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ABSTRACT

In the past decade in Australia there have been many educational initiatives aimed at diversifying educational offerings for young people who have completed their compulsory schooling. In more recent years the notion of Schools/TAFE cooperation has given rise to a range of such initiatives.

This report examines the concepts and practices of Schools/TAFE cooperation as these existed in the Australian States/Territories in 1985. Not all possible forms of cooperation between Schools and TAFE are considered in the report. 'Link (career awareness)' courses for example are excluded. The study leading to this report attempted to examine all cooperative initiatives that could result in successful students earning a 'joint credential' - a credential from both the Schools and TAFE systems.

The report identifies a range of different approaches to Schools/TAFE cooperation that have been developed and implemented. These approaches demonstrate that educators have striven to respond to different needs using different conceptions of Schools/TAFE cooperation, and different design and delivery strategies. Whilst these different responses are evident, a number of purposes of such cooperation have been commonly identified. The report recommends adoption of what is considered to be the primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation, viz. the provision of post-compulsory educational options which are different to more schooling and different to TAFE, and which are equally available to all young people. It further recommends adoption of what are considered to be two secondary purposes: the provision of additional options for curriculum diversification in senior schooling; and the achievement of cross-sectoral resource sharing.

The report acknowledges two conceptions (or forms) of Schools/TAFE cooperation - viz. the 'alternative' conception and the 'supplementary' conception. It recommends the adoption of each of these two different conceptions depending on the needs and circumstances of the students concerned. It also recommends strategies for the effective design, delivery and implementation of each of these two conceptions of cooperation.

It is considered that adoption of the recommended conceptions of cooperation, particularly the 'alternative' conception, will afford educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) in Australia an opportunity to make a substantial contribution to enhancing the potential life pathways of young people.

This document is Volume I, entitled "Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programs: A Review of Australian Practices". The other volumes are

Volume II - Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programs: Case Studies and Commentaries
Volume III - Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programs: A National Inventory of Programs
Volume IV - Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programs: Appendices to Volume I
Volume V - Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programs: A Review of Australian Practices - Executive Summary
This project was commissioned and jointly funded by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the TAFE Council of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission.

It was undertaken under the project title of the "TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project", and was managed by a Project Steering Committee, jointly chaired by officers of the two Commissions.

The project was undertaken by a Project Team of Neil Jones and Zofia Krzemionka, who were based at the TAFE National Centre for Research and Development.
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CHAPTER 1

THE CONTEXT FOR AN EXAMINATION OF SCHOOLS/TAFE COOPERATION

Introductory Note

This chapter, which attempts to describe the context for Schools/TAFE cooperation, at the time of commencement of the national research project, makes reference to two secondary source documents. The first of these was a draft working paper, commissioned as part of this project. This paper, "The Context for Cooperation Between Secondary Schools and TAFE" was written by Kate Barnett, as a private consultant. The second was a draft issues paper, commissioned by the Commonwealth Schools Commission, written by Jim Williamson of Melbourne CAE. Its title is "The Schools/TAFE Relationship ... An Issues Paper".

The contents of this chapter are also the result of suggestions made by the Steering Committee for the national project, particularly as these referred to the draft working paper by Barnett. As well, reference has been made to another draft working paper, written by Colin Macdonald of the NSW Department of Education. This paper is entitled "The Context for Cooperation", and represents some further thoughts on parts of the Barnett paper.

Primarily, this chapter reflects the reading undertaken by the project team, during the course of the project, from March 1985 to March 1986. The reports and documents read by the project team represent a wide range of views on the subject of Schools/TAFE cooperation, and on education generally. A particular focus for our reading was to review the events and developments which appeared to lead to the considerable interest by both the Commonwealth Schools and Tertiary Education Commissions in the area of Schools/TAFE cooperation, which prompted their joint commissioning of this research project.

1.1 Introduction

For discussion purposes, we feel each of the factors leading to the joint commissioning of this research project by the CSC and the CTEC can usefully be considered to fall within one of six groups. The first of these groups would seem to include those factors which are concerned with the role of secondary education in Australia. Analyses of the adequacy of effectiveness of secondary education have been evident for the past decade, in the findings of reports of working parties and committees established by educational and governmental authorities at both the State and Commonwealth levels — these are referred to in Section 1.2.

A second group of factors is socially based. This group includes factors related to changes in lifestyle and work patterns, and in technology, within localised communities, in the State/Territory communities, and in the wider Australian context. Prime amongst these is increased youth unemployment, and the consequent efforts of educational authorities in Australia (both Schools and TAFE) to find educational solutions to the problems of such unemployment. Some of these solutions have embraced cooperative strategies between Schools and TAFE. These factors are outlined in Section 1.3.

An understanding of the third group of antecedent factors derives from an examination of patterns of national statistics relating to students of post-compulsory school age. Rates of retention and participation in
post-compulsory secondary education have increased markedly over the past decade. These factors are considered in Section 1.4.

Section 1.5 deals with another group of factors relating to the existence of 'movements' in educational philosophy, or 'schools of thought' on the broader role of education in society -- particularly secondary education and TAFE.

The fifth group of factors relates to questions concerning the post-school destinations of students. Do current senior secondary curricula reflect the actual post-school options taken up by school leavers? What are the post-school destinations of school leavers? Section 1.6 includes some statistics on the range of post-school destinations, which lead to a number of questions which form an important part of the context for this project.

The common theme of the sixth group of factors, considered in Section 1.7, relates to the economics of educational resource utilisation. Some educational commentators have highlighted the potential savings of scarce educational resources (and economies of scale) that might be achieved via education 'systems' that are based on cooperation of effort and amalgamation of resources across the different educational sectors -- particularly Schools and TAFE.

1.2 Analyses of Secondary Education

Secondary education in Australia, particularly in its post-compulsory curriculum provision, has been the subject of substantial criticism over the past decade or more. Such criticism has been evident in the reports of working parties and committees of enquiry in each of the States in Australia, and in reports and discussion papers of Commonwealth educational authorities. Likewise the OECD's Review of Youth Policies in Australia (1984) pointed out that secondary education in Australia had

...little to offer a young person who is not going on for higher education. The courses are geared to the entry requirements of universities and colleges of higher education (p.29).

As well, and quite often complicating this sort of analysis, there have been various criticisms of schooling posed by the community at large, and by the media, that schools are failing to teach numeracy and literacy or to prepare students adequately for work; that educational 'standards' have fallen; that schools encourage mediocrity and give students unreal expectations.

Partly in response to these kinds of criticisms, State/Territory educational authorities have embarked upon a range of educational endeavours. Some of these have been experimental, and some have been centrally-initiated, and have involved policy changes. Among these endeavours have been Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, a significant number of which have had their origins in, and been resourced by, the Commonwealth Government's Participation and Equity Program (PEP). Others have developed and been resourced independently of PEP, but appear nonetheless to have been founded on the principles of participation and equity in education.

1.3 Social Factors

The discussion paper, 'Schools and TAFE' (1982), prepared jointly by the Commonwealth Schools and Tertiary Education Commissions, identified a number of social change factors, which we see as important in setting the context for this national project. That paper pointed to:
* rapidly changing technology affecting occupational structures, the types of work performed, the skills needed for work, and the organisation of the workplace;

* changing patterns in employment (more part-time and casual work, more unemployment) in response to structural changes in the economy;

* an increasing but unevenly distributed rate of leisure;

* the growth of alternative lifestyles bringing increased diversification to family types, educational directions and income-earning activities;

* marked regional differences in educational and work opportunities;

* a growing awareness and acceptance of cultural diversity....(p.2).

One of the most significant outcomes of the combined effect of these changes has been the loss of employment and career opportunities, particularly for young people. In 1984, for example, at any one time, some 22% to 25% of 15 to 19 year olds could not obtain employment (Blackburn, 1985, p.14). Continuing high rates of unemployment have encouraged governments to reassess the relationship between education and work, and between education and society itself.

In 1984 the OECD's Review also identified youth unemployment and under-employment resulting from such social changes as a key problem for governments in Australia. That Australian governments had already recognised these social factors and the solution of problems resulting therefrom as an important challenge for both Schools and TAFE, as post-compulsory educational authorities, is evidenced in the joint discussion paper of the two Commissions as follows:

For the present, schools and TAFE are each attempting to cater for a new kind of student -- one who would prefer to be at work. This group includes both those who stay on in full-time education in the light of the employment situation, and those who may be currently unemployed.

It includes those who are lacking in certain aspects of their general education, those who have no particular views about a vocation, and those who have a work preference but are inadequately prepared and/or have found a lack of work opportunities. Most of these young people are reluctant students. For the upper secondary school, more used to providing for students with aspirations towards higher education, and for the vocationally committed, these students present a new and demanding challenge (p.4).

Since 1982, when these social changes and the need to find solutions to the problems resulting from their presence were identified by the two Commissions, Schools and TAFE have initiated a range of cooperative endeavours aimed at providing equitable educational pathways for post-compulsory schooling. This project was therefore intended to be an important means of information to the two Commissions about these endeavours.
1.4 School Retention

Participation rates in senior secondary education have generally been increasing since the 1960's. Figure 1.1 shows the percentage increases in combined government and non-government schools nationwide enrolments for Years 10, 11 and 12 for the period from 1976 to 1985.

Figure 1.1

Source: A.B.S. National Schools Statistics Collection, Australia 1976-85
Figure 1.2 shows the combined national enrolments in Years 11 and 12 alone for the same period.
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Source: A.B.S. National Schools Statistics Collection, Australia 1976-85

Table 1.1 shows the percentage increases in combined government and non-government nationwide enrolments for Years 10, 11 and 12 for the period from 1976 to 1985.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>223 169</td>
<td>251 140</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>130 360</td>
<td>175 267</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>86 335</td>
<td>116 316</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These extractions from national senior secondary school statistics show that whilst there has been a general increase in participation in Years 10, 11 and 12 schooling over the past decade, the growth in participation for Years 11 and 12 has been of the order of three times that for Year 10 (34.5% and 34.7% cf 12.5%). It appears therefore that these Year 11 and 12 statistics reflect considerably more than any increase which could be attributed to population or other natural increases in school enrolments over this period.
There has quite simply been a marked increase in the number of students remaining at school to complete Years 11 and 12. The ABS National Schools Statistics Collection shows that in 1985, the "apparent retention rates" for respective cohort groups at the commencement of their secondary schooling, were 92% in government schools, and 99% in non-government schools for Year 10; 62% in government schools, and 81% in non-government schools for Year 11; 40% in government schools, and 66% in non-government schools for Year 12.

Some of the social factors referred to in the previous section have undoubtedly contributed to this growth trend. This project was not concerned with attempting to explain this trend. Rather its concern was to examine some of the newer curriculum options that have been developed, and were being developed during 1985, to provide for this increased student population.

It is nevertheless evident from the literature that there has been a high degree of concurrence amongst educational authorities in Australia that increasing school participation rates (as shown in the figures above) constitute a worthwhile goal on their own. The Commonwealth Schools Commission, for example, has urged in its PEP Guidelines (1983) that

...Australia should continue to progress towards the goal of universal participation in secondary education. Underlying this is the conviction that full secondary education...is intrinsically valuable....it should....be viewed as a positive, further stage in the evolution of education in Australia and....the basis for life-long learning (p.37).

Apart from its perceived intrinsic value, participation in senior secondary education has also been seen to be beneficial because of its contribution to an enhanced skills and knowledge base in the workforce. Achievement of this type of benefit would appear to be particularly relevant to Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. However, as the Blackburn Committee has argued, this benefit is only one reason for promoting greater participation in senior secondary schooling. Blackburn (1985) has cautioned against placing too great a weight on this reason, because, on its own it may also promote

...false beliefs, attributing unemployment and poverty to individual deficiencies. It thus pretends that individuals can control what is only marginally under their control (p.15).

It is largely because of the kind of changed social circumstances referred to in the previous section, that young people need a knowledge and skills base that will enable them to adapt to the changes that are occurring. Blackburn notes that

...in the face of uncertainty, the best policy is to ensure that as many young people as possible have a sufficiently high level of initial educational achievement to possess a flexible basis for the acquisition of specific skills, to have some conceptual understanding of technology and of productive processes, and to take their place confidently as participants in the work environment...

Better educated individuals have broader options in employment and beyond it than do less educated people....Personal resources developed through education can
increase the satisfaction to which people potentially have access and give them confidence in exploring new fields (p.15-16).

The Schools Commission and TAFE Council have urged a promotion of increased participation in education or training thus:

...available evidence ....suggests that it is those who are more fully educated who are most able to contribute and least likely to suffer in a climate of change... (p.16).

It is most likely that the increasing retention rates of schools will continue for the foreseeable future. As noted by Blackburn, in a climate of economic and social uncertainty young people and their parents will view further education as a more secure path to pursue, with or without the active promotion of this trend by educational authorities and governments. For this reason, the senior years of schooling are no longer viewed as an experience for an educational elite. This trend has clearly led to a recognition of the need to re-appraise existing educational provisions at this level. Future provisions should be developed to ensure that all students who choose to pursue further education do so with an equal opportunity to enhance their aspirations for employment and/or tertiary studies in a changing environment. This project was intended to contribute to that educational re-appraisal at a national level.

1.5 Educational 'Movements'

Here we wish to make reference to prevalent attitudes about the role of education in society -- particularly the roles of secondary schooling and TAFE. Williamson, in his draft discussion paper, "The Schools/TAFE Relationship" (1985) advances a typology on the role of secondary schooling. This typology comprises five "outlooks" on secondary education. In respect of the role of TAFE he identifies three themes that appear to be prevalent. Williamson's analysis is useful in presenting a synopsis of attitudes about roles, thus enabling the reader to appreciate the 'philosophies' which have backgrounded some of the more recent initiatives in Schools/TAFE cooperation which are the subject of this research study.

Williamson's typology of secondary education includes

1. The classical outlook -- which ascribes schools a role as sites of learning for all, but also requires that they should be a means for selecting out those students who are the most able or the brightest.

2. The liberal outlook -- which derives from the 'progressivist' movement, and argues that change toward a more humane society can be facilitated by students receiving a balanced or comprehensive curriculum (where the balance is between academic, skill and personal development studies).

3. The reproductionist outlook -- which accords schools the attribute of being places that work towards the reproduction of existing social inequalities, such as along class, gender and racial lines. This view holds that educational changes will be gained largely outside the school system.
4. The corporatist outlook -- which premises the achievement of 'liberal' goals on the gradual and rational strategy of firstly ensuring that we have a sound economic base for the pursuit of such change.

5. The radical reformist outlook -- which encourages schools (teachers and students) to take an active role in changing themselves and society in general.

Of TAFE, Williamson presents three common themes which account for prevalent views on its role. These are:

1. The labour-market theme -- which holds to the traditional view that TAFE's priorities are with educational offerings that provide vocational pathways for students (such as in apprenticeships);

2. The person-centred theme -- which emphasises the level of personal student satisfaction achieved by TAFE students (especially as this is intended by courses in the new 1000 classification, Recreation, Leisure and Personal Enrichment, or the old Stream 6 category of Adult Education;

3. The youth, unemployment and training theme -- which is more recent and reflects the increasing demands on TAFE to assume more responsibility for youth unemployment (such as in traineeships and pre-vocational courses).

It would seem to us that of these views on the roles of schools and TAFE, some were, at the time of the commencement of our research, and are at the present time, more generally apparent in the majority of Australian States/Territories. These are the classical and liberal outlooks on secondary schooling, and the labour-market and the youth, unemployment and training themes in TAFE. The existence of these perceived roles for schooling and TAFE establish a set of conditions for Schools/TAFE cooperation which are both in conflict and in harmony. A number of the design and implementation difficulties encountered in some of the Schools/TAFE cooperative programs examined in later chapters of this report reflect these points of role conflict. As well, some of the apparently successful cooperative programs examined would appear to be so because of a curriculum blending predicated on harmonious attitudes toward the roles of Schools and TAFE.

For the purposes of showing how the perceived roles of Schools and TAFE may influence the kind of Schools/TAFE cooperation that develops, or even whether cooperation develops at all, we will point to just one of the points of potential conflict and to one of harmony, which stem from the existence of these prevailing philosophies.

The "classical" view of secondary schooling and the "labour-market" view of TAFE would not seem to be in conflict, indeed they have co-existed apparently harmoniously in Australian education systems for decades, given that they pertain only to their own educational sector. That is to say, these two 'conservative' views have appeared to complement each other -- the classical view ensuring that secondary schooling is designed to steer academically able students towards higher education studies; the labour-market view ensuring that TAFE provides vocational studies for students with practical aptitudes. So long as each of these views has influenced the aims and processes of its own sector, and has not impinged upon the other, a state of complementarity has appeared to exist.

A point of conflict would seem to arise, however, when a classical view of secondary schooling and a labour-market view of TAFE are juxtaposed with the common purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming. In this circumstance, each sector may be required to contemplate a common student and an integrated
cross-sectoral curriculum. The conflict is accentuated when the possibility of cross-sectoral or joint accreditation is raised, because each sector has a well established specific-purpose credentialling system: Senior schools credentials for higher education purposes; TAFE credentials for vocational purposes. An example of this kind of conflict is evidenced by accreditation difficulties that occurred in the case study of the Basic Electronics program in the ACT (see Chapter 4).

A point of harmony would seem to exist when one considers the "liberal" view of secondary schooling in combination with the "youth, unemployment and training" view of TAFE. Here, the 'progressivist' schooling approach emphasises a comprehensive curriculum which attempts to cater for the educational needs of a wider range of student abilities and aspirations through the provision of academic, skill and personal studies. The 'youth training' approach is likewise centred on the provision of educational choices (vocational) for a wider range of students in a wider range of study and work circumstances. The two South Australian programs — the Course Award in Vocational Education, and the Integrated Studies Programs — case studied as part of this project (see Chapter 4), would seem to be examples of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs that reflect the harmony of these two views of educational roles.

1.6 Post-School Destinations

Increasing participation rates in senior secondary schooling have given rise to a heightened awareness amongst educators and the community at large of the full range of alternative post-school destinations of school leavers other than higher education. The realisation that many students are remaining in school past Year 10, but for whom further education in institutions of Higher Education is an unlikely path, has given rise to questions about the appropriateness of the existing role of senior secondary schooling. In particular, the 'classical' perception of senior secondary education as a preparation for studies in Higher Education, has been questioned.

Figure 1.3 shows the range of post-school destinations of students completing Years 10, 11 and 12 in 1983.
Figure 1.3
Destinations of Years 10, 11 and 12 1983 Students

FIGURE 2: Destinations of Year 10 students

YEAR 10
236,378 students in 1983

Further Education
76%

65% 5% 8% 12% 6% 4%
YEAR 11 FULL-TIME TAFE PART-TIME TAPE AND FULL TIME WORK FULL-TIME WORK ONLY UN EMPLOYED NOT IN EDUCATION OR THE FULL-TIME LABOUR FORCE

Full-time Labour Force
20%

FIGURE 3: Destinations of Year 11 students

YEAR 11
186,162 students in 1983

Further Education
76%

65% 5% 8% 10% 7% 1%
YEAR 10 FULL-TIME TAFE PART-TIME TAPE AND FULL TIME WORK FULL-TIME WORK ONLY UN EMPLOYED NOT IN EDUCATION OR THE FULL-TIME LABOUR FORCE

Full-time Labour Force
29%

FIGURE 4: Destinations of Year 12 students

YEAR 12
94,565 students in 1983

Further Education
62%

38% 7% 16% 25% 10% 3%
FULL-TIME HIGHER EDUCATION FULL-TIME TAFE PART-TIME TERTIARY STUDY AND FULL TIME WORK FULL-TIME WORK ONLY UN EMPLOYED NOT IN EDUCATION OR THE FULL-TIME LABOUR FORCE

Full-time Labour Force
51%

Figures 2, 3 and 4 are derived for CTEC data and from unpublished data from the ABS survey 'Transition from education to work, Australia, May 1984'. Because data from separate sources are being combined the figures represent approximate distributions only.

Source: Education News, Vol. 19, No. 4, July 1985
Figure 1.4, which is derived from Figure 1.3, represents an approximate projection of the ultimate post-school destinations of 1983 Year 10 students.

