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INTRODUCTION

Australia

Australia is a technologically advanced country of 18 million people – part of the Pacific Rim. Australia has traditionally been recognised for its rural and extractive industries but is also a manufacturing economy with an increasing reputation for its innovative workforce.

Within South Australia there has been an emphasis on high quality food and wine production, defence electronics, automobile and whitegoods manufacturing and plantation timber.

Malaysia

Malaysia is a fast developing country in South East Asia with a vision to become fully developed by the year 2020. With a population of 20 million it is a stable democratic society with a diverse industry base. Prior to 1997 Malaysia registered a growth rate in excess of 8% for almost a decade. The economic crisis in 1997 led to a 7.6% contraction of the economy in 1998, but there are promising signs for 1999.

In addition to substantial development in the capital, Kuala Lumpur, the government of Malaysia has also been developing a new administrative city (Putra Jaya) combined with an ambitious Multimedia Super Corridor project (MSC)

The Malaysian economy includes extractive and rural (tin and rubber), plantation (palm oil) and high tech manufacturing (computer and electronics). The similarities to Australia’s (and South Australia’s) economic mix have been significant.

It is not the purpose of this paper to dwell on the economy of either country – but the similarities in the employment and economic base are of relevance.

Before developing the substance of this paper it is necessary to describe a little of the two partners.

Department of Education, Training and Employment, South Australia

The Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE) is responsible for over 600 schools employing over 12,000 teachers in South Australia. There are eight Training and Further Education [TAFE South Australia] institutes on 50 campuses, with 95,000 students taught by 1,600 TAFE lecturers and around 5,000 hourly-paid TAFE instructors.

In summary the Department administers a A$1.6 billion budget and delivers high quality:
- children’s services
- schooling
- vocational education and training
- employment programs and initiatives
- coordination and youth affairs
As part of the Government of South Australia this department has the approval and support of the
government to operate internationally.

This Department has been at the leading edge of training in Australia and has been involved in
projects throughout the Asia Pacific region for more than ten years. The Department has been
involved in the delivery of consultancies, training, franchising, fellowship programs and study tours
in 38 countries.

The Lion Group, Malaysia

The Lion Group is a diversified business group with its Head Office in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

The eight major strategic businesses are the:
• Steel Division
• Motor Division
• Tyre and Chemicals Division
• Computer and Communications Division
• Food, Pharmaceutical and Agri-Products Division
• Retail, Distribution and Trading Division
• Property and Construction Division
• Finance, Insurance and Service Division

The company employs over 23,000 people, has assets of over $Aus 4.7 billion and an annual
turnover in excess of $Aus 2.6 billion.

The group is seeking to expand its business interests particularly in China. Prior to the economic
downturn in mid 1997 the Group anticipated a workforce of 40,000 by the year 2000.

Some highlights of the Group’s operations

• The steel division produces about one third of Malaysia’s requirements in steel products
• The company manufactures 1.2 million personal computers per year at Melaka Technology
  Park.
• The group retails under the Parkson banner with stores in 33 locations throughout Malaysia and
  three in China.
• The group is one of Malaysia’s largest private industrial park developers and is developing
  industrial parks in five locations in China

The Lion Group rates staff development as a high priority. Responsibility for training and
development rests with the SIT Corporate Learning Centre (CLC), headed by Mr Yip Kam Hong.
CLC is housed within the Sepang Institute of Technology at Klang.
History of Connection with Corporate Learning Centre

As with so many successful joint activities, this one developed from a long-term association between the two countries. The first introduction was made by Dr Paul Chan, a South Australian alumnus with extensive education and business interests in Hong Kong and Malaysia.

During 1996, Dr Chan was President of the newly established Sepang Institute of Technology (SIT) at Klang, and was developing relationships with key education providers in the UK and South Australia. The South Australian components included University and TAFE courses at degree and diploma level. It is not intended in this paper to explore this development any further except to say that the number of students enrolled at SIT has continued to grow and, in just a short span of years, SIT has developed an excellent reputation in Malaysia.

