
   - Be able to find OHS personnel and understand the consultative arrangements.
   - Recognise typical hazards relating to your own job and work area.
   - You do not have to be assessed right now.
   - You can arrange an assessment time or your area assessor.

2. When you do your assessment you can also cover the other criteria in the unit. These are attached to this sheet. You should read them carefully. Some will need you to do a demonstration.

3. If necessary you can ask for training. Most training can be done on the job - you will not have to do all of it in the training room.

4. Training and assessment should not take very long if you can demonstrate the skills and explain what you know about safety in your work area.

What do you get if you do it?
You have two options:
1. Do the training and assessment and receive a certificate showing you have done an introductory course in work safety.

2. Do the training and assessment. Receive a Statement of Attainment. This will be recognised in all food processing companies.

When do you have to do it?
To receive a statement before the end of the year - SOON.
See me after the workshop - NOW - or call me on 2307. Talk to your supervisor, trainer or assessor if you want some advice on this.
Occupational, Health & Safety  
Apply Safe Work Practices

What is assessment?
Assessment is used to measure your skills and knowledge.
The Food Processing Industry Training Package covers a number of competencies - skills. Each skill is described by a set of criteria.
Criteria describes what an operator should be able to do and explain about a skill.
Assessment is used for two things:
- Measuring an operator's skills before training;
- measuring an operator's skills after training.

How is it done?
Assessment is a consultative process between the operator and the assessor.
1. They read the criteria together. This makes sure they have the same understanding about it.
2. The assessor explains what is needed to show competency.

You show competency by providing evidence.
Evidence can be:
- a demonstration of a skills;
- a written statement from a supervisor, leading hand or colleague that says you have been doing the task to standard for sometime;
- answering questions in writing;
- providing documents that show you have been using a skill for real work situations.
3. The assessor will explain how to make sure you give enough evidence.
4. You will arrange a time to do the assessment. This should fit in with your work area - supervisor and colleagues.
5. The assessor will usually be able to give you an answer on the day of the assessment.
6. The result of the assessment is given to the training co-ordinator who will put it on your training record. The results for people who enrol will be submitted together. Statements will be obtained for people who complete it before December.

What happens after that?
You continue working to the standard you have been assessed at.
You can also go on and do the next unit, 'Implement OH & S principles and procedures.'
Training and Assessment Record

Name: ____________________________

Unit Title: Apply safe work procedures

AQF1

Unit ID: FDF COROHS1A

Descriptor: This is a core unit for all sectors of the industry. It covers the basic occupational health and safety principles and procedures relating to an employee's own work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Additional Evidence Required</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate policies and procedures on health &amp; safety for own work</td>
<td>site layout including emergency exits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate safe work procedures in own work area</td>
<td>importance of OHS to self and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out safety checks using approp check lists; start up and shut down procedures</td>
<td>roles, rights and responsibilities of self and employer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate procedures for reporting hazards</td>
<td>location on advice on OHS issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use personal protective clothing</td>
<td>OHS personnel and consultative arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use personal protective equipment</td>
<td>typical hazards relating to own job and work area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use hazard control equip for spills</td>
<td>first aid facilities and personnel reporting procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate emergency procedures including evacuation</td>
<td>use, care and storage requirements for PPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sign</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Additional evidence required for tasks is indicated where applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintain housekeeping standards in own work area</th>
<th>location and use of safety alarms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lock out, tag out and/or isolation procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage, symbols and signals relating to OHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage requirements for hazardous goods where required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe manual handling practices and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHS incidents including injuries, illness and near misses and related reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trainers Comments:  

Assessors Comments:
This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").