Figure 1.4

Projection of Ultimate Non-School Destinations of 1983 Year 10 Students

Notes:
1. The projections are approximate only. This is so for three reasons. (i) They are based on the statistics presented in Figure 1.3 which are approximate. (ii) The relevant data for 1984 & 1985, that would have enabled more precise longitudinal tracking of the 1983 Year 10 cohort group, were not available. (iii) There is uncertainty as to the exact distribution between TAFE and Higher Education of the 16% of 1983 Year 12 school leavers who entered part-time tertiary studies.
2. The projected categories are not mutually exclusive, there is overlap (and hence double-counting) between the TAFE and work categories, and the Higher Education and work categories.

Whilst Figure 1.3 illustrates the ranges of destinations for the three cohort groups (including school destinations), Figure 1.4 depicts the approximate projected distribution of the single Year 10 cohort across the possible range of ultimate post-school destinations. Generalising from this, it is evident that of the students in any Year 10 cohort, fewer than 20% proceed directly on to complete senior schooling and pursue further studies in Higher Education.

This project was, in part therefore, concerned with examining the potential for Schools/TAFE cooperative curricula to improve this take-up rate of tertiary education pathways.

Figure 1.5, also generated from statistics in Figure 1.3, depicts the projected distribution of the single Year 11 cohort across the range of ultimate destinations.
It shows that, for a Year 11 cohort, 28% proceed directly on to complete senior school studies and pursue Higher Education. By comparison, 22% proceed to TAFE and 48% to full-time work. The project was also concerned to examine the extent to which existing Year 11 curricula take this pattern of ultimate post-school destinations into account. And given this what contribution can Schools/TAFE cooperative curricula make?

Figure 1.6, likewise derived from Figure 1.3, shows the distribution of immediate post-school destinations of leavers, as a percentage of those who left at the end of or during each of Years 10, 11 and 12 for 1983.
If it is that as many as 37% of those leaving school at the end of or during Year 10 proceed to TAFE, (with 31% at the end of or during Year 11; and 17% at the end of or during Year 12), do senior school curriculum provisions take sufficient account of these destinations? And what role does Schools/TAFE cooperation have in view of these destinations?

Similarly, do senior school curriculum options adequately account for the substantial percentage of school leavers who proceed to full-time work, and to a lesser extent part-time work and/or unemployment? And what is the role of Schools/TAFE cooperation in these?

1.7 Economic Factors

A common theme of educational commentary in Australia has, in recent years, been the potential financial gains to be made by governments from developing education 'systems' that are more attuned to cooperative efforts and to the amalgamation of resources across the existing sectors of education, especially in times of economic constraint. The Schools and TAFE (1982) discussion paper pointed to this lack of resource rationalisation at the post-compulsory level as follows:

To date there is little evidence that schools and TAFE have made sufficient attempts either to minimise unnecessary overlap, or to work in collaboration to ensure that all potential students can be catered for in the most appropriate way...

In the best interests of students, cooperation is needed between school and TAFE administrators and teachers at local, regional and State levels. Course rationalisation, student counselling, joint teacher inservice, common curricular development and resource sharing would lead to greater understanding between the sectors (p.19).

More specifically, the OECD's Review of Youth Policies (1984) noted the organisational and financial separation of academic and vocational programs, and the fragmentation of resources in the Australian system compared to that in other countries. That report described (p.24) a system with five components, comprising:

1. Lower secondary -- geared to providing most young people with basic competencies.

2. Upper secondary -- designed to prepare students for higher education.

3. Higher education -- designed to prepare people for entry to the professional vocations.

4. Technical training and further education -- which provides basic academic and further education, technical and vocational skill training, cultural enrichment programs and training for apprentices.

5. Apprenticeship -- which, like the other four components, operates independently of the system as a whole.

The OECD Report pointed to three deficiencies it saw in organising educational provision into separate compartments as the lack of:
(i) a coherent overall sense of purpose that reflects the role of education and training in improving socio-economic equality and meeting the education and skill needs of the labour force through the end of the century;

(ii) a rational division of responsibilities among the parts for serving the overall purpose; and

(iii) formal points of transition between one institution and another (p. 25).

At the broad level, therefore, as is reflected by the commentaries quoted above, there is an interest amongst educators and governments in Australia to seek to improve the cohesiveness and rationality of educational provision. Within this broad area of interest, the sponsors of this national project were interested in an examination of any evidence that might demonstrate the potential of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs to lead to more rational use of scarce educational resources across the Schools and TAFE sectors, particularly where each sector was currently making educational provision in the same or similar curriculum areas (such as in business or technical study areas -- see for example our commentary, in Chapter 4, on the case study of the Integrated Studies Programs in SA).

* * * * * * *

While both the Schools and TAFE sectors in Australia provide for the same 15 to 18 year old target group, the differences between the Schools and TAFE sectors are well-established and significant. In large part these differences reflect the general-vocational educational dichotomy and the independent development and separate provisions of Schools and TAFE in Australia. An understanding of these differences is an important keystone to planning any changes in the future roles of Schools and TAFE.

Numerous State and Commonwealth reports, however, have pointed to the need for both sectors to work cooperatively, if a balanced and comprehensive post-compulsory education 'system' is to be developed. Among these are the Karmel Reports (SA, 1971; Tasmania, 1976), the Keeves Report (SA, 1982), the Partridge Report (WA, 1976), the Ahearn Parliamentary Enquiry (Queensland, 1979), the Blackburn Enquiry (Victoria, 1986), the Beazley Enquiry (1984), the Swan-Mackinnon Report (N.S.W., 1985), Education 2000 (Queensland, 1985), as well as the Quality of Education Review Report (Commonwealth, 1985).

There was an awareness by educationists at the Commonwealth level, at the beginning of 1985, that there were a number of field examples of educational programs involving Schools/TAFE cooperation in a number of States/Territories. This awareness gave rise to an interest in research into such programs -- into their philosophical basis and into their practice as evidenced in the field. This research project attempted to review such programs.
CHAPTER 2

THE PROJECT METHOD

2.1 Background

In August of 1984, a meeting of the Joint Commonwealth Schools Commission/Technical and Further Education Council Working Group identified a need for:

- coordinated national action to examine the desirability and feasibility of developing joint Schools/TAFE courses and shared credentials, and the need for the reform of existing assessment and credentialling practices which inhibit participation in education or training by the common 15 to 19 year old age group.

Subsequently, officers of the Commonwealth Schools Commission (including an involvement of the Curriculum Development Centre), the TAFE Council of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, and the TAFE National Centre for Research and Development developed a draft proposal entitled "The Development of Cooperative Programs and Exchange of Credit Between Secondary Schools and TAFE". (A copy of the proposal approved for funding by the two Commissions is included as Appendix A in Volume IV). This proposal was approved by the two Commissions in December 1984. As a result, a national project entitled the "TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project" was commissioned and jointly funded by the two Commissions. The project was undertaken by a Project Team of two people, Neil Jones and Zofia Krzemionka, who commenced work on the project in March 1985.

The Project Team was based at the TAFE National Centre for Research and Development. The project was managed by a Project Steering Committee (see Section 2.3).

2.2 Project Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for this project were approved by the Commonwealth Schools and Tertiary Education Commissions in December 1984. These were:

1. To consider current cooperative practices, in particular, the project will be seeking to:

   (a) describe the nature, objectives and extent of existing cooperation between Schools and TAFE with respect to cooperative programming and exchange of credit;

   (b) clarify the assumptions on which the respective roles of Schools and TAFE are based taking into account the document, "Schools and TAFE", jointly developed by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and the TAFE Council;

   (c) identify and document exemplary and promising cooperative practices, in particular, those factors which assist and facilitate those cooperative practices;

   (d) identify and describe those factors, including administrative, industrial, course design, etc. which have limited greater cooperation between the Secondary Schools and TAFE sectors;
(e) suggest objectives and procedures that will facilitate the adoption of effective cooperative practices on a wider scale;

(f) suggest strategies to be endorsed by both sectors, which will facilitate closer cooperation between Secondary Schools and TAFE. This will also entail procedures for accreditation/credentialling, curriculum design, and assessment/evaluation.

2. To gain the support of TAFE and Secondary School sectors in all States and Territories to undertake pilot projects involving close cooperation.

2.3 Management of the Project

The two Commissions established a joint Project Steering Committee to oversight and guide the project and to act as an expert reference group in support of the Project Team. The Steering Committee was jointly chaired by senior officers of the TAFE Council and the Schools Commission. Its membership was as follows:

* Margaret Crowley (Joint Chairperson), Commonwealth Schools Commission, (replaced by Nerida Mooney; replaced by Rochelle Getzler)

* Janet Sutton (Joint Chairperson), TAFE Council, (replaced by Jean Harvey; replaced by Veronica Barbeler)

* Patsy Cloake (Queensland TAFE), representing TAFETA

* John Hainsworth (WA TAFE), representing the Conference of TAFE Directors

* Ian Vaccini (NSW Education Department), representing the Directors-General of Education

* Gil Freeman, representing the Australian Teachers Federation (replaced by Bill Hannan)

* Peter Thomson, TAFE National Centre for Research and Development

* Laurie Howell, Curriculum Development Centre.

The Steering Committee met on five occasions during the course of the project as follows:

* 23rd April 1985, in Adelaide

* 19th July 1985, in Melbourne

* 15th October 1985, in Melbourne

* 14th February 1986, in Sydney

* 30th May 1986, in Adelaide.

The Project Team attended all meetings of the Steering Committee, and performed the Executive function for the committee. The Project Team prepared regular progress reports for the Steering Committee, the Curriculum Development Centre Council, the Commonwealth Schools Commission, the TAFE National Centre for Research and Development, the TAFE Council, and for the Directors of TAFE Authorities and Directors-General of Education Authorities. (Three progress reports are included as Appendix B in Volume IV.)
2.4 Intended Outcomes of the Project

The project proposal refers to five anticipated outcomes of the project as follows:

1. A report (or reports) documenting the nature and extent of existing cooperative practices;

2. Careful documentation, including film/video as appropriate, of exemplary and promising cooperative practices;

3. A discussion document (or documents) of an issues-options type;

4. Inputs to the Curriculum Development Centre Curriculum Information Network and to the National TAFE Clearinghouse;

5. Models for future Schools/TAFE cooperation.

The research activities for the project were accordingly designed to result in these outcomes -- refer to Section 2.6 below.

2.5 Project Definitions

Some major and/or frequently occurring terms are defined in this section. We adopted these terms as 'working' definitions for the purposes of the project. Some of the terms are new; most are not new but have been used in different ways by other writers and educational practitioners. As a result we felt it would be useful to the reader to present their definitions.

2.5.1 Secondary Schools (or Schools)

These are governmental and independent institutions providing organised educational programs for young people, generally aged 12 to 18 years, immediately following completion of their compulsory primary schooling.

2.5.2 Education Authorities

These are the governmental and independent agencies recognised by State and Commonwealth governments as providers of organised secondary schooling.

2.5.3 TAFE

This is Technical and Further Education. Often, as in the use of the term Schools/TAFE, TAFE means TAFE Colleges.

2.5.4 TAFE Authorities

These are the governmental agencies existing in each State/Territory which have the statewide responsibility for the provision of TAFE programs in TAFE Colleges.

2.5.5 Post-Compulsory

This is a term that refers to institutionalised educational provision that occurs any time after Year 10 of secondary schooling. (Strictly speaking this implies that secondary education up to and including Year 10 is compulsory. Whilst this is not the case -- since legally students are permitted to leave secondary schooling prior to completing Year 10 -- the term 'post-compulsory' is now widely used in a number of States/Territories in the way it is defined here.)
We therefore use it because of its general acceptance and considerable convenience.)

2.5.6 Higher Education

This is post-compulsory education provided by Universities and Colleges of Advanced Education.

2.5.7 Tertiary Education

This is post-compulsory education provided by Higher Education providers or TAFE providers.

2.5.8 Credential (or Certification)

This is the formal record, awarded to a student, upon satisfactory completion of the requirements of a course of study, in the form of a certificate or parchment.

2.5.9 Accreditation

This is the process of determining that the standards of a course of study are appropriate to the credential to which the course leads.

2.5.10 Secondary Accreditation Agencies

These are the authorities that have been established in each of the States/Territories whose responsibility it is to accredit courses of study provided by secondary schools.

2.5.11 Tertiary Entrance Score

This is the assessment score achieved by students in their senior school studies which is used by most institutions of Higher Education as the sole or prime measure in selecting students for entry to the institution.

Reference to 'tertiary entrance' in the report relates to 'tertiary entrance score'. 'Matriculation' would be a synonymous term used by some States/Territories.

2.5.12 Level 1, 2 and 3 Credentials

Level 1, level 2 and level 3 are analytical terms adopted for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the States/Territories.

A level 1 credential is earned by successful completion of a course or subject of study if the course or subject has been approved on a State-wide basis by the secondary accreditation agency to count in full towards a student's tertiary entrance score.

A level 2 credential is earned by successful completion of a course or subject of study if the course or subject has been recognised (or registered) by the secondary accreditation agency on a State-wide basis.

A level 3 credential is earned by successful completion of a course or subject of study if the course or subject is school based and school credentialled, and has been acknowledged as such by the secondary accreditation agency.
2.5.13 Senior Secondary School Certificate

This is the certificate or credential received by a student who satisfactorily fulfills the requirements of senior secondary schooling.

2.5.14 Credit (or Exemption)

This is advanced standing towards the award of a credential which is granted to a student on the basis of previous study. The student is given credit for, or exemption in one or more units or subjects without the requirement of further assessment.

2.5.15 Schools/TAFE Cooperative Program

This is a course, subject or unit of study provided for students at the level of Year 11 and/or 12 secondary schooling for which any of the curriculum, resources, teaching inputs or teaching location has been the subject of negotiation between TAFE and Education Authorities, either locally or centrally, and for which a joint credential (from TAFE and Secondary) exists, or is in the process of being negotiated.

Schools/TAFE cooperative programs are also referred to frequently in the report as Schools/TAFE programs, cooperative programs, or simply programs. (This definition excludes "link" or "career awareness" programs which are another example of a cooperative initiative between Schools and TAFE).

2.5.16 Cooperative Program Practitioner

This is an officer from either the Schools or TAFE sector who is involved in the teaching, design, or administration of a Schools/TAFE cooperative program.

2.5.17 Exemplary

This is a term used in reference to cooperative programs. An exemplary cooperative program means a program that is characterised by most or all of

* the provision of a joint Schools/TAFE credential
* the provision of additional study options for senior secondary students
* the capacity of the program to attract students who would otherwise discontinue their secondary education
* evidence that the program has been based on systematic analysis of student needs
* evidence that the curriculum for the program has been based on negotiations between TAFE and Schools

2.6 The Project Plan

A detailed project plan was prepared by the Project Team for consideration by the Steering Committee at its first meeting in April 1985 (attached as Appendix C in Volume IV). This plan outlined the proposed research activities, a reporting mechanism and timetable for the activities, and anticipated project outcomes both during the conduct of, and at the end of the project. The features of the plan are depicted in Figure 2.1 below.
Figure 2.1
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Central to the design of the project plan were five 'dimensions'. Figure 2.2 depicts these dimensions.
2.7 Review of Roles

This research project dimension was designed to attend to the stated goals of the project relating to a clarification of the respective roles of Schools and TAFE in the provision of education to 15 to 19 year olds. The project sponsors were aware of a number of State and Commonwealth reports of committees/working parties which had recently undertaken reviews or examinations of secondary education provision in Australia.

The focus for this dimension therefore was to be a review of these reports and other relevant literature and reports, particularly as these related to educational provision for the 15 to 19 year age group that is common to Schools and TAFE. We attempted to focus our reading on relevant literature and reports which dealt with Schools/TAFE cooperation, course credentialling, participation and equity, access, articulation, and youth, and we examined State/Territory policy documents relating to Schools/TAFE cooperation, where these could be obtained. The list of references provided in this report includes those documents, reports and papers that we canvassed in attempting to examine current views on the roles of Schools and TAFE, and State/Territory policy documents on Schools/TAFE cooperation.

During the course of the project, it became clearer that the range of cooperative programming practice in the field was rather more substantial than had been envisaged by the project proposers. The Steering Committee, and particularly the two Commissions, were keen for the project to capture as much information as possible about Schools/TAFE cooperative practice that was considered to be exemplary. As well, the Steering Committee was aware that a number of writers had been commissioned separately, to examine current views relating to the roles of Schools and TAFE. (For example, the work of Jim Williamson, referred to in Chapter 1, commissioned by the Commonwealth Schools Commission.)
For these reasons, and because the prime purpose of this project was seen as a
detailed examination of current exemplary cooperative practices, we sought to
widen the scope of the project as it related to the collection of relevant data
about the design and implementation of those Schools/TAFE cooperative programs
we had identified in the field across the States/Territories. This led to a
greater project effort on the second and third project dimensions, and a
consequent lesser effort on the first.

2.8 Range of Cooperative Programs

The project plan shows that we attempted to develop a 'national' inventory of
those Schools/TAFE cooperative programs identified in 1985. Our data collection
strategy for this research dimension was two-fold. We attempted to gain access
to quantitative data on Schools/TAFE cooperative programs through both
centralised and localised means, using an instrument, a 'checklist of
cooperative program characteristics', designed by us for this purpose. A copy
of this checklist of descriptive characteristics is included as Appendix D in
Volume IV.

We made field visits to all the States/Territories during the months of June to
October 1985. These field visits were a key data gathering strategy for all of
the project dimensions depicted in Figure 2.2, but they were of prime importance
in our efforts to determine a feasible means for gathering data about the number
and range of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs for inclusion in the proposed
national inventory. Over 200 people were interviewed during field visits to the
States/Territories. Interviewees were from one or more of the following groups
— officers from Education Authorities; Schools; TAFE Authorities; secondary and
TAFE accreditation agencies; teacher unions. Copies of interview schedules used
during these visits are included as Appendix F in Volume IV.

As it relates to this project dimension, our aim in conducting the interviews in
each State/Territory was to establish a means for gathering descriptive data
about as many cooperative programs as were known to exist in each
State/Territory. In some cases a centralised approach was adopted; in others, a
combination of centralised and localised means were employed. These approaches
are described briefly below.

(a) Centralised: In those States/Territories where Schools/TAFE cooperative
programs were coordinated centrally, and/or where the central authorities (both
Schools and TAFE) kept records of the range of programs, we sought to gather
descriptive data via centralised means. That is to say, we sent multiple copies
of the checklist to officers we had identified during our field visits as
centrally responsible for these programs. We sought their cooperation in
distributing these checklists on our behalf to individual schools and colleges,
or in otherwise providing the descriptive data from their central records where
these were held. It was possible to gain most of the relevant data by this
means for ACT, NSW, WA and Queensland.

(b) Combined Centralised/Localised: In the other States/Territories we gathered
the required data by centralised means where such records were kept. Where this
was not possible we sent individual checklists to individual schools and
colleges as and when we learned of another program that we felt may satisfy the
definition of a Schools/TAFE cooperative program adopted for this project.
Relevant data were collected largely by these means in SA, Tasmania, Victoria
and the NT.

The descriptive data were sought as described above during the months of October
1985 to January 1986. As is reported in Chapter 3, the data gathered for all
States/Territories except for NSW apply to those cooperative programs we were
able to identify were conducted during 1985. The NSW data apply to cooperative programs that were proposed to be conducted in 1986. The reasons for this variation are reported in Chapter 3.