The major financial backer of SIT during its start up phase was The Lion Group referred to earlier. Mr Yip Kam Hong from The Lion Group Training Department, and Mr Geoff Phillips representing the Department of Education, Training and Employment were introduced to one another by Dr Chan.

It is once again a demonstration of the importance of personal relationships and recommendations.

During this time (1995 / 1996), the Lion Group had made a decision to embrace a holistic model of workplace training, and the synergy with the approaches being followed in South Australia soon became apparent.

I have emphasised the importance of the personal introduction, but both parties worked at developing the relationship. A number of meetings were held in each country with a view to gaining an understanding of each other's situation - but the major process was relationship building - key people getting to know one another and making that important judgement about being able to work together.

It is appropriate at this point to step backwards in time to examine what has occurred in Australia with respect to workplace training.


There is nothing new about workplace training and competency standards. Both concepts have been in existence probably for as long as workplaces have existed, and the practice of training on the job, in the workplace, to meet an expected level of performance, has been around for as long. A classic example of this would be the master artists, Peter Paul Reubens for example, with his studio of apprentices, all of whom were trained in the workplace, on the job, to the level of competence where they could actually work on his paintings. We can probably all relate stories about workplace training, about training on the job. So what is different now?

Over the past decade it has all been formalised. Workplace change through Award Restructuring, the introduction of Competency Based Training, and the Training Guarantee Act 1990 placed greater emphasis than ever before on the need for a professional, planned approach to training and skill development relevant to the workplace. Hence, the formulation and formalisation of Workplace Trainer skills and competency standards.
1991 saw the formation of the Competency Standards Body (CSB) – Workplace Trainers. This organisation was endorsed by the then National Training Board (NTB), and had the express purpose of

1. developing standards for workplace trainers
2. presenting workplace trainer standards to the NTB for endorsement
3. marketing the endorsed standards
4. monitoring the use of the standards
5. reviewing the standards as required

The CSB was comprised of representatives of national and state government departments, unions, and training practitioners. Considerable national consultation on the draft standards took place around the country, and resulting from this was a set of competency standards for workplace trainers, endorsed by NTB in April 1992. These standards were not designed to be prescriptive but to act as a guide to trainers in the workplace.

A statement in the Foreword of the first set of standards states:

“Because of the wide ranging roles held by workplace trainers throughout industry, it is difficult to be too specific in defining performance criteria. These guideline standards therefore provide guidance to the range of contexts within which workplace trainers might operate.”

These standards encompassed the following skills:

1. Identify the need for training
2. Design and develop training
3. Organise training resources
4. Deliver and evaluate training
5. Assess trainees
6. Promote training, and
7. Manage training

For trainers in the workplace, however you want to define ‘workplace’, there was nothing new in this list. What the standards did was encourage trainers to examine their own processes against the performance criteria, and where necessary, strive to improve to meet the standards. A Certificate of Competency as a Workplace Trainer was available, and this became a useful addition to trainers’ credentials.

The past seven years have seen the standards refined and polished, with the introduction in 1993 of competency standards for workplace assessors, until at the end of last year the revised standards were incorporated into the Training Package for Assessment and Workplace Training. People who train in the workplace, on the job, are being encouraged to achieve the competencies for Workplace Trainers and Assessors. In South Australia, for a training organisation to be registered to deliver nationally accredited courses, all the trainers must hold a ‘Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training’. This is a national qualification, therefore portable across the country.

Now to return to the Lion Group.
The Vision

During 1995 staff within the Lion Group Training Department had thoroughly examined current training. They also had a comparative look at other organisations in Malaysia and in other countries.

The vision was formulated and included the following:

“To be the leading provider of learning-based solutions to all business enterprises in the SEA region and China in general, and to the Lion Group in particular, through state-of-the-art competency-based training and education (CBTE).”