The selection of the descriptive data to be sought for each cooperative program for inclusion in the inventory was based on the critical information needs that had been identified from our reading, from discussion at two Steering Committee meetings, from data collected on our preliminary visits to States/Territories, and arising from the issues that had been signalled as important to the Schools and Tertiary Education Commissions during 1985. Broadly, this descriptive information was of five types -- pertaining to contextual; resourcing; curricular; accreditation; and other selected quantitative descriptors for cooperative programs. Thirty three descriptive program characteristics were thus identified, and were included in the checklist. These characteristics, with explanatory notes, are presented in Table 2.1 below:
Table 2.1
Descriptive Characteristics of Cooperative Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Explanation of Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>Is program located in schools/colleges in the city or country, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auspice</td>
<td>Is program conducted under auspices of Government or Non-Government schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transport of students</td>
<td>Is travel from school to college by car, bus, taxi, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Socio-economic context</td>
<td>Is program located in rural, industrial, tourist, etc setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unemployment context</td>
<td>Is unemployment rate of schools/college area high, medium, or low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Year 10-11 retention</td>
<td>Is the retention rate of the schools for years 10-11 high, medium or low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Year 11-12 retention</td>
<td>Is the retention rate for the schools for years 11-12 high, medium or low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Funding source 1</td>
<td>Is the funding for the program from Commonwealth or State/Territory sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Funding source 2</td>
<td>Is the funding for the program from PEP or mainstream sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Funding administration</td>
<td>Is funding for the program administered by schools, TAFE or jointly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Program costs</td>
<td>Are the costs of the program met by schools, TAFE or jointly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Institutional location</td>
<td>Is the program delivered in schools, TAFE, jointly, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Is the program taught by teachers of schools, TAFE, jointly, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Participating schools</td>
<td>How many schools participate in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Potential schools</td>
<td>How many schools are geographically (or otherwise) feasible to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Program derivation</td>
<td>Does the curriculum for the program derive from existing TAFE courses or is it an integrated curriculum, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17 Vocational orientation</th>
<th>What is the vocational basis for the program (e.g. accounting, or plumbing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Attendance pattern</td>
<td>What rate of attendance at TAFE does the program require (1, 2 or 3 per week, or full-time or block)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Timing</td>
<td>Is the program conducted inside or outside school hours or both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Total duration</td>
<td>How many hours attendance does the program require (in school; in TAFE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Program accreditation</td>
<td>Is the program accredited by TAFE, the secondary accreditation agency or both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Program credential</td>
<td>Does the program afford a secondary credential at level 1, 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Career pathways</td>
<td>What occupational areas does the program lead towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Educational pathways</td>
<td>What further educational programs does the program earn credit or exemption in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Program initiation</td>
<td>Was the program initiated at the central or regional or local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Student year level</td>
<td>Are the students in the program year 11, year 12 or both, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Total enrolment</td>
<td>How many year 11 and year 12 students are enrolled in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Gender distribution</td>
<td>How many females and males are enrolled in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Program history</td>
<td>In what years has/is the program been/to be offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Curriculum documentation</td>
<td>How extensive is the curriculum documentation for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 Program evaluation</td>
<td>Is there an evaluation mechanism for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 Student access</td>
<td>Is the program open to all students or is access limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 In-service for teachers</td>
<td>Is in-service training provided for TAFE or school teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9 Case Studies of Programs

An important purpose of the preliminary field visits to each of the States/Territories described in the previous section was the identification of 'exemplary' cooperative programs -- programs that would serve as suitable case studies for the project. This research dimension of the project was therefore designed to gather critical qualitative as well as quantitative data on cooperative programs. Central to the qualitative data that were to be sought via case studies were data on those factors which appeared to facilitate or hinder cooperative practices between Schools and TAFE. Such factors thought to be important from the outset included administrative, industrial, curriculum and accreditation factors. Others became apparent during the conduct of the preliminary work on the project.

2.9.1 Case Study Selection

A project document entitled "Selection of Case Studies for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project", included as Appendix G in Volume IV, sets out the 17 criteria that were used to select case studies for the project, and the 41 cooperative programs selected by the Project Team as potential case studies. The 41 cooperative programs were then considered by the Steering Committee, and a selection made of those programs that would serve as the most informative as case studies for the project. Part C of Appendix G shows how each of the 41 potential programs were rated using the nominated criteria.

By and large the criteria were developed to ensure the selection of cooperative programs that were consistent with the definition of 'exemplary' adopted for the project. In this way, a 'judgemental' rather than a 'representative' sampling principle was used to select programs for case study. That is, a number of the programs selected for case study were necessarily atypical of the majority of such programs in Australia. The 17 criteria used to select programs for case study are described in Table 2.2 below.
Table 2.2
Criterion for Selection of Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>USE OF CRITERION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Geographical location &amp; transport accessibility of program to students.</td>
<td>1. Select programs to achieve a spread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Socio-economic environment of students' local community.</td>
<td>2. Select programs to achieve a spread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Source of funding for program, viz:</td>
<td>3. Select programs funded from a range of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) from Federal or State funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) from PEP or alternative votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutional location of the program, i.e. in TAFE Colleges, in Schools or in both.</td>
<td>4. Select some programs where teaching is conducted in Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teaching responsibility for the program, i.e. by TAFE, School teachers or both.</td>
<td>5. Select some programs where teaching is undertaken by School teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vocational orientation of the program</td>
<td>6. Select some programs which do not have a traditional TAFE trade base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Existence of a program credential with (a) TAFE</td>
<td>7. Purposely select programs which have secured (or are in the process of securing) a credential for the program from (a) &amp; (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Secondary Education and of cross-credentialling between (a) &amp; (b).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Existence of articulation pathways for the program through (a) TAFE</td>
<td>8. Purposely select programs which provide articulation pathways through (a), (b), (c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) other Tertiary institutions (c) work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Gender distribution of students undertaking programs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>9. Purposely select programs in order to achieve a balance of traditional male/female vocational orientations.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Specificity of needs of special groups - Aborigines, non-English speaking people, disabled.</strong></td>
<td><strong>10. Purposely select some programs designed to meet the needs of special groups.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Degree of centralisation/decentralisation of the curriculum: planning process for the cooperative program.</strong></td>
<td><strong>11. Select programs to achieve a spread.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Degree of curriculum negotiation between TAFE and Schools personnel in designing program.</strong></td>
<td><strong>12. Select programs to achieve a spread.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Extent to which a student (or community) needs assessment has provided basis for development of program.</strong></td>
<td><strong>13. Purposely select programs which have been designed resulting from a needs assessment.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Apparent harmony of cooperative arrangements between Schools &amp; TAFE.</strong></td>
<td><strong>14. Select programs to achieve a spread.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Existence of an evaluation mechanism for the cooperative program.</strong></td>
<td><strong>15. Purposely select programs which have an evaluation mechanism.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Accessibility of program for the purposes of case study.</strong></td>
<td><strong>16. Purposely select programs which are accessible to being case studied.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Public/Independent distribution of participating Schools.</strong></td>
<td><strong>17. Purposely select some programs in which independent schools are participating.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Steering Committee agreed that sampling criterion Number 7 from Table 2.2 should carry the greatest weight. That is to say, cooperative programs which enabled students to achieve a joint credential were accorded the highest priority in the selection process.

While criterion Number 7 was prime in the selection process, we also found that, in practice, criterion Number 16 (accessibility of the program to case study) became critical. In determining accessibility of programs a number of factors were considered. These factors included location, cost, timeliness, political sensitivity and human resources. In some cases, programs intended for case
study were found to be inaccessible because of their isolated location -- one at Yuendumu in the NT, several hundred kilometres from Alice Springs, for example, was discarded for this reason. Other intended case studies were foregone due to the cost that would have been incurred in undertaking the study. A number were likewise judged to be inaccessible because they were not able to be completed within the time constraints of the project. At least one was discarded from the list of intended studies because local administrators judged it to be politically unwise to focus the kind of attention on the program that would inevitably accompany a national case study. A number of other intended case studies were abandoned due to our inability to find suitable researchers to undertake the study on our behalf.

2.9.2 Case Study Contributions

At the time the project was originally conceived, it was anticipated that the number of cooperative programs that would be suitable for case study would be quite small -- of the order of six. As has been reported already, we identified a much larger number than this during our preliminary work. Since a major goal for the project was to gather as much 'field' data on exemplary programs as possible, the Steering Committee took the decision to attempt to gather as many case studies as was feasible within the constraints of the project.

In keeping with this decision, we sought to enlist the support of case study 'contributors'. These would be persons who had first hand knowledge of a program because of their own work, and who would be in a position to undertake the research required to compile a case study according to the requirements of the project. As well, case study contributions were negotiated with persons who had an interest in the subject of Schools/TAFE cooperation, and who were reputed for their case study research experience in education.

Because case studies were to be undertaken by different persons outside the Project Team, it became important to consider how we would achieve comparability of case study findings, especially since the collection of critical qualitative data was to be central to the case study dimension of the project. For this purpose we designed case study guidelines for use by contributors. The guidelines so designed are included as Appendix H in Volume IV. The guidelines are in two parts -- "Guidelines for Case Study Contributors" and "Guidelines for Case Study Writers". The first of these were the guidelines to be used for 'major' case studies; the second for 'minor' case studies.

The distinction made between 'minor' and 'major' case studies was one that was, in large part, determined by the feasibility factors referred to in the discussion of criterion Number 16, in the previous section. That is to say, where we were able to identify a potential contributor for an intended case study, the availability and capacity of that contributor to satisfy the requirements of a major case study (as specified in the guidelines) determined whether the status of the study would be either 'major' or 'minor'. If the contributor was unable to undertake a sufficiently searching examination of the program to be case studied, but was nevertheless willing and able to provide the basic descriptive information required for the program, then the case study was negotiated with that contributor as a 'minor' study.

In summary, the case study guidelines required that case study contributions be made in the form of a report document organised into the following sections:

1. History of the Program
   A descriptive account of how the program was initiated, who was involved, and the reasons for initiation.
2. **Design Process for the Program**
   A description of the planning process involved in the development of the program -- who was involved; how much did it cost; were student needs analysed?

3. **Placement of the Program into School/TAFE Offerings**
   A description of how the program has been placed into the full range of curricular offerings in the School(s) and/or TAFE College(s), including timetable arrangements.

4. **Characteristics of the Program**
   A description of the features of the program as per the 'checklist of program characteristics'.

5. **Other Program Features**
   A description of other features, such as impact on student subject choice, implementation problems, unanticipated outcomes.

6. **Impressions**
   Any evaluative impressions gained from students, teachers, administrators, parents, employers, etc.

The reader interested in examining the different expectations for 'major' and 'minor' case studies is referred to the guidelines for these in Appendix H.

Where case studies were contributed by people outside the Project Team, one of a number of different 'commissioning' arrangements was negotiated with the contributors. In some cases, contributors undertook case studies as part of their normal School or TAFE duties. For these, we sought approval from their employing agency for the contributors to undertake the work. In other instances, contributors were engaged on a 'fee-for-service' basis, and they undertook the work as private practice. The majority of case studies, especially 'major' studies involved the negotiation of a 'fee', either of an 'honorarium' or 'consultancy' type.

### 2.9.3 Case Studies Undertaken

In all, 14 case studies were completed under the auspices of the project. The case study documents are included in Volume II of the report. Our analyses of the case studies are also included in Volume II, and comprise Chapter 4 of this volume of the report, in the form of 'case study commentaries'. Where case studies were contributed by people, as commissioned work for the project, their authorship is recognised at the beginning of the case study document, and their contribution is acknowledged in our commentaries.

The case studies completed were:

**Major Case Studies**

1. The Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE) - case study of a cooperative program in SA.

2. Equine Management - case study of a cooperative program in WA.

3. Hervey Bay Senior College - case study of a Schools/TAFE cooperative initiative in Queensland.

5. Joint Secondary Schools/TAFE Program (Port Kembla Cluster) - case study of a cooperative program in NSW.

6. Integrated Studies Programs (ISP) - case study of a cooperative program in SA.

7. Basic Electronics Program - case study of a cooperative program in the ACT.

8. The Cooperative Program Conducted by Gold Coast College of TAFE - case study of a cooperative program in Queensland.

9. Pilot Vocational HSC (Walgett High School and Orana Community College) - case study of a cooperative program in NSW.

10. Business Studies Program (The Blackfriars Model) - case study of a cooperative program in SA.

Minor Case Studies

1. Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (PIPE) - case study of a cooperative program in the NT.

2. The Joint Horticulture Project - case study of a Schools/TAFE cooperative initiative in the ACT.

3. Farm Management Program - case study of a cooperative program in WA.

4. South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program - case study of a cooperative program in Queensland.

2.10 Networking

The project plan depicted in Table 2.1 shows that the project also had a 'networking' function -- the first of the two 'developmental' dimensions of the project. Two project activities were conceived to attend to this dimension. The first activity was initiated at the commencement of the project -- a National Network Listing of Schools/TAFE cooperative program practitioners. This was a State by State listing of the names and addresses of persons known by us to be involved and/or interested in Schools/TAFE cooperation.

Having initiated the national network early in the project's life, and produced a 'first edition' network listing, we undertook the role of 'keeper' of the network. As we learned of more people, either interested or involved in Schools/TAFE cooperation around the States/Territories, we updated the listing, and made copies of the listing available on request. In all, we revised the first edition seven times up to January 1986. The last edition carried approximately 500 names and addresses. A copy of this is included as Appendix I of Volume IV.

The second activity designed to support the networking dimension was a 'Newsheet', prepared by the Project Team and distributed at regular intervals to National Network members. The 'Newsheet' aimed to:

1. Identify practitioners, administrators, policy makers, researchers and teachers who were active, or involved in, the area of the Schools/TAFE interface.

2. Inform people in the network of the progress of the national project, and of some of its findings, as these emerged.
3. Bring into contact with one another people working in the area of the Schools/TAFE interface.

4. Provide a forum for the exchange of ideas amongst people in the area of the Schools/TAFE interface.

Three editions of the Newsheet were circulated to network members during the life of the project. Copies of these are included as Appendix J of Volume IV. During the project, it was anticipated that, if the network and Newsheet were judged as useful, these may have a life beyond that of the project.

Also during the course of the project, it was anticipated that once findings began to emerge, and to encourage the commencement of pilot cooperative programs, a national workshop of Schools/TAFE-cooperative program practitioners may have been organised. This did not prove feasible during 1985 as it was outside the financial and time constraints of the project's resources. It may be that, following the project's report, this initiative is again considered as an effective means to promote the project's findings.

2.11 Promotion

The last project dimension depicted in the project plan relates to the promotion of the project. This was not intended to be a central purpose of the project; rather promotional activities were viewed by the Steering Committee as important supportive activities to the goals of the project, especially related to the second 'term of reference' reported in Section 2.2 above.

A number of opportunities arose during the course of the project for us to combine project-promotional activities with activities which served the purpose of promotion of the concept of, and approaches to Schools/TAFE cooperation. These activities took the form of 'appearances' (papers delivered, or information sessions conducted) by the Project Team in various forums, and a number of contributions to educational journals. These included:

**Appearances**

1. Presentation of paper on purpose of project and concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation, given at SA State Conference of Australian College of Education (June 1985).

2. Conduct of workshop session on purpose of project and concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation at State Conference on Curriculum Cooperation organised by the SA Central Schools/TAFE Coordinating Committee (June 1985).

3. Presentation of progress reports at meetings of the SA Central Schools/TAFE Coordinating Committee (May, September, December 1985).

4. Presentation of progress report to Director General of SA Department of Education, representing the Commonwealth Schools Commission National PEP Advisory Committee (July 1985).


6. Presentation of paper on purpose of project and concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation, given at PEP Officers National Conference in Hobart (October 1985).

8. Conduct of workshop session on purpose of project and concept of, and approaches to Schools/TAFE cooperation, at National TAFE Conference in Adelaide (November 1985).

9. Presentation of paper on purpose of project and concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation, at TAFETA Annual General Meeting in Brisbane (January 1986).

10. Presentation of paper on purpose of project and progress to a joint inservice seminar of ACT Schools Authority (March 1986).

11. Presentation of progress report to SA Eastern Area Committee for Cooperative Programs (March 1986).

12. Presentation of paper on purpose of project and concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation, at NSW Regional Consultants' Seminar on Joint Programs (April 1986).

13. Presentation of paper on purpose of project and some initial findings, at SA Institute for Educational Research (July 1986).

Journal Contributions


3. News item in the newsletter of the Australian Curriculum Studies Association, Curriculum Concerns.
CHAPTER 3
THE RANGE AND NATURE OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

Introductory Note

The programs included in the review in this chapter are those about which data were accessible during the data collection phase of our study, from March 1985 to January 1986. The data for NSW relate to programs that were, at the time the data were collected, proposed for 1986. The data for the programs in the other seven States/Territories relate to programs conducted during 1985.

The data for NSW were compiled by the project team from records provided by Schools/TAFE administrators in NSW. In some cases, items of data sought in the checklist used for this purpose, were not available. Consequently, in a few of the Tables that appear in this chapter, there is an inordinately high rate of 'no response'. This does not reflect an unwillingness on the part of NSW officers to provide the data sought; rather the data were not available. The data for the other seven States/Territories were provided directly by Schools/TAFE administrators, using the checklist designed for that purpose by the researchers.

As with any research undertaking which attempts to examine an educational innovation in its early stages of development, the innovation itself is in a state of constant and considerable change. This presents difficulties for researchers endeavouring to draw conclusions from data which, once collected, are known to have changed. For this study, the difficulties presented by the changing nature of cooperative programs were substantial. Furthermore, changes have occurred since January 1986, especially in NSW, where we are now aware that considerably less than the number of programs included in the review in this chapter are actually being offered in 1986. We also know that some of the programs that are being offered in 1986 were not included amongst those that were proposed in 1985. Some changes have also occurred in other States, although these would appear to be less substantial.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, it was important to draw the research project to a close so that its project audiences could consider findings in this important area of educational endeavour. To this end, we did not include changes to the data occurring after January 1986. It is appreciated that this detracts from the power of the quantitative analysis presented in this chapter.

We do feel, however, that the data presented are sufficient to form an inventory of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in Australia. It is our hope that this inventory will be revised (and up-dated) on a regular basis, thereby providing a useful data base for those involved in the planning and delivery of such programs.

3.1 The Incidence of Cooperative Programs

Our study has identified 234 Schools/TAFE cooperative programs (as these are defined for the purposes of this study in Chapter 2) in the Australian States and Territories. We believe, however, that the full range of programs offered
by schools and colleges in Australia could exceed this number by as many as 30. That there is a gap at all, or that there is uncertainty about the actual number of programs Australia-wide, results partly from our adoption of an 'inclusive' definition for cooperative programs, and partly from the limitations of the data collection methods employed to identify programs in this study. These have been outlined in Chapter 2.

The State/Territory distribution of cooperative programs is shown in Table 3.1.

**TABLE 3.1**

Distribution of Cooperative Programs by State/Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>173 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>34 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together NSW, QLD, and WA account for 94% of cooperative programs identified in Australia. The comparatively large numbers (173 in NSW; 34 in QLD; 11 in WA) of cooperative programs in these States is due, in the main, to the existence of a fairly strong commitment to a policy of Schools/TAFE cooperation.

As well, and in part reflecting the promulgation of statements of policy by the educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) in these States, centrally 'organised' Schools/TAFE cooperation has had a comparatively longer, although
still short, history in these three States—efforts to centrally organise cooperative programs appear to have commenced in 1984 in NSW and QLD. In WA this occurred in 1985. 'Organisation' of cooperative programs is evidenced by a number of factors including centralised initiatives to:

* structure the pattern of programs offered according to a state-wide plan
* determine joint (schools and TAFE) accreditation for the programs
* determine and implement joint policy for the administration of programs
* determine and implement equitable funding arrangements for programs.

The estimated gap between the number of actual and identified cooperative programs (referred to above) is probably most evident in the remaining five States/Territories, namely, in ACT, NT, SA, TAS, and VIC. Because Schools/TAFE initiatives have been less centrally organised to date in these States/Territories, an identification of the full range of cooperative programs, by centralised data collection means, has been more difficult to achieve in these cases. Further, the conduct of fieldwork during our study has shown that, during 1985 at least, some cooperative Schools/TAFE initiatives had occurred at the local level without a complete awareness of officers at the central level. We feel this may have been so, especially in the case of TAS and VIC, where centralised efforts to coordinate cooperative Schools/TAFE initiatives, were least apparent.

One final comment needs to be made about the incidence of cooperative programs as depicted by Table 3.1. This relates to the caution that should be exercised in making interstate comparisons about the extent of Schools/TAFE cooperation solely from that quantitative data. Table 3.1 presents data relating to the discrete number of cooperative 'programs'. We are not confident that it affords a reliable picture concerning the comparative extent of Schools/TAFE 'cooperation' in the States/Territories. Indeed there are many other modes and instances of Schools/TAFE cooperation being practised in some States/Territories which were not the focus for this study — for example many of the link (career awareness) courses jointly conducted between Schools and TAFE.

Furthermore, reference to Tables 3.12 and 3.19 (see pp.46 and 58 respectively) shows that what has been recorded as one program in Table 3.1 could range from (say) a 40 hour unit with one school participating, to a 600 hour unit with in excess of 10 schools participating. A more comprehensive and reliable indicator of the comparative presence of cooperative programs in each of the States/Territories can be provided only after the qualitative data collected via the case studies (Chapter 4) has been synthesised with the quantitative data presented in this chapter.

3.2 The Environment of Cooperative Programs

Tables 3.2 and 3.3 show that the geographical and demographic distribution of cooperative programs identified in this study is spread fairly evenly between city (44%) and country (55%), and between suburban locations (50%) and rural locations (49%), with a substantial proportion (16%) also situated in industrial/commercial locations either in city or country centres.
### TABLE 3.2
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Geographic Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>103 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>128 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.
2. The classification 'resort' refers to locations where the prime economic activity of the location is holiday/recreational, such as along the Gold Coast in south eastern Queensland.

### TABLE 3.3
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Local Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Environment</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>114 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban/Inner-City</td>
<td>117 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Commercial</td>
<td>38 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.
Table 3.4 shows that the majority (85%) of cooperative programs identified are offered in schools for which respondents estimated medium to high rates of youth unemployment prevailed in their local area. Correspondingly, Table 3.5 indicates that the majority (85%) of cooperative programs are offered in schools which have exhibited, in recent years, medium to low rates of student retention from Year 10 to Year 11.

**TABLE 3.4**

*Classification of Cooperative Programs by Local Unemployment Rate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Average (&lt;10%)</td>
<td>25 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (10%-25%)</td>
<td>140 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average (&gt;25%)</td>
<td>58 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.5

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Participating School(s) Retention Rate for Year 10-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention Rate Year 10-11</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (&lt;60%)</td>
<td>42 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (60%-75%)</td>
<td>156 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (&gt;75%)</td>
<td>31 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Schools officers interviewed during our fieldwork pointed to more recent increases in retention from Year 10 to 11, at their school, and suggested that this possibly resulted from the introduction of a cooperative program. The data collected were unable to provide evidence of this claim. We do note, however, that in Australia in recent years, generally increasing retention rates from Years 10 to 11 have been witnessed (these are discussed in Chapter 1). These increases have been ascribed to a number of factors. It would be difficult to gauge the extent of causality between increasing retention rates and Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in a particular school at this early stage of their development. Notwithstanding this, the picture of the typical school currently offering a senior school curriculum which includes Schools/TAFE subject choices is one of a school situated in an area of above average youth unemployment, and of below average Year 10 to 11 retentivity.

3.3 The Funding of Cooperative Programs

Respondents to the cooperative program checklist used in this study indicated that the major source of funding for meeting the costs of development and implementation of cooperative programs was joint Commonwealth PEP and State/Territory mainstream establishment. Table 3.6 shows that 84% of cooperative programs identified were funded in this fashion and that a further 10% of cooperative programs were funded solely from Commonwealth PEP sources.
The great majority of sole State funding of cooperative programs identified in this study was accounted for in QLD, where in 1985 a policy decision had been taken to provide substantial funding for cooperative programs from the State budget, in order to relieve concern by school and college personnel over the continuity of a program which was otherwise solely dependent upon Commonwealth PEP funding.

Tables 3.7 and 3.8 relate to the administration of financial resources for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs.
### TABLE 3.7
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Funding Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Administration</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAFE Administered</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Administered</td>
<td>34 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint TAFE/Schools Administered</td>
<td>186 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3.8
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Program Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Costs</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met by TAFE</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met by Schools</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Jointly by TAFE/Schools</td>
<td>218 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 shows that funds for the majority (79%) of cooperative programs identified in this study were allocated and administered jointly by Schools and TAFE Authorities. In most cases this means that funding is allocated centrally.
by a committee with joint representation from both the Schools and TAFE and that, regionally or locally, funds are administered by a coordinating team or committee with joint representation from the schools and colleges concerned in that region or location.

For example in NSW, an Inter-Departmental Committee on Joint Schools/TAFE Courses is responsible for the allocation of funds from a central budget (drawn partly from Commonwealth PEP funds) to regions and locations. (The size of the statewide allocation of PEP funds to Schools/TAFE programs is pre-determined by the centralised authorities in NSW). At the regional or local level, Regional Schools/TAFE Consultants (employed by the Department of Education), or school or college coordinators consult with their counterparts to administer funds at the local level. Similarly in SA, the Central Schools/TAFE Coordinating Committee (which has joint representation) recommends the allocation of funds to regions and locations, and regional officers confer jointly to administer those allocated funds to schools and colleges.

Table 3.8 indicates that for 93% of cooperative programs identified, the associated developmental, running and hidden costs have been met jointly by Schools and TAFE Authorities not necessarily in the same proportions. This would appear to be a somewhat surprising picture in the light of the number of Schools officers interviewed during our fieldwork who identified the 'user-pays' principle when describing the means of meeting the costs of school students receiving instruction from TAFE teachers. (The 'user-pays' principle, in a Schools/TAFE cooperative context, means quite simply that schools are charged by the TAFE college for the provision of facilities and/or teacher instruction time to their students. Schools meet these charges out of their allocated PEP funds, or from other school funds.)

Interviews with Schools officers at the central level indicated clearly that the majority of Schools/TAFE funding was borne by Schools.

The apparent discrepancy between the perceptions of fieldwork interviewees and checklist respondents has at least two possible explanations. Firstly, it is likely that fieldwork interviewees for this study (most of whom were at the school or college level) may have been unaware of the nature of the arrangements made at a central and joint planning level to enable the school to cover the running costs of the cooperative program. For example, in one instance at least, central officers interviewed reported to us that 'transfers' of PEP funds (between TAFE and Schools) had been effected at the central level. Without a knowledge of this arrangement a field officer may develop an impression that the school is being asked to meet all the running costs for the program.

Another possible explanation for this discrepant view relates to the fact that the great majority of checklist responses came from centralised officers in those States/Territories where cooperative program funding arrangements had been centrally organised. It is likely that the 'gap' between actual and identified cooperative programs, referred to in Section 3.1 above, could account for a larger number of cooperative programs where the running costs were met by schools solely, according to the principle of 'user-pays'. In these cases, and a number of such cases (6%) have been identified in Table 3.8, we found it was more likely that the school had negotiated 'one-off' funding arrangements with the local TAFE college. This was more likely to have occurred in VIC and TAS, and to a lesser extent, in locally negotiated arrangements in ACT, QLD, and WA.
3.4 The Delivery of Cooperative Programs

Tables 3.9 and 3.10 show that the major responsibility for the delivery of cooperative programs lies with the TAFE sector. Ninety-four per cent of cooperative programs identified in this study (Table 3.9) are located in a TAFE college -- that is to say, the cooperative program (in most cases comprising an existing TAFE subject or unit of study) is delivered in a TAFE college, using the facilities of the TAFE college. Ninety-three per cent of cooperative programs identified (Table 3.10) are taught by TAFE teachers. The delivery of only 6% of cooperative programs involves Schools.

**TABLE 3.9**

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Institutional Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>(94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint TAFE/Schools</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.
2. The classification 'other' refers to programs for which a component was located outside institutions - i.e. in the community or workforce.
TABLE 3.10

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>218 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint TAFE/Schools</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In large part, this apparent 'lopsidedness' in the delivery of cooperative programs, when their organisation and funding has been relatively shared, results directly from the derivation of the majority of cooperative programs — shown in Table 3.11.
TABLE 3.11

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Program Derivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Derivation</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing TAFE Subject(s)/Course(s)</td>
<td>217 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified TAFE Subject(s)/Course(s)</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Curriculum</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially Designed Course</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.

Table 3.11 shows that 93% of cooperative programs comprise no more and no less than existing TAFE subjects or courses. This preponderance of TAFE content in cooperative programs is mostly accounted for by the 3 States identified as relatively 'organised' in their cooperative program administration in Section 3.1 above -- NSW, QLD and WA.

Because these States have tended to adopt central policies which ensure that successful completion of a Schools/TAFE cooperative program will earn the student a TAFE-accredited award, the design of the TAFE component of the program has been crucially dependent upon a criterion of inclusion of established accredited TAFE studies. This of course has meant that, for the cooperative program to maintain the accredited TAFE standard, its delivery depends upon TAFE teaching resources, facilities and teachers.

It is our view that a great deal can be learned from the way in which these States have approached the central coordination of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. The approaches adopted by these States are outlined in Chapter 5. As well, case studies of cooperative programs typically designed as a result of these centralised approaches are commented on in Chapter 4.

It is also our view that much can be learned from the 6% of cooperative programs (Tables 3.9 and 3.10) which are not located solely in a TAFE college, and which are not taught solely by TAFE teachers. These programs are located either in Schools, or partly in Schools and partly in TAFE, and they are taught by School teachers, or jointly by Schools and TAFE teachers. The group of 8% of cooperative programs identified in Table 3.11 as comprising 'modified TAFE subjects/courses', or an 'integrated curriculum', correlates highly with the
group of 6% identified in Tables 3.9 and 3.10. A number of cooperative programs from this group also serve as case studies - commentaries on these are presented in Chapter 4.

3.5 The Size of Cooperative Clusters of Schools

The majority (82%) of cooperative programs identified are conducted between a TAFE college and a 'cluster' of schools (see Table 3.12 below). By a 'cluster' of schools is meant simply a group of schools in fairly close geographical proximity to one another, and in close proximity to a TAFE college, and where the schools cooperate with the college in a corporate manner. Often the schools cluster will comprise a group of schools in a formally established Departmental region or sub-region; other times the cluster will comprise a natural grouping of schools where there has been informal agreement amongst the schools to cooperatively negotiate with the local TAFE college.

**TABLE 3.12**

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Number of Colleges/Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Colleges/Schools</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>(45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12 shows that 45% of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs involve either 2, 3, or 4 schools in a cluster which cooperates with the TAFE college. The range 2-4 is the most common cluster size; 27% of cooperative programs involve from 5 to 10 schools in a cluster; 10% of cooperative programs involve more than 10 schools in a cluster; and 18% of cooperative programs identified involve a one-to-one cooperative relationship with the TAFE college.

Whether clusters have been arranged on formal lines (as in NSW), or whether informally constituted, it appears that a number of administrative and educational advantages are to be gained from clustering. Economies of scale (such as the creation of a larger pool of School students enabling the provision of wider TAFE subject choice) would seem to be of advantage to Schools. As well, the considerable organisational and administrative arrangements that are
required to be made to accommodate school students in the TAFE college appear to be simplified where a cluster of schools exists. Here, rather than conducting (say) 2, 3, 4, or 5 separate negotiations with separate schools in its area to arrange subject availability, timetabling, etc., the college is able to negotiate once with the officer or committee representing the corporate interests and needs of the cluster.

It is also evident from our work that some difficulties have been encountered in the administration of a number of the clusters identified in this study. Often, particularly if the cluster comprises schools that are widely dispersed geographically, satisfactory transportation of students to the college has been difficult to organise. In these cases the physical barriers to ensuring all students are able to travel (by bus, for example) to the TAFE college, and to ensuring their arrival is synchronised, within the time constraints that prevail, and further to arrange for students to be transported back to their school -- often in time to attend a timetabled class at the school -- are substantial. Transportation and other organisational difficulties are described, where they are relevant to particular case studies, in Volume II of this report.

The range of transport modes used by students for the cooperative programs in this review is shown in Table 3.13. The high rate of 'no response' in this table makes it difficult to draw any conclusions regarding differences in transport modes.
### Table 3.13

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Method of Student Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Transportation</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Car</td>
<td>19 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Bus</td>
<td>26 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Provision</td>
<td>25 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>159 (68%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.

The 18% of cooperative programs (43 programs) that are based on a one school:one college relationship, identified in Table 3.12, are in many instances the product of natural selection. That is to say, due to geographical isolation from other schools and/or transportation difficulties like those outlined above, the establishment of a cluster of schools in the area has not been feasible. For these, the only possible Schools/TAFE cooperative arrangement has been of the one-to-one kind. However, as can be seen from Table 3.14, for the great majority of those cooperative programs identified outside NSW, (where nearly all cooperative programs are based on a cluster arrangement), the estimated potential school cluster size for cooperative programs already existing is greater than one.


### TABLE 3.14

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Potential Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Schools which could be participating in the program at that location</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>15 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>15 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>184 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** NSW accounted for the majority of the 78% of 'no response'.

In fact checklist respondents for 44 (or 72%) of the 61 non-NSW cooperative programs identified in this study estimated that the potential school cluster size was greater than one. For many of these, the estimated potential school cluster size exceeded the actual number of schools currently participating in the cooperative program. In these cases, it is apparent that existing cooperative arrangements could be extended to either establish a cluster, or to increase the size of an existing cluster.

The quite different cluster structures that have been identified amongst the cooperative programs included in this study are described in some detail in a number of the case studies that are presented in Vol. II of this report.
Suffice to say here that a number of the cluster structures identified show that clustering does not necessarily imply that the curriculum provisions for all students are reduced to the 'lowest common denominator'. Rather a number of the current cluster structures being employed in the field show that wider student choice and more flexible administrative arrangements are possible through the schools clustering approach.

3.6 The Curriculum Design Process for Cooperative Programs

The discussion already presented in Section 3.4 above has made reference to the heavy reliance on existing accredited TAFE subjects/courses that is evident in the design process for cooperative programs included in this study. This characteristic is amply illustrated in Table 3.11 above. Some of the likely reasons for this reliance have already been outlined. Others are taken up in the discussion of case studies presented in Chapter 4, and in Chapter 6, which presents a synthesis of findings from this study.

Notwithstanding this, Table 3.11 shows that only 3.5% of identified cooperative programs are either 'integrated curricula' or 'specially designed courses'. A further 5% of cooperative programs were identified as relying upon a 'modification' of existing TAFE curricula in the design process. This could give rise to concern that, in the curriculum design process, sufficient weighting is not given to an assessment of the specific needs and aspirations of students who choose to participate in Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. Table 3.15, however, shows that for the great majority (96%) of cooperative programs, for which there was a checklist response, the program itself was initiated at the local level — indicating that the specific needs and aspirations of local students would have been apparent to course designers. As well, student preferences are being exercised when they choose from cooperative programs covering a range of established TAFE courses/subjects that have been offered to them.

**TABLE 3.15**

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Program Initiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Initiated</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiated by Central Authority (i.e. Statewide)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated at Regional Level</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated at School/College Level</td>
<td>66 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>165 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One needs to keep in mind, however, that existing TAFE courses/subjects have largely been designed to meet the assessed needs of an existing TAFE clientele. And that that TAFE clientele has a number of fairly well-understood student characteristics which are quite different to Secondary school students in Years 11 and 12 -- for example the average age of a TAFE student is 26 years.

Use of the terms 'integrated', or 'specially designed', or even 'modified courses' imply, to the writers at least, that some organised effort has been made to design the curriculum to meet the specific and different needs of the students concerned. It seems likely that in the design process for many Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, efforts to assess students' needs have occurred by and large, locally and informally.

In most cases, as with the programs identified in NSW, and also but to a lesser extent in WA and QLD, the reliance upon established TAFE courses results directly from centralised policy decisions taken in those States to design cooperative programs so that they include recognised TAFE courses/subjects, in order to achieve the benefit of a TAFE credential for completing students. This principle clearly works in the students' favour; further, as is asserted in Chapter 6 of this report, the award of a TAFE credential to students successfully completing a cooperative program, is a central feature of what we believe constitutes an exemplary cooperative program.

Another element of the design process for the identified range of cooperative programs is characterised by the spread of responses in Table 3.16. This demonstrates quite clearly that the cooperative programs identified cover the full range of vocational orientations traditionally offered by TAFE providers in Australia. This is not surprising when it is considered that the selection of study areas is made by TAFE and Schools officers in the location concerned. These selections are thus based, at least in part, on the teaching specialisms available at the local TAFE college, and on the perceived needs and preferences of students on location.
TABLE 3.16
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Vocational Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Orientation</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Trades</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Mechanics</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Mechanical</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Maintenance</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Building/Reinforced Plastics</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machining/Metal Machining</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Trades</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Fabrication</td>
<td>27 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Construction</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>20 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>51 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering and Hospitality</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking/Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics and Theatre Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty Culture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Vocational Life Skills/Link</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Chemical Technician</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.

Nor does it seem surprising that the TAFE study areas most commonly accessed in the process of design for this range of cooperative programs is reflective of the more prominent and longer established study areas in TAFE. The vocational orientations (generally synonymous with TAFE 'study areas') shown in Table 3.16 to be most commonly related to cooperative programs (5% or greater of cooperative programs identified) are:
In many ways this distribution is evidence that cooperative programs are founded on a design principle which can be stated as "Schools are providing what they are best at, and TAFE is providing what it is best at". This interpretation of these data is quite apparent. It is also useful in attempting to understand the influences that have played a significant part in the rapid and recent growth in the development of cooperative programs, at least in some States. One such influence seems to have been the reliance, by TAFE, on its 'tried and true' study areas -- on its well established vocational curricula. Other factors which seem to have influenced this growth in Schools/TAFE cooperative programming are discussed in Chapter 6.

Some questions do arise, however, concerning the weighting of cooperative programs towards established TAFE study areas. At least two of these, which seem to be related to one another, are:

* to what extent are some of these established TAFE study areas providing vocational education for a shrinking job market?

* to what extent are cooperative programs serving to take up the 'spare capacity' that has occurred in TAFE colleges in recent years due to different patterns in the demand for student places in TAFE courses?

Our study did not aim to examine these questions. Consequently we are not able to provide answers. However, we feel it is important to draw attention to the implications of these questions for the design of cooperative programs. In this way, the designers of curricula for future cooperative programs may be encouraged to address such questions as a part of their design process.

Suffice to say, in relation to the first of these questions, it is our general understanding that job opportunities in the metal trades have substantially contracted in recent years, resulting in some part, from the economic decline in the manufacturing industries. As well, the nature of work in the secretarial and business occupations has changed markedly. Further, it is apparent that the hospitality and tourism industries, as with some other service industries, are currently enjoying considerable growth. Information of this kind is one of the important building blocks in the design of any vocational curricula, and TAFE in Australia is constantly endeavouring to research such information in order to design curricula which equip students to cope with such changes.

We would wish to stress, however, that job market factors are particularly important building blocks for the design of equitable courses of study for young people who are seeking to gain a credential, as part of their senior secondary school studies. Such a credential opens new pathways to further education or work. Given the importance of the goal of increased equity in Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, as with the other initiatives of the PEP, job marketability should be a central consideration in the design process.

| * Metal Trades                  | 5% |
| * Metal Fabrication             | 12%|
| * Electrical                   | 5% |
| * Business                     | 9% |
| * Secretarial                  | 22%|
| * Commercial                   | 12%|
| * Accounting                   | 7% |
| * Hospitality and Tourism      | 7% |
| * Beauty Culture               | 6% |

\[85%\]
In relation to the second question concerning 'spare capacity' in TAFE colleges, we are able to report, based on responses from interviewees in our field work, that a number of both Schools and TAFE officers felt the existence of such capacity in colleges was an important determinant in the selection of TAFE study areas for cooperative programs. It was seen as a means for employing existing educational resources more economically. Indeed there is a sound case to be made for Schools/TAFE cooperation, solely on the grounds of economics. This case is presented in a number of Commonwealth Schools Commission, and Tertiary Education Commission reports, as well as by a number of the educational commentators referred to in Chapter 1 of this report.

It is important to note that 'spare capacity' in a TAFE college might exist primarily in an area where there is lower community demand for some TAFE courses. Cooperative programs need to be maintained to ensure that students are not receiving redundant vocationally oriented course components which may be useless if they attempt to move into vocational training.

Our caution in endorsing the 'spare capacity' criterion as one of the design criteria for cooperative programs relates also to the potential for this to become the dominant criterion. The educational needs and interests of students, and the potential of the course of study to open pathways to further education and work should remain the prime criteria. The economic advantages to be gained from a better use of available scarce resources are to be sought in every educational context and endeavour -- but of course these should be achieved through the efficient management of the endeavour, not as the purpose of the endeavour.

3.7 Attendance Requirements for Students

Table 3.17 shows that the predominant student attendance patterns (74%) for cooperative programs involve 1 or 2 attendances at a TAFE college per week. This picture relates directly to the other features of cooperative program curriculum delivery already discussed in Section 3.4 above. Because the majority of cooperative programs are existing TAFE subjects/units, and are taught by TAFE teachers in TAFE colleges, it has followed that the Schools students are generally required to adopt typical TAFE attendance patterns, of 1 or 2 weekly college attendances.
### TABLE 3.17
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Attendance Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Pattern</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TAFE Attendance/week</td>
<td>123 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TAFE Attendances/week</td>
<td>48 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TAFE Attendances/week</td>
<td>22 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time in the Program</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Week Block</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response or Not Applicable</td>
<td>30 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The classification 'not applicable' refers to programs for which TAFE attendances were not required, since (for example) the relevant component of the program was undertaken by correspondence study in the school, or elsewhere. Such an instance occurred with the Equine Management Program conducted at Kobeelya College in WA.