To achieve their vision they set the following short to medium term goals and objectives:

- To realise the Lion Group HRD's plan to build a competency-based organisation that can meet the needs of the Group Vision.
- To meet all the training and education needs of the Lion Group via strategic alliances through Sepang Institute of Technology.
- To be the leading provider of competency-based training and education (CBTE) for Malaysian industries by the year 2000.
- To set the standard for design, development and delivery of CBTE in Malaysia.
- To establish a CBTE specialist development program that is recognised as the most respected qualification for trainers in the HRD field and by the Human Resources Development Commission (HRDC) in particular.
- To be the centre for development of training specialists in Malaysia.

all the time focussing on a longer term goal of becoming:

- the leading provider of CBTE in SE Asia and China by the year 2005.

To achieve these goals they sought the exclusive right of use of CBTE technology from TAFE in South Australia to SIT-Lion Group through a long-term business partnership.

To enter this market a number of processes were identified:

- Develop expertise in CBTE through TAFE Teacher training - customisation - validation - certification.
- Create success in CBTE in Lion Group.
- Educate HR practitioners in Lion Group on competency-based approach to HR management.
- Offer CBTE Specialist Certification Course to the practitioners: to create involvement and commitment and to establish a potential pool of trainer resource to deliver a wide range of CBTE courses.
- Establish RPL system and offer credit transfers for Group Training Courses towards TAFE Awards leading to a source of TAFE Award candidates for Sepang Institute of Technology and future candidates for degree programs in conjunction with South Australian universities.
This would be followed by processes which would

- Duplicate success in industry:
- Educate HR practitioners on competency-based approach to HR management.
- Offer CBTE Specialist Certification Course to the industry: to set standards for CBTE trainers and to create a potential pool of trainer resource to deliver a wide range of CBTE courses.
- Offer licensed learning materials to certified CBTE trainers for use in their own companies.
- Assist certified trainers to install the competency-based training system into their organisations.
- Establish a CBTE Practitioners Association for promotion of CBTE.

The most significant point of all of the above is that the CBTE program is an integrated part of an overall approach. CBTE provides workplace trainers with the methodology to deliver training in the workplace. They then work collaboratively with CLC and DETE staff to design and deliver training of a high standard as required.

For the partnership between DETE and CLC there was the joint development of a 32 module management development program based on competency principles – and the CBTE program underpinned this development.

The Project team

From the Lion Group:

- Mr Yip Kam Hong, Training Manager
- Ms Tan Chew Hoon
- Ms Choy Boon Ling
- Ms Low Hooi Tee
- Ms Siti Sahlah
- Mr Tan Ben Hock
- Mr Kelvin Phuan

For the Department of Education Training and Employment

- Mr Geoff Phillips, Business Development Manager, International Education Services
- Ms Joy Fisher, Manager Workplace Training Unit, Douglas Mawson Institute of TAFE
- Mr Brian Nation, Workplace Consultant, Douglas Mawson Institute of TAFE
- Mr Andrew Inglis, Workplace Consultant, Douglas Mawson Institute of TAFE
- Mr Ray Clark, Workplace Consultant, Regency Institute of TAFE
- Ms Pauline Clark, Workplace Consultant, Regency Institute of TAFE
Substance of CBTE

There were to be two themes to the proposed new training scheme -
1. the skilling of the current trainers in competency based methodologies, and
2. the introduction of competency standards for all employees in the company, with associated training to assist them to meet these standards

Allied to each of these themes was assessment in the workplace, with formal recognition of achievement of competencies by the company.

The first step in this process was to work with the Lion Group trainers on competency based training methodologies, with the ultimate aim that the Workplace Trainer course could be delivered by them.

It was agreed that a training course would be set up, which would allow participants to achieve the Australian Workplace Training qualification, albeit in a different delivery pattern from the traditional Australian one. Initially, six Malaysian trainers were identified, and these trainers were given the responsibility of working with the DMI team to establish a pattern for training in Malaysia.

A mentoring pattern was designed and established, a five-step process, where the first ‘methodology of CBT’ course was delivered in Malaysia in November 1996 by two Australian trainers with one of the prime Lion Group trainers in attendance. Course two saw the same pattern, with a different Malaysian trainer attending. Course three was run by one Australian trainer, and the first Malaysian trainer, course four by one Australian and the second Malaysian trainer, and course five by the two Malaysian trainers, with the Australian trainer in attendance as a mentor and advisor. In this way, the Malaysian trainers had the opportunity to work with the Australian specialists, then to be mentored by them. At the completion of the five-step process, the Lion Group trainers were accredited to conduct and assess the workplace trainer programs themselves, with TAFE SA issuing the qualification to the participants of the training program.

This process took two years. The downturn in the Malaysian economy severely affected the plans, and training took a lower priority, as in every country and every organisation where budget constraints is an issue. However, the process was completed, and in December 1998 the handover of workplace training to the Malaysian trainers was formalised. Participants in the CBTE Workplace Trainer programs in Malaysia are trained by the Lion Group trainers, assessed on the job, and issued with an Australian award, up until last year the Certificate IV in Workplace Training (Category 2), and now the Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training.

The quality assurance mechanism then followed.

Procedures have been set in place where the Malaysian trainers constantly review the outcomes of the training courses they conduct, and send the findings to DETE staff, often with requests for advice or resources, such as up to date videos, new handouts, information about competency standards. The continuing mentoring partnership is important to maintain standards and consistency. Without this process, the partnership would not work.

It is planned that there will be at least one quality assurance visit each year, and updating in training where necessary.
In April of this year a three-day workshop was presented in Malaysia to all the trainers involved in Competency Based training. This allowed for the adoption of a new course structure, methodology, content and materials to meet the revised workplace trainer standards. This time also saw the formation and introduction to the alumni of the CBTE Practitioners’ Association, or the ‘CBTE Club’.

The second stream of the strategy was to introduce a program to upskill Lion Group staff. In conjunction with TAFE staff, a three-level tier of competency standards, both generic and job-specific, was developed to cover all employees in the company up to supervisor level. Eleven core generic competency areas were identified

1. Communication
2. Manage Resources
3. Planning and Organising
4. Staff Development
5. Problem Solving
6. Customer Service
7. Teamwork
8. Quality
9. Occupational Safety and Health
10. Computer, and
11. Information Management

All company employees were required to achieve the level of competency related to their job level for each of the core competencies. A process of self-assessment was undertaken, followed by an interview with the supervisor to confirm that the employee was indeed competent. Competency gaps were then identified, and a training plan for off the job learning developed.

All the off the job training for company employees was to be delivered by the Lion Group trainers, who had completed the CBTE training course. As the core competency standards were newly developed, there were no training materials available to allow the off the job training to take place. Training modules were required to match the standards, and these were acquired in a variety of ways

1. Existing Lion Group training materials would be adapted to CBTE methodology
2. Lion Group trainers would write new modules
3. TAFE Australian training modules would be used
4. Australian training modules would be adapted for use

With eleven core competencies, and three levels of competence, a minimum of 33 training modules were required.

Ultimately, 44 training modules were identified and established, by one of the methods listed above. Then began a process of delivery and mentoring, very similar to the one established for competency based methodology.

Both the staff from the Corporate Learning Centre, who had completed the Certificate IV in Workplace Training (Category 2) with TAFE SA staff, and ‘graduates’ from the public CLC programs, were identified and contracted to deliver the ‘Career Development Scheme’ training, again in conjunction with TAFE SA trainers.
This process is now virtually complete. Lion Group employees are encouraged to participate in training, both on and off the job, with the incentive being eligibility for promotion on achievement of all the competencies of their current employment level. There is a large bank of qualified ‘competency based trainers’ in the company, and a number of contractors available on a specialised basis. The programs are run under a franchise arrangement, with a number of difficulties encountered and mainly overcome.