Furthermore, Table 3.18 shows that the majority of Schools students (89%) are attending the TAFE college, at least in part, outside normal school hours.
### TABLE 3.18

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside School Hours</td>
<td>23 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside School Hours</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Inside and Outside School Hours</td>
<td>200 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This again coincides with the observation made in Section 3.4 that the major responsibility for the curriculum delivery of cooperative programs, at their current stage of development, lies with TAFE. The adoption of standard TAFE attendance requirements is due, in part we feel, to the still fairly early stage of development of cooperative programs in most States/Territories. It has been simpler for TAFE organisationally, to provide services to this new group of students, using its established attendance practices. This provision has been expeditious, especially in the light of considerable pressure in some States/Territories to mount cooperative programs quickly, and across a fairly broad front. Another reason for reliance upon standard TAFE attendance requirements is the advantage seen by many Schools/TAFE practitioners in retaining as much of the traditional character of TAFE in the design of cooperative programs as is possible. This view is based on the principle that if secondary students are to 'experience' the adult learning environment of TAFE then it should be an environment which has not changed substantially in character.

Table 3.19 shows that the cooperative programs identified vary considerably in total duration.
TABLE 3.19

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of Hours Attendance in Program</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>13 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>54 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>55 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-250</td>
<td>17 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>21 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-450</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-550</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551-750</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;750</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response or Indeterminate</td>
<td>39 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst there is this variation, a majority (68%) of programs identified have durations within the range of 50 and 300 hours. This range approximates to TAFE programs within the range of a short 1 semester unit of study, and an average 2 year unit of study. The mean duration for the 83% of cooperative programs included in all but the 'no response' category of Table 3.19 is approximately
177 hours. This duration corresponds fairly closely to the typical TAFE year long (36 week) subject or unit of study for 4 hours per week. It also relates closely to the duration for typical senior secondary subjects which lead to tertiary entrance (for example in NSW, 2 units of study in English for one year has a duration of 160 hours). This typicality contrasts with the marked minority of cooperative programs identified in Table 3.15 which show evidence of having been designed 'from scratch'. Some of the cooperative programs with longer durations, which have been designed in this way, or which are based on an integrated curriculum, are case studied, and commented upon in Chapter 4 of this report.

3.8 The Accreditation of Cooperative Programs

Table 3.20 shows that 88% of cooperative programs identified are 'jointly accredited'. That is to say, 88% of programs are approved subjects/courses of study, which earn a credential that is acknowledged by the State/Territory statutory accreditation agencies for both Schools and TAFE.

TABLE 3.20

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAFE Accredited only</td>
<td>17 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Accredited only</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointly Accredited</td>
<td>205 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Accreditation</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further 8% are accredited by either Schools (1%) or TAFE (7%). Only 3% (6 programs) of cooperative programs included in this study are non-accredited. It must be noted here, however, that this results largely from the working definition of cooperative programs that was adopted at the outset of this study. This definition, (presented in Chapter 2) as has already been noted, favoured the identification of cooperative programs with joint accreditation.

Table 3.21 shows the distribution of cooperative programs according to the 'level of secondary credential' that is earned by successful completion of the program. These levels are defined in the note to Table 3.21.
### Table 3.21

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Level of Secondary Credential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Secondary Credential</th>
<th>No. of Program</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Level 1 = Accreditation Authority approved for tertiary entrance
- Level 2 = Accreditation Authority 'registered' State wide
- Level 3 = School based and school credentialled, and acknowledged by Accreditation Authority

These different levels have been employed for the purposes of aiding the analysis of cooperative programs in this study. The levels are not representative of any formalised or generally used classification system in any of the States/Territories in Australia, nor are they acknowledged by educational authorities or by secondary accreditation agencies in the States/Territories. They are simply tools that have been adopted for this study to enable an analysis of the different kinds of credential awarded for studies undertaken by students at the senior secondary level. (It may be worth noting at this stage, however, that the classification system used here seems to us to be the only means possible to enable comparisons between the credentials awarded in the different States/Territories to be made. As such, the classification system may serve as a useful device for other researchers wishing to conduct comparative research relating to senior secondary credentials at the National level).

Table 3.21 shows that in total, 94% of identified cooperative programs lead towards a secondary credential. As is demonstrated by the data presented in Table 3.20, a very small number (around 1%) of these earn only a secondary credential. The great majority of these therefore earn a joint Schools/TAFE credential. We wish now to focus on the level of credential awarded by the secondary accreditation agency, given it is understood that most of these cooperative programs lead also to the award of a TAFE credential.

Of the 219 cooperative programs (94%) that earn a secondary credential, all but two are awarded at either level 2 or level 3 — 83% of all cooperative programs identified lead to a level 2 credential, while 10% lead to a level 3 credential.
This quite simply means that, with the exception of two programs, students undertaking cooperative programs as they are currently accredited by the secondary agencies in the States/Territories, are not earning credit, for that study, towards tertiary entrance. This finding is a crucial piece of evidence for the analysis we attempt to provide in later sections of this report.

In the case study chapter (Chapter 4) we examine a number of the reasons for this finding as it relates to individual cooperative programs. In Chapter 6, we attempt to synthesise all the factors bearing on this result. We examine the apparent reasons for the levels of secondary credential awarded, and analyse the educational rationales, the philosophical and economic implications, and the further education and career implications of this credentialling practice. The reader wishing to consider the full range of factors bearing on the determination of an appropriate level of secondary credential for cooperative programs is referred to Chapter 6.

A number of the issues that are addressed in greater detail in Chapter 6 will be noted here as they arise directly from the data presented in Tables 3.20 and 3.21. The first of these relates to the existence of levels of secondary credential, and their suitability to Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, where a prime goal is to equitably broaden the curriculum choice afforded senior school students. One might question the extent to which educational equity is achieved via a credential which affords students an award at less than ‘level 1’. This is a question of the status accorded secondary credentials by the community at large -- by educators, employers, parents and students, in particular.

Whilst educational authorities and secondary accreditation agencies do not formally identify their ‘different’ senior secondary awards as different in status, or different in level, it seems plain to us that the community does. This is evidenced by employers who, in a strongly competitive job market, continue to use performance in the senior school certificate as a selection criterion for job applicants, and by institutions of higher education (especially universities), most of which continue to limit the number of places offered to students who have applied for entry without a ‘tertiary entrance score’ achieved in Year 12 studies. Students and parents also bear witness to the community perception of credentials of different status when they say, for example:

* "I’m only doing PE subjects" (in the NT -- there students study SSABSA and/or PE subjects)

* "My child is doing an alternative curriculum" (in NSW -- there students may study 9 points of 'other approved studies' out of a required total of 11 for the award of an HSC)

This concern for the status of secondary credential awarded, does not pertain to Schools/TAFE cooperative programs per se. It results from a ‘hierarchy’ of credentials, built into the credentialling practices of States/Territories, and which accommodates other educational efforts to broaden the curriculum choice offered students, such as ‘school-based’ subjects. It is, however, relevant to the accreditation of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, because to date most States/Territories have chosen to place cooperative programs within the already established framework for accreditation of senior school subjects.

3.9 Student Pathways

Table 3.22 shows the range of TAFE 'study areas' that have been identified as further education pathways which arise from the successful completion of the
Schools/TAFE cooperative programs included in this review.

**TABLE 3.22**

Classification of Cooperative Programs by TAFE Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAFE Course(s) to which Program Leads</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Trades</td>
<td>15 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies/Secretarial</td>
<td>67 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Studies</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>17 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering and Hospitality</td>
<td>13 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Studies</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Trades</td>
<td>41 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studies</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Work and Training.</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
Table 3.22 Continued

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Technician</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketwriting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The total number of cooperative programs included in this review is 234. Column totals are not shown since 'double counting' has occurred - i.e. some programs have been included in more than one classification.

As already noted in Section 3.6, this range reflects a wide scope of TAFE provision, particularly in the well established study areas of TAFE. The study areas most commonly identified are:

* Automotive Trades  -  6%
* Electrical         -  5%
* Business/Secretarial Studies - 29%
* Accounting         -  7%
* Catering and Hospitality -  6%
* Metal Trades       - 18%
* Fashion           -  6%

Career pathways emerging from the study of cooperative programs bear a close relationship to these TAFE study areas. Table 3.16 (see p.25) shows the distribution of 'vocational orientations' for cooperative programs identified. Considered together, these data present a picture of some of the options introduced to students as a result of their undertaking a Schools/TAFE cooperative program.

The opportunity for further TAFE study results from the students' partial (or in some cases full) achievement of a TAFE credential. This generally means that students are granted exemption or credit for the TAFE study successfully completed, if they choose to pursue further the particular TAFE study. This is quite simply Schools-TAFE articulation -- one of the goals of Schools/TAFE cooperation.

The career options thus afforded are of two kinds, and can be pursued by students in the light of their experience, preference and circumstance. Students may choose to seek work as their immediate goal. In this case they are able to present to prospective employers with a senior school certificate which includes accredited TAFE studies. Such students have the opportunity to continue with the TAFE study part-time, whilst at work. Here the Schools/TAFE cooperative program undertaken may have helped to serve the immediate purpose of gaining employment, and additionally, lead to further education in the TAFE
study area already commenced.

Other students may choose as their immediate goal the completion of their vocational studies. In this case they are able to seek enrolment either part-time or, where available, full-time in TAFE, to complete the qualification already commenced. Once completed, these students are able to present prospective employers with a full TAFE credential, completed in some cases, in less post-school time than would otherwise have been the case.

The other educational pathways identified by a small number of checklist respondents were to 'higher education' courses. One example offered related to a cooperative program in business studies. Here it was suggested that students may be encouraged to seek entry into a business studies course (at UG1, UG2, or UG3 level) at a College of Advanced Education as a result of their study experience gained in the Schools/TAFE cooperative program. In this way the cooperative program would act as a 'taster' or 'linkage' program. There is little doubt this linkage effect would be apparent, and would provide valuable guidance to some students in their post-school education decisions.

Still in the context of this example, it seems to us that the more powerful linkage to emerge is the one resulting from recent developments in articulation between TAFE Authorities and Institutions of Higher Education. Some of these are identified in the publication The Articulation of TAFE Middle-Level and Higher Education Courses in Australia by Kevin Parkinson. Once arrangements for the exchange of credit between TAFE Authorities and Institutions of Higher Education are negotiated, the credit exchange is attainable by students who have completed a relevant cooperative program.

3.10 The Students Undertaking Cooperative Programs

Tables 3.24 and 3.25 show that 5508 students are involved in the cooperative programs identified in this study. This represents approximately 2% of the total national population of 292,000 students enrolled in Years 11 and 12 in 1985. It is also equivalent to approximately 2% of the number of part-time students enrolled in TAFE in Australia in 1985.

This finding has implications for the debate concerning the cost to educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) of supporting Schools/TAFE cooperation. Relative to the substantial costs involved in supporting other new educational initiatives in post-compulsory education, involving larger numbers of students, the total costs of Schools/TAFE programs would be small. The other side of this debate, however, holds that scarce educational dollars should preferably be directed towards new programs in which a larger number of students (larger than 2%) is participating. In relation to this debate, our observation is that, while Schools/TAFE cooperation is still largely experimental, and student participation is small, authorities should find ways to provide funding support, at least until Schools/TAFE cooperative program evaluative data begin to emerge.

Table 3.23 provides a classification of cooperative programs by Year level of student enrolment. Sixty-six per cent of programs identified were attended by students from Year 11 only; 30% were attended by students from both Years 11 and 12.
TABLE 3.23

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Student Year Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>155 (66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Years 11 and 12</td>
<td>71 (30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3.24

Total Student Enrolment in Cooperative Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 11 only</th>
<th>Year 11/12</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3606 (65%)</td>
<td>1902 (35%)</td>
<td>5508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.24 shows the distribution of students attending cooperative programs according to Year level. Of the total of 5508 students attending programs identified in this study, in excess of 65% were Year 11 school students. The data collected do not enable us to be precise about this number, however, it would appear to be of the order of 4400 (or approximately 80% of the total). Around 20% would be Year 12 students.

The predominance of Year 11 students reflects in part the recency of cooperative program development in the States/Territories. A number of the cooperative programs included in this analysis were designed as two-year programs; others were implemented as one-year pilots, some of which would likely be extended to cover two years. In some of these latter cases, checklist respondents and field people interviewed were not able to predict with any confidence whether the program would extend into Year 12, even though negotiations were in hand to plan
the second year of the program.

As well, the demonstrated Year 11 focus of cooperative programs reflects the greater subject choice afforded students in Year 11 compared to Year 12, in most of the States/Territories. For example, this may mean that a student undertakes five or six subjects in Year 11, but in Year 12 this number reduces by one. Often the additional Year 11 subject selected is a Schools/TAFE cooperative program, and since it does not count towards tertiary entrance, students may elect to abandon it at the end of Year 11. In this way, the cooperative program has been undertaken as a planned terminating subject.

Table 3.25 shows the gender distribution of the 5508 students attending cooperative programs identified in this study.

**TABLE 3.25**

Gender Distributions in Cooperative Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2933 (53%)</td>
<td>2575 (47%)</td>
<td>5508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-three per cent of the identified student population is female; 47% is male. By comparison in 1985 the national female population in TAFE was 42% (including all streams and all courses), while the national female population in Years 11 and 12 was 51%. This marginal skew to female participation in cooperative programs, when compared with national TAFE and senior school enrolments, is largely accounted for by the high incidence of cooperative programs with a secretarial studies vocational orientation (see Table 3.16) -- Enrolments in secretarial studies courses in TAFE are traditionally dominated by females.

A number of practitioners interviewed in our fieldwork suggested that the relatively high incidence of secretarial studies-based cooperative programs was due, at least in part, to the greater awareness in schools of keyboard and office skills. Indeed, in some States/Territories, schools as well as TAFE colleges offered subjects/courses in these skill areas. These features, namely the familiarity with the subject area, and the shared experience in delivering curriculum, were said to facilitate the introduction of Schools/TAFE cooperation in this subject area.

Table 3.26 shows that student access to the majority of cooperative programs reviewed here was reported as 'open'.
TABLE 3.26

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Student Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Access</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>217 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to Entrance Tests (Music)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Access</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Program for Disabled Students</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 5% of cooperative programs were reported to have 'limited' or 'closed' access to students. In some of these cases, respondents indicated that the program had been designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged groups, or that it was based upon skill prerequisites. In others, respondents indicated that the program was made available only to those students judged to be 'at risk' of leaving school.

It is apparent to us, however, as a result of our fieldwork, where we were able to speak with cooperative program practitioners and explore the notion of access further, that the state of open access is one thing; the counselling of student subject selections is another. In some cases, students known to be seeking entrance to studies in Higher Education institutions, were counselled against electing to study a cooperative program. In others, students were counselled to consider study of a cooperative program.

The importance of student counselling, its relationship to student access to cooperative programs, and to the status of cooperative programs is taken up in Chapter 6.

Table 3.27 shows the distribution of cooperative programs identified between government and non-government schools. The relatively low participation rate of non-government schools is apparent.
### TABLE 3.27

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Auspice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auspice</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>229 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Government</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some part, this finding may reflect the difficulty we found in gaining information about Schools/TAFE cooperative programs involving non-government schools. This was due to the absence of a centrally established administration, for either the Catholic school system, or for non-Catholic independent schools in each State/Territory, which had knowledge of Schools/TAFE initiatives in the field.

As reported in Chapter 2, we were aware of the existence of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs involving non-government schools. Attempts were made to gather relevant data on these.

In some States/Territories, it was apparent that Schools/TAFE cooperation policy favoured government school participation. In others a 'user-pays' principle appeared to prevail at the local level.

### 3.11 Evaluation of Cooperative Programs

Table 3.28 shows that for 88% of cooperative programs identified respondents indicated that evaluation of the program was reliant upon 'standard TAFE procedures'.
TABLE 3.28
Classification of Cooperative Programs by Evaluation Mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Mechanism</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard TAFE Procedures</td>
<td>207 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially Designed Evaluation</td>
<td>15 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Evaluation</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result coincides with findings in other sections of this chapter, where it has been shown that the curriculum development processes adopted for cooperative programs have largely depended on established TAFE practices. This has been a logical feature of the cooperative programs reviewed here, since as was shown in Table 3.11, the great majority of cooperative programs are existing TAFE courses/subjects.

The term 'standard TAFE procedures' for the evaluation of courses means that courses may be examined in at least two ways. The first of these is a discrete systematic examination of the course in terms of its curriculum design, structure, content, delivery and resources. In TAFE Authorities in Australia, such an examination tends to occur at regular intervals, is a thoroughgoing process, and results in recommendations to the TAFE accreditation body to accredit a revised course. The second way in which TAFE courses are examined is continuous. This on-going evaluation of courses occurs at the college and classroom level, and is largely undertaken by teachers. It tends to focus more on the delivery of the course, but also takes into account aspects of the content, design and resources for the course. Minor course changes are often introduced as a result of this on-going examination, without recourse to the centralised accreditation agency.

Importantly an examination of the needs of students, and the requirements of industry/commerce is a part of both of these levels of evaluation. In the first instance, a range of methods for occupational analysis and student profiling are drawn upon to undertake systematic needs research as the basis for reviewing the course. In the second, research into needs is often undertaken less formally, arising from the opportunity to gather formative data whilst the course is being delivered.
In our fieldwork, we saw ample evidence of the second level of evaluation in relation to cooperative programs -- especially those cooperative programs which constituted existing TAFE courses/subjects. This was particularly evident in the case of curriculum delivery. Often it was reported to us that changes in delivery style, attendance pattern, and content emphasis had been introduced as a result of formative evaluation efforts. Such changes were to be expected given that many of the cooperative programs concerned were being conducted as trials (or pilots). In large part, this type of evaluation reflects sound teaching practice, where a designed curriculum is delivered to suit the individual needs and learning styles of students.

We would expect that as TAFE Authorities systematically review those courses which have served as 'parent' courses for the derivation of cooperative programs, then such reviews would take into account the specific needs and characteristics of the new Schools clientele, just as they would take into account the needs and characteristics of other identified clientele groups.

The 7% of cooperative programs (in Table 3.28) for which a 'specially designed evaluation' was reported tended to relate closely to the cooperative programs shown in Table 3.11 as programs which were other than existing TAFE subjects. A number of these have been case studied, and are therefore reported in Chapter 4.

3.12 Curriculum Documentation for Cooperative Programs

Table 3.29 shows that, according to checklist respondents, the curriculum for 93% of cooperative programs is documented 'completely' -- ie in a way which includes statements of aims/objectives, content, teaching method, resources, and assessment procedures.

**Table 3.29**

Classification of Cooperative Programs by Curriculum Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Documentation</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>218 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>234 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the majority of these instances, this is not meant to imply that separate curriculum documentation for these cooperative programs has been undertaken. Rather it means that, since most cooperative programs were derived from 'parent' TAFE courses, which have been documented for the purposes of accreditation, documentation for these cooperative programs is therefore available, indirectly. Where 'integrated' or 'specially designed' courses, and in some instances 'modified' TAFE courses (see Table 3.11) have been identified, efforts to separately document curriculum for the cooperative program is often apparent. A number of these are reported as case studies in Chapter 4.

3.13 Teacher In-Service for Cooperative Programs

The data obtained in this review of cooperative programs, by the checklist method, is presented in Table 3.30 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Service Provided</th>
<th>No. of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>26 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>182 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>234 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that there has been some teacher in-service activity in support of the implementation of cooperative programs. However, it became evident to us when we reviewed responses that the checklist item (item 33 in Appendix D) was not well understood by respondents. We were able to obtain some data on teacher in-service from a number of the case studies. This is reported in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

COMMENTARIES ON CASE STUDIES

4.1 Introductory Note

The commentaries in this chapter are based on the contents of case studies that were written for the purposes of this research project by a number of contributors, apart from the Project Team. We are grateful to the contributors for undertaking the case studies. Individual contributors are acknowledged in the introduction to each commentary. The actual case studies are contained in a separate Volume to this report - Volume II.