Franchising

It is now appropriate to address the financial matters which faced the developing consortium. The exact nature of the arrangements between the two parties will not be revealed because much of this needs to remain commercial in confidence. Rather than precise details, a model will be presented which captures the essential elements of the current arrangements.

The personal relationship that occurred during the early stage and referred to earlier, had a profound impact on the financial implications.

A digression to one of the lessons learned in a relatively short career in international business. There are mountains of texts and articles that refer to "Western" versus "Asian" aspects of business. One factor which is dealt with frequently, but not simply, can be summed up in two words "analytical" and "intuitive". It will be left to the audience or reader to work out which is more likely to reflect Western or Asian approaches.

In my own case, I found it advantageous to use my analytical approaches, apply those measures that I would for a program in Australia, but increasingly, to also go with my intuition if there were gaps in my knowledge. The success of this project has given me confidence to back my judgement in other ventures.

This is a franchise model - not exactly McDonalds, or Pizza Hut, but still a franchise model.

There are three elements to a franchise model:

1. Licence fee
2. Royalty payments
3. Training or Quality Assurance components

and, to some extent, these three elements are interrelated. The first two relate to the value of the intellectual property possessed by one party, and the third relates to the implementation in a new location.

The three elements are interrelated and the weighting of each element is part of the negotiations which occur between the parties. In an attempt to achieve a "Win/Win" situation, it is the trade off of one element against another which determines if the partnership can progress (neither party being dogmatic in their demands).

Key local market research is needed (usually led by the franchisee but verified by franchisor) regarding the potential demand and price for the product i.e. how many students at what fee?
For today's analysis, I have only mentioned the elements referred to above. This does not mean that elements related to administration, management, promotion etc are not important, just that they are similar for all programs - franchised or not.

The following assumptions will be made for the purpose of illustration

**Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>FRANCHISOR</th>
<th>FRANCHISEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Length (hours)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee per Student ($)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (units per quarter)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence Fee</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty Payment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Consultants per week costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Travel</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc / Living</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Cost (Franchisee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room hire, marketing, admin</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel costs (when paid by franchisee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And a simple spreadsheet applied to this scenario is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(TAFE SA)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRANCHISOR</strong></td>
<td>FRANCHISEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course One</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Two</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Three</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Four</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Five</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Six</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Seven</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Eight</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Nine</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Ten</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussions between franchisee and franchisor then seek to reallocate costs to a point where the solution is “Win- Win”.
If the travel costs are reallocated then the scenario becomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(TAFE SA)</th>
<th>FRANCHISOR</th>
<th>FRANCHISEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course One</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Two</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Three</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Four</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Five</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Six</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Seven</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Eight</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Nine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Ten</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis has been very simplistic – but serves to illustrate the interaction between the various components.

**Challenges encountered**

Transporting a training program from one country to another, from one culture to another, is NOT an easy task, as was soon discovered. Many mistakes and a number of false assumptions were made but so was progress.

The first difficulty arose when the amount of preparation time required to transport an entire training program was severely underestimated. Working in a discrete environment, it is very easy to ‘go to the cupboard’ and pull out whatever resources one chooses. Not so when the course is being run thousands of kilometres away. Upgrading of resources, checking carefully for ambiguities in language and elimination of jargon became critical. For the three courses, this process took six months. One very positive outcome, however, is that there is now completed a better set of resources for use in Australia than would otherwise have been the case.

Assumptions were made which turned out to be inaccurate. It was assumed that training systems in Malaysia worked in the same way as in Australia. Wrong. It was assumed that there would be a degree of flexibility in course offerings. Wrong. It was assumed that the trainers had control of their training to the same extent as in Australia. Wrong.

None of this is to suggest that the situation in Malaysia was a negative one, it was just different from what was expected, and the Australian trainers were the ones who had to adapt.