The commentaries were written by the Project Team. They are based on the case studies, but also draw on other data collected during the project. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.2 Profile and Commentary on the Basic Electronics Program in the ACT

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the author of the Basic Electronics case study, Julie Wilesmith, of Bruce TAFE College. We would like to acknowledge Julie's work and thank her for her contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.2.1 Profile of Basic Electronics

Program Title: Basic Electronics
Program Location: Belconnen/Hawker, ACT
Participating Colleges/Schools: Bruce TAFE College, Hawker College (Senior Secondary)

This Commonwealth and mainstream funded program provided for Year 11 or 12 students in 1985 the opportunity to study the existing TAFE course Basic Electronics as part of their two year course of study leading to the award of the ACT Year 12 Certificate. The cooperative program operates between Bruce TAFE College at Belconnen and Hawker College (a senior secondary school) in the ACT. Hawker and Belconnen are residential/commercial suburbs in the ACT in which the school retention rates are about average for the Territory (around 70% from Year 10 to 11). These suburbs of Canberra are fairly typically middle class, experiencing a relatively low level of unemployment.

The TAFE Basic Electronics course comprises three subjects: Introduction to Electronic Systems and Electronic Workshop Practice 1 and 2. These three subjects represent about one half of Stage I of the three stage (i.e. 3 year) Electronic Trades Course offered by part-time study in the ACT. In 1985 Hawker students attended the TAFE college for two two-hour sessions per week both inside and outside school hours for a period of one year (i.e. 36 weeks).

Fifteen students undertook the program in 1985; 12 in Year 11 and 3 in Year 12. All were males. Nearly half of these students had discontinued study in the program by the end of Term 2. Entry into the program was open to all students at Hawker in 1985 - Basic Electronics being offered in the timetable on a 'line' with other subjects from which students were able to choose. Students travelled to the TAFE college via the school bus and when numbers dropped, Hawker teachers transported students in their own cars.

TAFE teachers taught Hawker students as a discrete class during 1985. (In 1986 Hawker students were to be integrated into normal TAFE classes, which means that students attend in one four hour block per week in a day class from 1:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. or a night class from 6:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m. instead of two two-hour sessions).

Prior to 1985 Hawker college had offered an electronics subject, with a Level 1 secondary credential. Because teachers at Hawker considered the electronics facilities and expertise available at nearby Bruce TAFE college to be of a higher standard, negotiations were undertaken during 1984 to provide access to the TAFE Basic Electronics course for Hawker students, rather than to continue offering the electronics subject approved by the ACT Accrediting Agency. Staff at Bruce TAFE responded to this demand for their course as a normal TAFE provider. A judgement was made that the college had the capacity to meet the demand and hence an additional class was offered for Hawker students.

Hawker students successfully completing Basic Electronics in 1985 were awarded a Level 2 secondary credential. The essential difference between this and the Level 1 credential being that the Level 2 award does not contribute towards a student's tertiary-entrance. As the Basic Electronics course is a TAFE accredited program in the ACT, successful students receive an award for that
course and gain credit for three subjects out of Stage I of the Electronic Trades course.

4.2.2 Commentary on Basic Electronics

At the time of selecting cooperative program case studies for our national project, in the second half of 1985, we were keen to include Basic Electronics because it seemed likely that it would provide one of the very few examples in Australia of a program, jointly accredited by TAFE and secondary agencies, where the secondary credential was awarded at Level 1 (i.e. contributed towards tertiary entrance). That this scenario did not subsequently eventuate is disappointing because it would have been nearly unique. Only one other cooperative program in Australia in 1985, to our knowledge, satisfied the two criteria of joint accreditation and secondary certification at the level of tertiary entrance. That program is in Business Studies and is conducted in South Australia.

However, from the point of view of our research, the case study on Basic Electronics provides some very valuable data which relate to some of the difficulties that need to be resolved if cooperative Schools/TAFE programs are to be established as jointly accredited programs which also contribute towards tertiary entrance. This commentary will therefore focus on these issues in the main, under the heading of 'course accreditation'.

Course Accreditation

The case study on Basic Electronics records that the nature of its accreditation by the ACT Schools Authority was not fully determined prior to the commencement of the program in 1985. Provisional approval was granted by that agency in February 1985. This meant that the program could be offered for 1985 only and that secondary students completing the program would be awarded a Level 2 credential. Subsequent longer term accreditation was to be dependent upon a resubmission of the proposal by Hawker College, once the course's re-accreditation by the TAFE accreditation agency (the ACT Further Education Accreditation Committee - FEAC) had been approved.

It is clear that the 1985 credential earned by Hawker students for completing Basic Electronics, was a credential with less secondary status than was achievable under the pre-1985 arrangement. This situation seems quite remarkable in the face of the evidence presented in the case study by involved staff, which points to the suitability and requisite 'level of difficulty' of the Basic Electronics course for Hawker students. This evidence will now be examined.

* In November 1984, officers from Hawker and Bruce formally agreed that the content of the revised Basic Electronics course was suitable for Hawker students.

* During 1984, Hawker electronics staff considered that the better facilities and teaching expertise available at Bruce would lead to an enhanced curriculum delivery.

* A nearby school, Copland College, offered in 1985 a less demanding subject in electronics which is accredited by the ACT Schools Authority at Level 2. More capable students from Copland have been encouraged to undertake the TAFE course independently of the school system.
* In 1985, Hawker staff agreed that Basic Electronics was "on a par with, if not of greater 'conceptual difficulty' than" the tertiary accredited (Level 1) electronics subject offered by Hawker previously.

* Hawker students studying Basic Electronics commented on the difficulty of the course and suggested it warranted a Level 1 credential.

* A Hawker science teacher undertook the Basic Electronics course during 1985, and strongly maintained that the 'conceptual difficulty' of this course warranted a Level 1 secondary classification.

Such evidence would lead one to expect that Basic Electronics would have been accredited by the ACT Schools Authority as a Level 1 course, and that as a result Hawker (and other) students might gain the benefits of an enhanced curriculum with no loss in the status of the credential awarded by comparison with previous years. As is already noted, this did not occur. The apparent reasons for this will now be examined.

* The Accreditation Section of the ACT Schools Authority examined the TAFE curriculum document for Basic Electronics early in 1985 and on the advice of its representative from the Australian National University, judged that the course was not of sufficient 'conceptual difficulty' to warrant a Level 1 credential.

* The TAFE Basic Electronics course was revised during 1984, and while endorsement for that revision had been gained in 1984 at the local level, by the College Program Approvals Committee and the College Council at Bruce, approval by the ACT Further Education Accreditation Committee (FEAC) had not been achieved until November 1985.

* The ACT Schools Authority appears to have required that FEAC approval be obtained prior to its granting formal accreditation status to the course - hence its decision to provisionally approve the course for 1985 at Level 2.

* Staff from both Bruce and Hawker have consulted with officers of the ACT Schools Authority and have commented that the curriculum documentation for Basic Electronics was probably insufficiently detailed for a reader to fully appreciate the scope of the course.

* Bruce TAFE college policy precludes the submission of a fully detailed curriculum (including content objectives) when seeking approval from either FEAC or the ACT Schools Authority.

The case study postulates a number of possible explanations for the Level 2 classification approved by the ACT Schools Authority. Included amongst these are the use of the word "Basic" in the title of the course and that the Basic Electronics course comprises curriculum content from Stage I of a TAFE Trade course. It is felt these may have led to an impression of low level of difficulty.
It is our view, however, that much of the evidence reviewed and reasons postulated above are speculative. The two factors which seem to us to have contributed most to the status of the secondary credential for Basic Electronics in 1985 are:

1. the absence of formal FEAC accreditation for the revised Basic Electronics course prior to the proposal's consideration by the ACT Schools Authority.

2. the inflexibility of the proposal submission policy of Bruce TAFE college and of the classification process adopted by the Accreditation Section of the ACT Schools Authority.

The text of the case study suggests a number of ways of resolving the accreditation problem for Basic Electronics. It is our hope that the problem is resolved, because while under the 1985 arrangements, students studying Basic Electronics are benefitting from an enhanced curriculum they appear to be disadvantaged by the status of the award they earn for that study.

Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.3 Profile and Commentary on the Business Studies Program  
(The 'Blackfriars' Model) in SA

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. They were compiled from documents and information provided by a number of people involved in the program in SA, including Marj Sheppard of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA), Richard Hearn of the Catholic Education Office in SA, Geoff Sanderson of the SA Department of TAFE, and Ted Ward of Pulteney Grammar School. We would like to thank these people for their contribution to our national study.

The commentary is based upon the documents provided by, and discussions held with these people, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.3.1. Profile of the Business Studies Program

Program Title: Business Studies Program (Blackfriars Model)

Program Location: Adelaide, South Australia

Participating Colleges/Schools: S.A Department of TAFE/
13 Schools (including Blackfriars Priory School, Sienna College, St Dominic's Priory College, Pulteney Grammar School, St Peter's College, St Paul's College, The Parks Community Education Centre, Enfield Community High School)

Note: The other program commentaries included in this chapter have been based on case studies of programs, written in the main, by people directly involved with the program concerned. This commentary has been compiled by the project team, without the benefit of the insights of a documented case study so written. Because of this, it is not possible to present in this profile some of the detailed information about program characteristics provided in other case study profiles. Nevertheless we have been able to compile substantial case study data on Business Studies, and these enable us to comment on a number of the important features of the program.

This State funded program is located in metropolitan Adelaide, and involves 13 schools -- both independent and government. The origins of the particular kind of Schools/TAFE cooperation, which in 1985 was represented by the Business Studies Program, are in the mid-1970's. At that time, staff of the Blackfriars Priory School recognised the need to provide greater curriculum choice to their senior students -- via studies that offered practical relevance to their employment and study prospects. Consequently the staff sought to negotiate a cooperative curriculum with the then Department of Further Education in SA through the Adelaide College. Even at this early stage of the Business Studies Program development, a number of the features of this program which make it exemplary in our view, and of great interest to this study, were apparent. The Business Studies Program profiled here is generally referred to as the 'Blackfriars Model' because of the early initiative taken by staff of the Blackfriars School.

An understanding of the structure and nature of the Business Studies Program, as it presently exists, can be gained from the table below.
SSABSA Subject | TAFE Subject | Units
---|---|---
Accounting P | Introductory Accounting | 3
Accounting | Introductory Accounting | 3
Australian Economic Studies | Socio-Economics | 3
Business Mathematics | Business Mathematics | 3
Business Studies | Business organisations & Structure | 3
Computing Studies | Electronic Data Processing | 3
Economics | Socio-Economics | 3
Professional Typing | {Keyboard Mastery | 1
| (Introductory Office Typing A & B | 2
| (General Office Typing A & B | 2
| (Typing Speed | 1+

Note: Students may accumulate a maximum of 18 credit units for exemption from subjects in either the TAFE Business Practice, Commercial or Business Certificate.


Year 11 and 12 students successfully completing SSABSA approved subjects from the table above earn credit in the TAFE subject(s) listed alongside. In this way they are able to gain up to 18 points (out of a total of 48 points) towards (say) the TAFE Business Certificate as one of the three TAFE Certificate awards identified in the note to the table. At the same time students are contributing towards their Year 12 SSABSA (senior secondary) certificate at Level 1 -- i.e. they are contributing towards a 'tertiary entrance score' for entry to specified Institutions of Higher Education in SA in the normal fashion.

The table shows that for some subjects there is a one-to-one correspondence between SSABSA and TAFE subjects. In one case, one SSABSA subject relates to more than one TAFE subject; for another case, one TAFE subject relates to more than one SSABSA subject. These subject inter-relationships are central to the structure of the Business Studies Program. They determine the extent of credit earned by a student.

The process involved in establishing these subject inter-relationships for the Business Studies Program is also important to note. The process of negotiation which resulted in the particular mix of subjects shown in the table was one that involved officers from TAFE and Schools, as well as SSABSA. The process seems to us to have had three related stages (or levels) of activity, all of which were important to the design of the program. The first of these was the agreement 'in principle' by senior officers of TAFE and Schools to explore the possibility of credit exchange in the business studies area. The second stage was developmental. This involved TAFE, Schools and SSABSA officers meeting in a working party arrangement, to compare existing curriculum documentation, analyse similarities and differences of aims, content, duration, assessment and
delivery, and on the basis of those analyses, to determine the subject mix which would permit exchange of credit. The third important level of activity relates to the monitoring (or maintenance of standards) of the program. This involved the cross-participation of officers in the accreditation monitoring processes of educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE).

The SSABSA played an important role in the process described above. Clearly, as an accreditation agency, it had an interest in the process that would determine arrangements for the exchange of credit, where SSABSA subjects were involved. Its involvement in the design of the Business Studies Program went beyond the passive, receptive stance adopted by secondary accreditation agencies that we have observed in relation to the design of many other cooperative programs included in this study. SSABSA undertook an active role in the design process. Its officers convened meetings, identified issues to be resolved, contributed to the detailed analysis of curriculum documentation, and participated in (often initiating) the formal correspondences between SSABSA, and senior officers in the Departments of TAFE and Education. In this way, SSABSA provided an impetus to the business studies initiative.

The SSABSA business subjects undertaken by students are openly selected from the range of SSABSA accredited subjects offered at the student's school in the same manner as other subjects. The subjects are studied at school, during school hours and are delivered by school teachers. 88 students from the Blackfriars school participated in the Business Studies Program in 1985. An estimated total of in excess of 150 students participated in the program from the 13 participating schools in 1985.

The duration of the program varies depending on the business studies subjects chosen by the student. A student choosing one business subject would be required to spend 54 hours on that study. If a student studied a number of business subjects, then of course the duration would be longer.

4.3.2 Commentary on the Business Studies Program

The Business Studies Program has, in our view, two particularly outstanding features as a Schools/TAFE cooperative program. Its near uniqueness as a cooperative program which is jointly accredited by both the Schools and TAFE accreditation mechanisms (including secondary accreditation which leads to the award of a credential at Level 1) is the first of these. The simple concept of the Business Studies Program, represented in structural terms by a series of subject inter-relationships, designed by negotiation amongst the relevant educational agencies, and once negotiated, seeming to require minimum ongoing management/resource inputs is the second notable feature.

Accreditation of the Program

The 'Blackfriars' model Business Studies Program is one of only two cooperative programs identified in our study which is 'maximally' accredited by both Schools and TAFE. By this we mean that the Business Studies Program affords a secondary credential at Level 1 (not Level 2 or 3), and full credit for TAFE studies completed. By comparison with many other cooperative programs reviewed in this study, therefore, students electing to undertake the Business Studies Program are gaining the full advantage of wider curriculum choice at school, leading to further education and employment pathways in the business field. In so doing, these students are not being disadvantaged because of opportunities foregone.

A consideration of the comparative features of other cooperative programs case
studied as part of this national project should serve to highlight our point concerning opportunities foregone. Students electing to undertake study in a substantial Schools/TAFE program, as these have been designed in the majority of cases in Australia, whilst gaining the advantages of wider curriculum choice at school, as well as enhanced work and further study pathways (in TAFE), are actually foregoing the option of seeking entry, from school, to institutions of Higher Education. This happens because study in the Schools/TAFE program affords to the student, at best, a secondary credential at Level 2. A Level 2 credential, by definition, does not contribute towards the 'mark' or 'score' required by many tertiary institutions for entry from school.

Now it may well be that some students do not intend, or wish to seek such 'tertiary entrance'. In these cases, it would seem that the opportunity foregone has not in any real sense disadvantaged the student. This may be so. But what of the student who elects study in a Schools/TAFE program because it seems suitable at the time (say at the beginning of Year 11), and at a later time develops work or study aspirations (perhaps arising from the Schools/TAFE study) which require the acquisition of a 'tertiary entrance' score. Such a student will have gained in terms of identifying a preferred educational direction, but will have done so at the cost of foregoing the opportunity of seeking tertiary entrance from school.

A number of important concerns arise from the foregone opportunities dilemma referred to above. The first of these relates to the matter of subject choice by students. A number of people interviewed during our work put the view that placing students in the position of having to make subject selections (say at the beginning of Year 11) was by definition a selective process. That is, once certain subjects were selected, other subjects that the student may develop an interest in (say at the end of Year 11), were no longer feasible options. In other words opportunities had been foregone. Such a process of student selection was seen as a natural part of the progression of students from the 'junior' to the 'senior' school. Further, acceptance of the responsibility for decisions taken as part of this progression was an expected part of the education of the person for later life.

Proponents of this view observed that to provide students with the additional decision involving Schools/TAFE studies at the beginning of Year 11, with its attendant responsibility for that decision, was no different to the existing and appropriate decision period that students had to deal with. We see at least two problems with this view. Firstly, the provision of Schools/TAFE study options is intended to increase the range of further educational (and work) pathways for students, not to limit them. To say that the further education pathways achieved via Schools/TAFE studies are no less than before is not in our view a strong recommendation for the inclusion of such study options.

A second more disturbing problem inherent with this view relates to the status and longevity of the opportunity foregone. Students choosing to study one secondary accredited subject (at Level 1) rather than another, are foregoing the opportunity to take on study of the second, but either way that study contributes to their 'tertiary entrance' score. The option foregone is not the serious and relatively permanent one of entry from school to a range of tertiary institutions. In the case of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs accredited at less than Level 1, no contribution is made to a student's general tertiary entrance potential.

In relation to this problem of foregone opportunities, the Business Studies Program is considered to be exemplary. It preserves the students' option of
progressing to a range of tertiary institutions, and furthermore adds to this the opportunity of achieving credit in those tertiary studies.

Another concern we see arising from the opportunities foregone dilemma relates to the acceptance of, indeed the expectation that opportunities should be foregone at all, as a consequence of a student's educational choice. A view sometimes reported to us during our work held that if students chose to study a Schools/TAFE cooperative program then, in terms of the 'market place for educational credentials', they were merely exercising their option of gaining vocational credentials (in TAFE) at the expense of senior secondary credentials. This view maintains that the educational 'system' should not allow students to score twice from one course of study -- from school in gaining a secondary credential (at Level 1) which facilitates entry to tertiary studies, and from TAFE. After all, is not the purpose of schooling to develop a student's general educational abilities, and the different purpose of TAFE to develop a student's vocational educational abilities.

We are aware of the need for the education 'system' to make the most efficient use of its limited resources, and that part of this requires that different educational sectors should focus on meeting the community's demand for education in their established areas of expertise, without duplication of effort. We do not consider, however, that this position should necessarily preclude a merging of the educational efforts of secondary vis-a-vis vocational educational agencies, particularly where these efforts, in their established forms, have been found to be deficient in meeting the needs of an increasing number of students wishing to participate in full-time education. If there were nothing wrong with established educational provisions, educators and students would not be busily proliferating new educational options at the post-compulsory level.

A central purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation should be to provide educational pathways to students who would otherwise be disinclined to continue their education for a variety of reasons. Schools/TAFE cooperation, in its exemplary form, has heralded a reaching out to these students. Education and TAFE Authorities are seeking to explore beyond their traditional bounds in an effort to provide educational programs that meet the particular needs of these students. These efforts need to be mounted equitably within the context of the 'credential market place'. Students should not be disenfranchised in one educational sector because of a decision made to choose a study program which earns educational credit in another. It is worth noting here that there are already in existence many instances of 'double-counting' for the same study program in TAFE and other tertiary institutions, as well as an increasing effort to establish articulation pathways between school and tertiary, between TAFE and tertiary, and between tertiary and tertiary education providers. In all these cases the credibility of the 'exchange' is dependent on the accrual of educational credit. A traditional view of who administers general education and who administers vocational education should not in our view impede the exchange.

The Business Studies Program appears to be exemplary in terms of its educational exchange. Students are able to earn credit with TAFE and with SSABSA since both agencies have accredited the program.

Our final concern with the foregone opportunities dilemma relates to the often-used label for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs as 'alternative' programs of study. Indeed in the case of some cooperative programs reviewed, the term 'alternative' appears in the title of the program. Our concern here is for the attitudes and values that govern the use of this term. This term is not
associated with the Business Studies Program. It appears that at least part of the reason for this lies in the Business Studies Program perceived worth as a program of senior secondary school study, which in turn relies on the program's acceptance by SSABSA.

On occasions in the conduct of our study, teachers and students referred to particular cooperative programs, which did not earn a Level 1 secondary credential, as 'alternative' studies. The clear implication of this label is one of less status when compared to studies leading to 'tertiary entrance'. Often related to this is the expectation that Schools/TAFE cooperative programs are intended only for students of 'lesser academic ability'. This kind of effect has often been reported in relation to school PEP courses in general. It is a product of the "classical" view which sees senior secondary education narrowly, as a route to tertiary studies in institutions of higher education. It is a view which we feel is sustained by an ignorance of the current issues of participation and equity in education. This view seems also to be evident amongst some parents and employers.