Then over the years there was the timing issue. Plans were made to offer a certain course on a certain date, it was written into our training schedule, travel arrangements were made, then for one reason or another – insufficient participants, other demands by the company, etc – the course would
be cancelled. Trainers in Australia learned to accept that ‘it will happen when it happens’ and to schedule training flexibly around proposed dates for Malaysia.

Another of the cultural differences dealt with was the learning styles of the Malaysian participants. Having worked in the competency based training arena for quite a few years, Australian trainers tend to run training courses without handbooks, or at least not to use them within the course. The majority of the Malaysian participants were uncomfortable with this approach. They liked the handbooks in front of them, to be armed with a pen or pencil, and to have each page referred to as pertinent topics were addressed. In the beginning the Australian trainers tried to change this, to insist that books remained closed, but participants were so uncomfortable with this that they lost the value of what was being said. So changes occurred. Course notes were adjusted to include page references, and it became customary to refer to the pertinent pages prior to a topic. Participants could then choose to read or listen. It works, of course, it is just different from the norm in Australia.

Problems with hierarchy were also encountered. Programs where a supervisor and an employee were attending together caused some difficulty, because the hierarchical structure says that the supervisor is always right, thus the employee would not speak up, even when he or she had some really good points to make. Perhaps this is no different from in Australia.

Lessons, Opportunities, Positives

Difficulties were numerous. The financial crisis resulted in a downturn in demand. Exchange rate issues and foreign currency restrictions caused problems. Taxation matters required solutions. Legal contracts required interpretation.

Difficulties notwithstanding, the exercise in Malaysia has been most positive. Foremost is the growth, professionally and socially, of all the trainers. Living and working in a different country, in a different culture, has made all involved question values and views, and to adapt to fit the circumstances.

And the friendships we have made!! We have been honoured by being invited into people’s homes, to share meals, to stay overnight, becoming for a short space of time a part of the family. We have made so many friends, gathered ‘god children’ along the way, stayed in so many places and seen so much of that glorious country that we all consider Malaysia a ‘second home’. Competition to return is fierce.

From the very beginning this project was seen as a stepping stone to other training. To ensure the success of future projects, the developing and maintaining of the partnership was essential.

We are not able to deal with the range of opportunities within this paper but the strong relationship has given both parties the confidence to explore other joint activities – including opportunities for collaboration in third countries.

Future directions

We are now proceeding to take this product and methodology a step further. The successful introduction in Malaysia and the continuing development in Australia (and particularly South Australia) have produced the building block.
In Australia the transition to the Diploma of Workplace Training and Assessment has been completed and the product now has 16 units of competence (more on this shortly).

The materials developed for use in Malaysia and the materials being used in South Australia are now on a convergent path. The process of customising and “franchise shaping” has produced a template, teaching and learning methodology, and resources which are better than the original material used in South Australia.

The “train the trainer” model in Malaysia has resulted in a team of presenters who are ready to contribute to the next phase. In addition to a thorough grounding in CBT these partners (and the alumni of this program) have some additional key skills. They are fluent in other languages, which will allow us to extend the reach of this program.

We have already commenced the translation of the material into two other languages (Mandarin and Malay). Within South Australia we do have speakers of these languages (including native speakers) but on our own we do not have the depth that is available within this partnership. Many organisations in Australia have considered (and indeed have introduced) courses in other languages. All will have faced the quality control aspects and will have concluded that monitoring in another language is resource intensive. Our approach has been to gain an assurance that the delivery in English (a language we can readily understand) is to an equivalent standard and then to have those trainers deliver in their native language. Remember – the methodology is a “train the trainer” model – not deliver once and then tell the newly trained to go and replicate. The Lion Group trainers have all been involved in at least three courses with their Australian counterparts, and there are no plans to franchise the CBT beyond the Lion Group, except on a partnership basis.