One of the lessons to emerge from a consideration of the Business Studies Program is that this program has overcome the status problem of many other cooperative programs, by dint of its level of accreditation from SSABSA. That level of accreditation enables the Business Studies Program to be seen as other than an alternative course of study for students of lesser academic ability. The SSABSA accreditation of the subjects within the program have effectively placed these within the mainstream of senior secondary studies.

Design and Structure of the Program

The Business Studies Program is one of the few cooperative programs identified in our study which has adopted what we might term a 'contract' approach to the design of the program. By this we mean that the program's design rested on establishment of a firm mutual recognition of the prior existence of business studies curricula in both schools and TAFE, that these existing curricula were similar, if not identical, and that the design process was therefore focussed on joint efforts to reach an agreement which would secure dual accreditation of those curricula.

The design process is outlined in the profile section of this commentary. There three stages (or levels) of design activity are identified:

(a) an agreement 'in principle' stage
(b) a 'developmental' stage
(c) a monitoring stage.

Some discussion of these stages is developed here because it would seem that they were crucial to the achievement of the successful but uncomplicated structure of the Business Studies Program. The agreement in principle stage sets up the 'contract' in 'draft form'. This stage involves a recognition by TAFE and Schools that each has an established curriculum set in the study area concerned (in this case in business studies). For many years Schools in most States/Territories have offered subjects in the business studies area -- in Accounting, Typing, Economics, etc. Business studies is of course a long established area of vocational study in TAFE. This stage therefore amounts to an acknowledgement of common curriculum ground, and in many cases of students of common ages and interests. As well, the curricula under the auspices of each of TAFE and Schools has an established level of accreditation.
The second stage is characterised by a thoroughgoing series of negotiations to establish the details of the 'contract'. In the case of the Business Studies Program initiative, this involved the establishment of a working party with membership from Schools, TAFE and SSABSA. The working party undertook the time-consuming task of comparing curriculum detail for the existing TAFE and SSABSA accredited subjects. It should be noted here that the working party members were not compelled to agree that subject curricula were equivalent, or even sufficiently similar to continue the negotiation process, before they started their work. Stage 1 agreement did not preclude disagreement at stage 2.

This flexibility is evidenced by the structure of subject equivalences negotiated during stage 2 of the design process for business studies. There is not always a one-to-one correspondence of TAFE and SSABSA accredited subjects, as is shown in the table presented in the profile above. The working party was able to analyse the curriculum details sufficiently thoroughly, and to approach this analysis with sufficient flexibility to deduce curriculum correlations across existing subject bounds. Yet the resulting subject matrix (of TAFE subjects vis-a-vis SSABSA subjects) is not complex, and does not appear to impede student choice.

The third stage -- that of monitoring -- is one which maintains a surveillance over the 'contract' set by stage 2. For the Business Studies Program this stage involved the cross-participation of TAFE and Schools officers in the accreditation monitoring processes. In fact, it is our understanding that this stage was a crucial condition to the setting of the contract for the Business Studies Program. Even after curriculum equivalences have been established (in respect of aims and content), educational authorities in Australia typically have a highly developed concern for the 'maintenance of their standards'. This concern is reflected by a keen interest in the maintenance of the quality of the curriculum and its delivery, and in a confidence in the level of student learning resulting from a course.

Concern for the maintenance of standards, in general terms, and in the case of the Business Studies Program, is particularly evident in TAFE. TAFE Authorities in Australia are highly conscious of the credibility of their courses in the eyes of employers and the community, and of the reliance for that credibility on factors such as the proven subject area expertise of their teachers (in industry), teaching facilities, equipment and resources which satisfy certain standards, as well as the accreditation of the curriculum by agencies with industry representation. Clearly these factors involve a range of industrial relations, economic and curriculum issues. The achievements of the Business Studies Program appear to us to be all the more commendable because of the complexity of a number of these issues.

For the Business Studies Program, appropriate TAFE officers needed to be satisfied that TAFE standards would be maintained. In part this was achieved by the participation of TAFE assessors in the assessment monitoring processes of SSABSA. In this way TAFE assessors were able to judge that SSABSA standards met appropriate and established TAFE criteria. This practice of judgement of appropriateness of criteria is seen as crucial to an acceptance of the type of Schools/TAFE cooperation evident in the Business Studies Program. It seems to have been the basis for acceptance by TAFE of, for example, the delivery of the curriculum by school teachers in schools. These features are not evident in very many other cooperative programs identified in our study.

A final point to note about the Business Studies Program as it has been
described in this commentary relates to the resources required to maintain the 'contract'. These would seem to be minimal. Because of the effort put into the design of the program according to the stages that have been described, the Business Studies contract between Schools and TAFE would seem to require only a continuation of the assessment monitoring procedures to sustain it in the immediate future. In the longer term, when either SSABSA and/or TAFE undertake substantial revisions to their existing curricula, in the light of changes in the needs of students, or changes in the nature of skills required in business practices, then the 'contract' would require re-negotiation. This would not seem, however, to be likely to entail markedly different sets of changes between the curriculum requirements of TAFE and schools. It is more likely that the sets of changes would be responding to the same changed circumstances, in which event the curriculum revisions would likely correlate closely.

If these expectations for change are borne out, then it is apparent that the style of Schools/TAFE cooperation embodied in the Business Studies Program will be one that is, once established, relatively inexpensive and straightforward to maintain.

Suitability of the Model for Other Study Areas

It is our view that the Blackfriars model Business Studies Program is most suitable for the further development of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. It would seem to be applicable in most States/Territories in Australia in the case of the business study area — furthermore it would seem to have a generalisability to other study areas. In those States/Territories which have already established study areas that are common to Schools and TAFE, such as in business/secretarial, technical (drawing, drafting, carpentry, etc), computing, design (artistic or technical), and electronics, the Business Studies Program model would seem to be adaptable. The critical ingredients of the model are the three stages or activities described in the design process for Business Studies Program and the achievement of maximum credit in both the Schools and TAFE accreditation systems.

The model is simple in concept and in its design requirements. And it would seem to be inexpensive and relatively uncomplicated to maintain. Educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) interested in experimenting in the development of cooperative programs, or in encouraging the adoption of cooperative approaches by educational practitioners in the field, could easily find the Business Studies Program model is one that bears strong consideration.

Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.4 Commentary on Case Studies of Community Colleges in Tasmania, and Hervey Bay Senior College in Queensland

This commentary was written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. It would not have been possible without the work undertaken by Michael Frost, teacher of Rosny College, Hobart, the author of the case study on 'TAFE-Secondary College Integration and the Community Colleges in Tasmania'. We are also grateful to officers of the Queensland Department of Education who were able to provide documentary and verbal information relating to the Hervey Bay initiative. We would like to acknowledge these works and thank these people for their contribution to our national study.

The commentary is based upon the contents of the case studies, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
This commentary differs from the others included in this chapter in a number of ways. Firstly, the objects of the case studies referred to here are not single Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in the way that these have been defined for the purposes of our project. Rather they are large-scale educational initiatives undertaken by State governments and educational authorities, both involving the building and planning of 'new' types of educational provision for post-compulsory students. These two large-scale initiatives incorporate the planning of Schools/TAFE cooperation as a part of their enterprise, and it is this feature that is of interest to our work. Clearly, however, each of these two initiatives had a broader purpose, and this will be outlined in our commentary.

Secondly, the features of curriculum design, process and implementation of the Schools/TAFE cooperative program, which have been central to our comments upon other case studies are not the focus of attention in this commentary. The issues discussed are rather ones of Schools/TAFE cooperative policy, educational change and the management of the implementation of that change. That this commentary has this different focus is in keeping with the criteria used to select case studies, as reported in Chapter 2 of this report. These two case studies were selected because of the information benefits that could be expected from a comparative examination of planning similar educational change at a state level, and because in one instance the change was complete, while in the other the change was in its early stages. As well, it was apparent when we commenced our national project that educational planners in other States/Territories were considering similar educational changes.

A third difference relates to the structure of the commentary. A comparative approach has been taken because of the similarity in stated goals of the two educational endeavours. A fourth difference, as it relates to the Queensland initiative, is evident in that other case studies have examined educational programs that are current. The Hervey Bay College was, during 1985 when we gathered information about it, still in its planning stages. It is therefore quite likely that some of the information gathered at that time has been superseded, particularly so because of the developmental nature of the initiative.

4.4.1 The Context of Change

There are both similarities and differences in the climates leading to the changes that occurred in Tasmania and Queensland. And these climates have a number of elements which appear to have contributed to the impetus for change in each case -- elements which were economic, structural, social, educational and political. The similarities and differences will be outlined as they appear to relate to these elements.

The economic and structural (industry structure) contexts for the two educational endeavours would appear to have been substantially different. The early to mid-70's in Australia witnessed a period of economic and commercial buoyancy. Manufacturing and service industries were developing and expanding. Primary industry exports were steady, the international trade balance seemed acceptable and there was the promise of continuing prosperity resulting from the natural mineral resources beginning to be tapped by the emerging mining industry. Further, unemployment averaged a relatively low 4% nationally and there was optimism in the improvements to be gained, both in work and leisure, from the new technologies, particularly in electronics and information systems.
That this positive picture of the Australian economy in (say) 1974 may have been based on a short term view of macro-economic indicators, or that it subsequently proved to be false, is a matter about which we are not able to comment. It was, however, the prevailing popular wisdom of the day. It would therefore have formed part of the context for the community college movement in Tasmania.

The mid 1980's, by comparison, although only a decade later, have seen a substantial contraction in manufacturing, a severe recession in the rural sector relating to balance of payments difficulties, the prosperity promised by the mineral resources boom has dissipated, and unemployment has reached the highest national level (12%) since the depression of the 1930's. Furthermore, some industries have begun the painful process of 'restructuring', either voluntarily or by government persuasion, in an effort to increase the efficiency/productivity of their enterprise. This quite different economic climate formed the context for the current Hervey Bay initiative.

It is interesting to note that economic advantages would seem to us to be one of the significant rationales for both the Tasmanian and Queensland community/senior college endeavours. Yet the contextual information we have been able to compile on each makes little reference to economic advantages. Especially in the case of the college at Hervey Bay, it may have been expected that one of the major premises for its establishment would have been the economic gains of sharing scarce educational resources (between the various institutions providing post-compulsory education) at a time when governments are highly conscious of public accountability for public expenditure. Obviously this factor did contribute to the decision to plan the senior college; it is certainly evident in the 'Education 2000' report (1985) which is serving as the framework for planning the future of education in Queensland at the present time.

In both cases there seems to have been a reliance on the community/senior college trend identified in some overseas countries, such as Canada, the UK, and the USA. This reliance is certainly evident in the case of the community college initiative in Tasmania. This influence is recorded in the case study. One observation we make concerning the overseas experience is that Australian education has a number of unique characteristics and traditions. The implementation of 'good ideas' from other countries has on more than one occasion been thwarted in the Australian context because too little regard was paid to those particular characteristics and traditions.

The social, educational and political elements of the context of the two endeavours seem to have been more prominent in their acceptance as worthwhile educational initiatives. In the case of the community colleges of Tasmania in the early 70's, the social and educational climate in Australia was one rich with new ideas and a willingness to innovate and to find the resources required to support the innovation. The case study document refers to the Karmel Report (1973) and its identification of the concept of 'life-long' education, stimulating an interest among educators to change existing education systems to reach a wider community clientele. The first Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education (ACOTAFE) Report (or Kangan Report) of 1974 was undoubtedly a contemporaneous influence. This report and subsequent ACOTAFE reports focussed on the ideas of life-long learning (or continuing or 'further' education) and on clearing pathways to education for disadvantaged persons. Indeed it was these reports which heralded the changes from 'technical' education authorities to 'technical and further' education authorities in the Australian States/Territories.
Furthermore, at the local level, it had been recognised that the Launceston Technical College required refurbishment or replacement as a TAFE facility if it were to continue to adequately meet the vocational needs of the Launceston community. It would appear logical to synchronise this improvement of TAFE facilities with the establishment of the Alanvale Community College in the northern part of Launceston.

It would seem to us that the optimistic social and educational climate, coupled with the successful record of large-scale educational change in Tasmania (reported in the case study), and the identified need for an improved TAFE provision at the local level would have provided substantial impetus to the community college endeavour launched in Tasmania in the 70's. Also, in keeping with the movement towards the establishment of TAFE Authorities in some States/Territories at this time, the community college endeavour was placed within the broader initiative to establish a separate Division of Further Education within the Tasmanian education system.

By contrast, the social and educational climate for the change in Queensland in the mid-80's is one reflecting the greater economic constraints of this time. As with the 70's there is a keen interest to initiate educational change, but now this arises more from a desperate need to improve educational provision in the face of growing unemployment, a receding economy, greater public awareness of, and dissatisfaction with the deficiencies of the education system, and of governments striving to achieve greater efficiency in their use of public funds. These factors have combined all around Australia to bring strong pressure to bear on educational planners to find equitable ways to increase participation in education, to provide wider educational choice, to clear pathways to further education in the tertiary sector (including TAFE) and to employment, and to provide programs which prepare students for jobs which have changed and are continuing to change at a rapid rate.

Also, as in Tasmania, the Hervey Bay College is in some part a response to an identified local need to expand an existing TAFE provision (at Maryborough). The Maryborough College would have required either refurbishment or replacement. So the logic in synchronising the refurbishment of an existing TAFE facility with the building of a new post-compulsory college would have been likewise apparent.

The political climates for both the Queensland and Tasmanian initiatives would appear to have been alike in a number of ways. In each case the decisions to launch the changes were taken by long-standing State Governments perceived as comparatively stable, responsible and conservative. As well, in each case the proposed changes were heralded to the community with strong conviction by those governments. Indeed, for both it seems the Ministers for Education and the Directors-General of Education maintained strong personal interests in the undertakings. Both represented 'top-down' decisions. That is to say, the decisions were firstly taken to launch the initiatives, and following this the machinery was set in place to negotiate, consult, and plan their implementation.

4.4.2 The Purpose of the Changes

In Tasmania the community college concept was an important element of the broader purpose of restructuring tertiary education in that state. Such a college would provide, as in the British tradition, a comprehensive education for 14-19 year olds in a purpose-built facility. The college would provide
* an academically-oriented Year 11 and 12 curriculum
* technically and vocationally-oriented curricula
* a range of curricula to meet the needs of the local community
* a community resource
* vocational curricula in cooperation with a nearby technical college.

For the Alanvale College (reported in the case study for this project), the college would be set in a metropolitan Launceston community which included a College of Advanced Education, a High School, the then newly planned Australian Maritime College, and a newly planned Technical College.

In Queensland the Hervey Bay Senior College is an important experimental element in the broader purpose of consolidating the present range of post-compulsory educational provisions in that state. It is planned the college will offer

* an academically-oriented curriculum for senior students
* vocationally-oriented curricula
* vocational preparation courses
* combination programs of academic and vocational curricula
* general/community and personal enrichment courses.

The Hervey Bay college would be set in a rural/coastal community some 270 kms from Brisbane which includes one high school in the immediate area, and another nine schools in the region. A TAFE college is located at nearby Maryborough. The Hervey Bay case study details the post-compulsory curriculum options to be made available at the new college.

4.4.3 Management of the Change Process

It is evident from the Tasmanian case study that the change process was planned to occur over a fairly long period of time. The Alanvale college opened in 1975, and initially offered senior secondary (or 'matriculation') studies. It was planned that its course provisions would grow from this beginning, to include the other elements of the community college concept (vocational and community provisions) by a process of "evolution". It seems likely that the educational administration anticipated that this evolutionary process would be nurtured by the flow of educational reports, policy papers and ministerial and press releases which reiterated the principles of community education and of a 'further education' authority embracing senior secondary, TAFE and adult education provision.

The first community education courses were offered at Alanvale in 1976. This represented a second phase in the process of evolution. The third phase, the provision of TAFE programs at Alanvale, was more complex, and the case study details the events that formed part of the endeavours to implement this phase. A State Council of Further Education was established in 1978, and a series of working parties set to work to develop a policy 'blueprint' to implement the creation of the Further Education Division, and to identify issues requiring attention in order that the full range of curriculum provision could be introduced at community colleges.

The working parties identified a range of such issues, including the composition of the college administrative structure, revisions to curricula, course accreditation arrangements, and the resolution of the quite discrepant 'working conditions' of TAFE and matriculation teachers. Between 1978 and 1980 teacher
groups had voiced concern on a number of issues. The three teacher unions representing the interests of different groups of teachers had begun to play significant roles in the evolutionary process. Further working parties were established to design machinery to implement the policies stated in the blueprint. It was thus anticipated that Alanvale would operate as a full community college as from 1980.

During the period to 1980, in-service sessions on the concept of the community college, and joint staff (matriculation and TAFE) planning seminars were conducted. A college council, drawing on representatives from the community, was established. The third phase had been implemented, but during 1982 the proliferation of industrial action by teacher unions, the delays caused in the provision of facilities and equipment for Alanvale and the uncertainty relating to policy guidelines appear to have combined to erode the future development of the college. The new State Government of 1982 abandoned the Further Education Division, and moved to re-establish Alanvale as a provider of matriculation studies only by 1984. Alanvale Technical College would offer TAFE courses.

The Tasmanian case study identifies a number of factors which appear to have contributed to the fate of the Alanvale College as recorded. These include the adoption of an insufficiently assertive "evolutionary" change strategy to implement the change, lack of effective communication to stakeholders concerning the nature of the change, innate resistance to change, and the adoption of inappropriate methods to manage the conflicts that inevitably arose during the course of the change process. As well, it points to the local geographic unsuitability of the Alanvale situation for the establishment of the college (by comparison with the college established in the east of Hobart -- i.e. Rosny College), and to the artificiality of a decision made 'from the top' without due regard to the needs and circumstances of the local community. The case study also notes a number of industrial issues which were central to the concerns expressed by teachers during the change process. These will be taken up below.

It is not of course possible to make the same kind of analysis of the Hervey Bay College initiative. There we do not have the advantage of hindsight, nor in this study, of such a detailed review of the processes characterising the management of that change. We are conscious, however, of the interest by educators in Queensland in comparative factors and circumstances which may serve to highlight any potential flaws in the planning and implementation of their senior college at Hervey Bay, and at two other locations where we understand such colleges are proposed to be established in Queensland within the next two years. We are also aware that in at least two other States, similar ventures are presently being seriously considered. To this end, we offer the following comparative comments in the hope that they will be of use to the educational planners involved. Our intention is not to compare the Tasmanian and Queensland initiatives per se. Rather it is to use the two as a framework for drawing out what appear to be some of the important considerations in planning such initiatives.

We are quite confident, however, that the Tasmanian case study document itself, will be of considerable interest to planners in other States/Territories, and that it contains insights into local problems that only those directly involved with their endeavour will recognise as relevant.
4.4.4 Some Planning Considerations

It is apparent from the comparative contextual outlines of the Tasmanian and Queensland initiatives that some circumstances were alike, and would also be evident in other Australian locations where comprehensive colleges are mooted. In both cases, for example, there was the expressed intention to reach a wider clientele, and to clear pathways to education and work by providing greater curriculum choice. In both cases an existing TAFE facility was felt to be in need of refurbishment in order to continue to meet the needs of the local community. In both cases the changes were born of close examinations of the current 'system' of educational provision in the State. In both cases the change was strongly heralded by an established State Government. Lastly, in both cases the decision to change was made at the top, prior to the planning of an extensive process of consultation, negotiation and program implementation.

The outline of the purpose of each endeavour also shows marked similarities. In each case the proposed colleges would be purpose-built to serve four areas of perceived community need -- viz. entry to higher education; vocational education; general education comprising both vocational and tertiary entrance studies; community/enrichment education.

The plan for managing the change process in both instances was one that was to be gradual. However, the articulation of the phases to be traversed in that process differed both in terms of its clarity and direction. It was made explicit by the Queensland Department of Education at the outset that the Hervey Bay exercise was a trial, that it would commence operations in 1986, that the four areas of educational provision would be phased in according to student demand statistics generated by a model used by TAFE in Queensland for predicting student enrolments, and according to the impact of the new college on the existing educational providers in the region, and that the initiative would be evaluated. This approach contrasts with the rather more laissez-faire "evolutionary" one adopted in the Tasmanian exercise.

The complex problems of jointly delivered programs (Schools and TAFE) which appeared insoluble at Alanvale were simplified in Queensland because of the existence of this kind of provision in the area already. Indeed the TAFE college at Maryborough will continue to play a role in this kind of program for the present time. Most importantly, however, the issues of joint development and delivery of courses in the Hervey Bay region are not set within the broader distracting context of an amalgamation of historically separate teacher groups. In Tasmania, the community college educational initiative was in many ways overshadowed by the broader and more threatening industrial change of establishing a new educational authority. In Queensland no such broader change is envisaged. Largely there the stakeholders can focus their efforts on the educational change in progress.