It may also be worth noting that the “practice what we preach” process needed to be in place. Workplace Training is all about improvements in training, improvements in productivity, training for a purpose. Workplace training is centred on the individual learner, assisting him or her to achieve a best effort and a best result. Workplace training is about assessing outcomes based on standards, confirming that tasks are being performed in the company to the established level. This is the philosophy that has been developed in Australia, training workplace trainers and assessors, and this is the philosophy that has been transferred to Malaysia.

New trainers will be progressively added to the team in order to build up capacity.

Translation to another language will then be considered with the most likely additional language being Bahasa Indonesian (because of its similarity to Malay).

Plans are progressing to offer the competency based training programs in Vietnam and Thailand over the next year, again with translated materials. There are not too many Thai or Vietnamese speakers amongst the TAFE staff skilled in workplace training, so opportunities to replicate the Malaysian franchise model will be sought.
Opportunities for others

The new Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems encompasses 16 Units of Competence, from practitioner skills of training and assessment, to systems wide competencies. Each of the Units stands alone, although logically some fit well with others. For example, the Units –

- Design and Establish the Training System
- Design and Establish the Assessment System
- Manage the Training and Assessment System, and
- Evaluate the Training and Assessment System

make up a very useful package, especially if a company is looking at setting up a new training system.

The experience in Malaysia can be repeated in other countries and partnerships to achieve this are being explored.

South Australian and Malaysian trainers are able to work with organisations in other countries. Partnerships can establish performance standards and put a training and assessment system in place which is guaranteed, after the initial investment, to increase an organisation’s productivity and profit.

Trainers can be trained and, working on the Malaysian model, empowered to be competent trainers of competency based methodology, and competent assessors in the workplace.

Training courses which encompass CBT, and assessment tools which confirm the competence of employees’ performance can be designed. This training is not limited to any discipline, any facet of any organisation. Competency based training and assessment is the building block, the foundation upon which an organisation and its employees achieve their present and future goals.
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Appendix

ASSESSMENT AND WORKPLACE TRAINING QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

There are two (2) qualifications in Assessment and Workplace Training:

- Diploma of Training and Assessment Systems, incorporating
- Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training

DIPLOMA OF TRAINING AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS

Specialist assessment and training competencies are required by people responsible for designing, implementing, managing and evaluating assessment and training systems. They may also be responsible for conducting competency needs analysis, establishing training systems, developing assessment tools and procedures. The units of competency emphasize system level operation and management. Some of these individuals may have a background in assessment and training and have undertaken the Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training. Others may have moved into a position of responsibility for these areas without a practitioner background.

To qualify, at least four (4) units must be chosen from the following group:

- BSZ501A Analyse Competency Requirements
- BSZ502A Design and Establish the Training System
- BSZ503A Design and Establish the Assessment System
- BSZ504A Manage the Training and Assessment System
- BSZ505A Evaluate the Training and Assessment System
- BSZ506A Develop Assessment Procedures
- BSZ507A Develop Assessment Tools
- BSZ508A Design Training Courses

PLUS an additional six (6) units from the Diploma or Certificate.

PLUS an additional minimum of three (3) units relevant to the implementation of assessment and workplace training from other Training Packages. These may include financial management, project management, human resource management or counselling competencies appropriate to a Diploma level or higher qualifications.

CERTIFICATE IV IN ASSESSMENT AND WORKPLACE TRAINING

Certificate IV applies to people for whom training is a large part of their job, or a full job function within a structured assessment and training system. These people have considerable responsibility for training program development and delivery as well as assessment of training participants or employees.

There are eight (8) units of competency which make up the Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training:

- BSZ401A Plan Assessment
- BSZ402A Conduct Assessment
- BSZ403A Review Assessment
- BSZ404A Train Small Groups
- BSZ405A Plan and Promote a Training Program
- BSZ406A Plan a Series of Training Sessions
- BSZ407A Deliver Training Sessions
- BSZ408A Review Training