There are structural similarities in the industrial relations environment in Tasmania and Queensland. In both cases there are, for example, multiple teacher unions representing the disparate interests of historically demarked teacher groups. In both cases these unions have been involved, at least at some stage in the planning process for the change. A major difference, however, seems to be that in Queensland, there has been no evidence of attempts to negotiate a separate industrial award for staff of the new Hervey Bay College. As is shown in the case study, a unique set of "administrative arrangements" have been determined for Hervey Bay staff. These were proposed, are quite specific and were made public early in the planning process. Interestingly these arrangements appear to attend to most of the working conditions 'issues'
identified in the Tasmanian case study that were the focus for disagreement in that exercise — viz. job tenure; salaries; hours of duty; increments.

Both endeavours have also adopted structurally similar approaches to implementing the change. In each case, a working party structure was used. A series of working parties were designated particular Tasks to undertake to contribute to the overall implementation plan. In Queensland, however, as already noted, there was a more concrete implementation plan for working parties to use as a framework, and the working parties were designated defined and discrete tasks to perform. In Tasmania, the implementation plan developed as it went along, and working parties seemed to be set up in response to a crisis rather than as an initial part of the planning process.

It is evident that for both initiatives some effort has been made to 'sell' the new idea to the community and to the stakeholders, through information communicated to the public and by staff development (or in-service) seminars. In the case of Hervey Bay, however, there appears to have been a more active campaign, at the 'front-end', to present a well-researched case to the community through community meetings which were able to focus on the needs of that community. By comparison, attempts to inform the public and to involve stakeholders in the process in Tasmania, seemed to be belated, and when undertaken, provided forums for the expression of disagreement and lack of confidence in the educational management of the enterprise.
4.5 Profile and Commentary on the Equine Management Program in WA

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the author of the case study, Anne Reiss, of Kobeelya College. We would like to acknowledge her work and thank her for her contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.5.1 Profile of Equine Management

Program Title: Equine Management

Program Location: Katanning, Western Australia

Participating Colleges/Schools: Bentley Technical College/ Kobeelya College

This privately funded Schools/TAFE cooperative program is located at rural Katanning, some 280 kms south-east of Perth. Kobeelya College is an independent girls school situated some distance from the nearest TAFE providers of equine management at Bunbury and Albany. This program was offered in 1985 as a phase one; it will be offered in 1986 as a phase two.

The Equine Management program is a two year program, and is undertaken by students in Years 11 and 12 at Kobeelya College, which has a well-established record in equine education. The equine management program offered at Kobeelya is the TAFE accredited Equine Management Certificate Course. It is provided solely at Kobeelya, and is delivered by teachers employed by Kobeelya. TAFE generally offers this certificate course over one year full-time or three years part-time. At Kobeelya the course is run over two years to synchronise with the two years of senior school study. The 1200-odd hours duration for the TAFE equine management course is accounted for at Kobeelya as follows:

* 5 x 45 minute periods per week
* before school, after-school and week-end study
* 2 weeks per year work experience with employers in the industry.

In 1985 the course comprised studies in horsemanship, horsemastership, conformation and action, horse transportation and First Aid. Additional studies in phase two of the course (in 1986) are to include equine veterinary science, evolution and farriery. The equine management course is jointly accredited by TAFE and the Secondary Education Authority (SEA), the senior secondary accreditation agency in WA. The SEA accreditation results in a Level 2 credential. The equine management course therefore contributes toward a student's senior school certificate (to the value of 12 points), but does not contribute to a 'tertiary entrance score'. The accreditation by TAFE results in the award of credit in the TAFE Certificate course in equine management for subjects completed. It is thus possible for students who have undertaken the full equine management course at Kobeelya to be awarded the TAFE certificate.

Seven Year 11 students (out of a total enrolment of 13 in Year 11) undertook equine management in 1985. Entry to the program was open to all students. The program was jointly managed by staff at Katanning and TAFE staff at Bentley Technical College (in suburban Perth). Katanning staff undertook a need/demand study during 1984 to identify the extent of student and employer interest in the program. TAFE staff at Bentley were responsible for the provision of curriculum support in the delivery of the course -- some teaching materials were provided and student assessment was undertaken using TAFE procedures administered from Bentley.
4.5.2 Commentary on Equine Management

A number of features of the equine management program are notable, especially as they are not shared by many of the other cooperative programs identified in this national study. Included amongst these are

(a) the delivery of the program
(b) the funding of the program
(c) the auspice of the program
(d) the duration of the program.

Program Delivery

Only 7% of cooperative programs identified in our study included any component delivered by other than TAFE teachers; only 1% were taught solely by school teachers. The equine management course was taught by established secondary teachers at Katanning, and by specialist teachers employed casually by the school for the delivery of specific parts of the course, such as farriery and veterinary science. Neither the school's employment formula nor TAFE's award permitted employment of the casual teachers as credentialed teachers, yet the teachers concerned were recognised as 'able' by both the TAFE and secondary accreditation agencies. This is apparent by virtue of the accreditation afforded by both agencies.

The delivery of equine management solely on school premises (at Kobeelya), with the exception of discrete periods of work experience, is another almost unique feature of this program. Only 2% of the cooperative programs identified in our study were delivered without recourse to specialist TAFE facilities. This highlights, in our view, an exemplary feature of the program. In Australia, there are a large number of 'special interest' government and non-government secondary schools, which have existing specialised resources of the same (or nearly the same) standard as TAFE. The Kobeelya study has shown that such schools can enhance their curriculum and extra-curriculum activities, and clear student pathways to TAFE and other tertiary studies by accessing accredited TAFE courses, without placing any substantial resource strain on the TAFE system. As well, such a cooperative arrangement does not place any added demand for limited student places on the TAFE system.

It is important that judgments about the school's capacity to deliver the curriculum to the standard expected by the community be made. TAFE needs to be concerned to maintain the credibility of its course awards to the community at large (and to employers and students in particular). This leads to the notion of accrediting institutions to deliver courses. In the case of Kobeelya, it appears that the school was granted an implicit form of accreditation to offer a TAFE course. As noted in the case study, the school was in some minor ways deficient in its resource facility. This deficiency was, however, made up by the TAFE college at Bentley, which supported the course's delivery at Kobeelya particularly with curriculum materials.

It occurs to us that a great many schools in Australia have the capacity to be accredited as TAFE providers in selected curriculum areas, given that they meet certain criteria. This would of course depend upon many factors including the available curriculum facilities, teaching expertise and resources of the school, as well as the capacity of the school to provide work experience for the students. A mechanism for conducting a close examination of the school seeking accreditation would need to be developed. The factors that would need to be
negotiated are numerous, and we will not attempt to identify all of these here. The Kobeelya study has, however, shown that this approach to Schools/TAFE cooperation is feasible.

The reader interested in examining other evidence from this study, relating to institutional accreditation is referred to our commentary on the Business Studies cooperative program in SA and to our general discussion on this subject in Chapter 6.

Program Funding

The case study records that funding for the equine management program came from the Kobeelya school's own resources. Only one other program identified in this review was so funded. The school financed a 'market' survey of need/demand prior to introduction of the program. This relied on a private donation. In addition to these costs, the school paid full-time and casual teachers from school funds. Other costs associated with the course were school running costs, for which $1000 was budgeted, and some minor administrative costs that were borne by Bentley TAFE related to student enrolment and the despatch and marking of examination papers.

Largely due to the school's existing resources, therefore, the equine management program appears to have been a comparatively inexpensive educational endeavour.

Auspice of the Program

The equine management program is one of only 2% of cooperative programs identified that involve a non-government school. As pointed out elsewhere in this report (see Chapter 3), it is probable that other cooperative programs exist but that we have not been able to gain data on these. It is likely that at least some of these involve non-government schools. However, we do not feel the number would be large since, while we did not have any centralised access to data within the non-government school system, we would have expected to identify the majority of such cooperative programs through our centralised TAFE sources. Notwithstanding this the number of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs remains quite small, and results from the Schools/TAFE cooperative policies adopted in most States/Territories of giving preference to government schools.

The Kobeelya study has shown that a successful cooperative arrangement with TAFE can be forged by a non-government school. This success would appear to depend again upon the low level of demand that such a program places on the TAFE system for, while TAFE systems are stretched to meet the demands for courses as at present, they will continue to maintain a means of prioritising student places. The low level of demand inherent in the equine management program is in terms of both low cost to TAFE, and small student numbers.

Program Duration

The 1200 hour duration of the equine management program is the largest of any identified in our study. In WA, therefore, the equine management program represents about four times the duration required to accrue 12 points towards a senior school certificate awarded by the SEA in WA. As with other Schools/TAFE cooperative programs of durations substantially longer than the standard range of durations accredited by secondary agencies in other States/Territories in Australia, this sort of comparison gives cause for concern that students are not receiving an equitable return on their educational investment in such programs. One way of redressing this apparent inequity would be to seek a Level 1 secondary credential for the program.
Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the author of the Gold Coast case study, Patrick Parsons, of the Queensland Division of TAFE. We would like to acknowledge Pat's work and thank him for his contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
The case study which is the subject of this profile and commentary actually describes the two types of schools/TAFE cooperative programs conducted at the Gold Coast in 1985: integrated programs and link courses. Our profile and commentary address only the integrated programs described in the case study, since a study of link (or career awareness) programs was not a part of our national study.

4.6.1 Profile of Gold Coast Integrated Program

**Program Title:** Gold Coast Integrated Program

**Program Location:** Gold Coast, Queensland

**Participating Colleges/Schools:** Gold Coast College of TAFE
Benowa, Keekra Park, and
Southport State High School.

This State funded program provided, during 1985, as a trial, the opportunity for Year 11 and 12 students to study a number of existing TAFE units/courses as part of their two year course of study leading to the award of a Senior Certificate in Queensland. For the trial period in 1985, seven of these TAFE units offered were approved by the Board of Secondary School Studies for inclusion on that Board's Interim Statement of Results and its senior school credential, the Senior Certificate.

The city of the Gold Coast is located some 90 km south of Brisbane. The Gold Coast stretches for approximately 35 km along the eastern coast and is a large urban centre. The area's economy is tourist based. It suffers a fairly high rate of unemployment and it's schools have evidenced in recent years comparatively high retention rates to Years 11 and 12.

The three state high schools participating in the integrated program in 1985 operated as a 'cluster' with a cluster Coordinator, based at Benowa School, performing administrative and organisational duties to support the program. The three schools were in close proximity to the TAFE college, the most distant, Southport, being about 10 km away.

During 1985, students participated in 17 TAFE subjects, seven of which were involved in the trial arrangement which earned a joint Schools/TAFE credential for 1985. The balance of this profile will focus on these seven subjects and references to the 'program' or the 'integrated program' will relate to those seven subjects.

The seven subjects comprising the Gold Coast program, their durations, teaching patterns and locations are depicted below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAFE Subject</th>
<th>Duration &amp; Pattern</th>
<th>Taught by</th>
<th>Taught at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Processing I</td>
<td>54 hrs for 18 wks</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Microcomputers</td>
<td>54 hrs for 18 wks</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Communication</td>
<td>54 hrs for 18 wks</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Benowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of Programming</td>
<td>54 hrs for 36 wks</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic I</td>
<td>54 hrs for 36 wks</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Communication I</td>
<td>54 hrs for 18 wks</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Keebra Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Communication II</td>
<td>54 hrs for 18 wks</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Keebra Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student attendance was required both inside and outside the school hours for Basic I and Elements of Programming. The other subjects were conducted wholly inside school hours.

All three schools in the cluster participated in Word Processing I and Introduction to Microcomputers with a total schools enrolment in each subject of 30 students (24 females and 6 males). Benowa and Keebra Park were involved in Business Communications I and II with a total enrolment in each of 31 (17 females and 14 males); and in Technical Communication with an enrolment of 8 (all males). Benowa and Southport were involved in Elements of Programming and Basic I with a total enrolment in each of 11 (4 females and 7 males).

The integrated program was cooperatively planned during 1984 by the Principals of the participating institutions. The implementation of the program was undertaken largely by the cluster Coordinator based at Benowa and the head teacher of Business and General Studies at Gold Coast TAFE College. A quite complex network of committees (refer to case study Figure 2) was established to coordinate, develop and monitor the whole cooperative program – including link courses and courses for special categories of students.

The integrated program was open to all students. Students participating in one or more of the seven subjects in the program would earn, on successful completion, a TAFE credential and/or credit in a TAFE course for further study, and a Level 2 secondary credential.

4.6.2 Commentary on Gold Coast Integrated Program

The Program, as trialled in 1985, has been established for 1986 with some additional TAFE units to be offered. In respect of its crucial features, however, i.e. joint accreditation, joint teaching and location and its cluster arrangement, the program remains the same. Indeed as with the 1985 pilot of the Port Kembla program in NSW, the Gold Coast integrated program seems to have served as a blue-print for much of the development that has occurred in schools/TAFE cooperation in Queensland during 1986.

The analogy drawn above with the Port Kembla program seems to us to extend quite a deal further. The same joint accreditation arrangements and schools cluster
approach apply to both programs, although there are some minor operational differences in the cluster approach of each. In much the same way as our treatment of a commentary on the Port Kembla case study, we will use this commentary on the Gold Coast program as a vehicle for highlighting some of the features of schools/TAFE cooperation in Queensland - particularly as they relate to developments during the later part of 1985 and in 1986.

Those features of the Gold Coast Program that we wish to comment on are its funding, aspects of its implementation, joint accreditation and the considerable gains we feel have accrued as a result of its 'experimental' status during 1985.

Funding

The Gold Coast Program was funded during 1985 largely out of state funds derived from the Education Department's budget.

In Queensland both TAFE and secondary education are administered by the Education Department. State funding for the program was provided by the division for Secondary Education. Supplementation occurred out of the Commonwealth Additional Curriculum Project vote. Interestingly, no Commonwealth PEP funds were directed to the program in 1985, even though schools/TAFE cooperation is a central element of the Commonwealth Government's PEP guidelines for schools.

In Queensland, senior officers of the Education Department adopted the view in 1985 that PEP funding should be directed wholly towards 'targeted' secondary schools. Cooperative programs involving such schools therefore attract PEP funds. The schools involved in the Gold Coast cluster were non-targeted schools and as such were largely reliant upon considerable state funds to mount the program.

We consider this aspect of the administration of schools/TAFE cooperation in Queensland as noteworthy in at least three ways. The first of these relates to the security of program continuity and program planning. During our study, many schools/TAFE practitioners remarked on the uncertainty of the programs future because of its dependence on PEP funding. As well, early program planning for the following year was often precluded due to the uncertainty of fund continuity. On occasions, schools and colleges would not receive formal advice about the availability of funds until it was too late to plan effectively for the next year. By 'mainstreaming' funds for many schools/TAFE programs, as was done in Queensland, program administrators were able to plan their programs, more confident in the knowledge that the funds would be available in time and would be continuous.

Our second observation to the Queensland approach to funding relates to its positive psychological effect on the people in the cooperative program—administrators, students and the community. The State Government decision to fund cooperative programs at non-targeted schools represents an expression of commitment to such programs. It represents an indicator, especially to students and the public at large, of its educational policy for post-compulsory education. It provides statewide imprimatur to the joint credential that students earn in such programs. Importantly too, it provides encouragement to school and college administrators to examine their other priorities in the light of the governments apparent expression of support to cooperative programs.
In the third instance, Queensland's rather more definite approach to funding cooperative programs (compared to other States/Territories), gives that state a greater degree of control over the program statewide. In this way, the central administrators are able to set and implement educational policy on cooperative programs with a greater degree of independence of the requirements of Commonwealth PEP funding.

Implementation of the Program

A number of aspects of the implementation of the program evidence both the thoughtfulness of the design phase of the program and the resourcefulness of the field people in ensuring the program was effectively delivered to students. Like the Port Kembla program, a tutorial session was initiated for students who were having difficulty with their studies. For the Gold Coast program, however, these sessions were conducted as required, and outside schools hours, rather than as a regular period in the school timetable.

Part of the design of the program included cooperatively arranged in-service sessions for secondary teachers. Where a TAFE accredited subject was to be delivered by school teachers, in-service sessions focused on the interpretation of the syllabus by TAFE teachers for secondary teachers and on TAFE's perception of the needs of the industry in the study area. These sessions provided support to secondary teachers and were considered to be an important element of the overall cooperative strategy by the Industry and Commerce Training Commission (ICTC), the TAFE accrediting authority in Queensland. The ICTC viewed the kind of teacher-in-service described as an important contributor to the monitoring process and maintenance of standards of the TAFE accredited programs.

It is interesting to note that the cooperative teaching arrangement which applied in the three 'communications' subjects is one that is evident in very few other cooperative programs we have identified in our national study. The Business Studies program conducted in South Australia is one other - a case study of this program is also included in our study. Significantly, both these programs are offered in the business studies area - a study area where both TAFE and secondary schools have an established teaching expertise. Further, both programs have a built in delivery monitoring strategy which has been negotiated and is acknowledged by the parties concerned - TAFE, secondary schools and the TAFE accreditation authority (and the secondary accreditation authority, SSABSA, in the case of Business Studies in South Australia).

We consider the cooperation in teaching evident in both the South Australian and Gold Coast endeavours to be an important precedent in schools/TAFE cooperation in Australia. It is important because it's success relies upon an acknowledgement of traditional barriers associated with the joint teaching between sectors, it has been consultatively resolved, and it has placed a priority on the economic use of resources and expertise available in both sectors to enhance the delivery of curriculum to post-compulsory students. The arrangement seems to us to be all the more innovative when consideration is given to the quite separate teacher's awards and working conditions applicable to teachers in TAFE and secondary teachers in Queensland.

The case study records that for most of 1985, a variety of ad hoc but resourceful transportation arrangements were used to transport students, staff and materials where appropriate, between schools and the TAFE college. The purchase of a minibus (at a cost of $11,500) late in 1985, funded again by state funds, overcame a number of transportation difficulties that had been evident earlier. Such concrete research support for the program is considered crucial.
if students are to be able to meet the requirements of tightly scheduled classes in different locations without needing to rely upon the good offices of teachers.

Accreditation of the Program

As with the joint Secondary Schools/TAFE Program in NSW, the seven subjects from the Gold Coast program that have been the focus of our commentary, are jointly accredited. That is to say, successful students earn credit in a range of TAFE business studies certificate courses. As well, students are awarded their Senior Certificate (for completion of Year 12 studies) which records the TAFE subjects as 'Board registered' or Level 2 subjects.

Students involved in the integrated program may study five Board approved (Level 1) subjects, plus one TAFE (Level 2) subject; or four Board and two TAFE; or three Board and three TAFE subjects. Only the first of these combinations permits the student to obtain a tertiary entrance score. This arrangement also closely resembles the NSW Joint Program - except there appears to be greater flexibility in the latter due to the points (11 and 12 points) system which determines a student's tertiary entrance score. These students are able to select subjects of 1 or 2 points in value.

In both cases, however, the scope for a student to select more than one relevant TAFE unit is limited by the spectre of the tertiary entrance score. Until integrated programs (or joint programs) achieve a Level 1 status and thus contribute equally towards the tertiary entrance score, students' curriculum options in the senior school remain subject to the constraints of a credentialling system which emphasises norm-referenced rather than criterion-referenced tertiary entrance assessment.

The Gold Coast 'Experiment'

We consider the '1985 Queensland pilot credentials project' involving the seven TAFE subjects undertaken in the Gold Coast cluster to have been effective from at least two perspectives. As with the Port Kembla program in NSW, it has served as a model for further cooperative developments in Queensland. For 1986, 220 TAFE subjects earn a Level 2 secondary credential in Queensland - these subjects have a minimum of forty hours total duration and are assessable. In 1986, the report "The Participation of State Secondary Students in Cooperative Programs with TAFE", by the division of TAFE (P. Parsons and K. Kreis, 1985) shows that 53 State Secondary Schools/Departments intended to participate in the integrated programs in 1986. On the basis of available statistics in that report for 1985, and the reports projection for school participation rates in 1986, it would seem that in excess of 4000 students will be involved in integrated programs in Queensland in 1986.

The second way in which we consider the Gold Coast trial to have been effective relates to its innovatory character. Its experimental status was a tribute to the flexibility of the parties concerned. In the face of considerable public debate in Australia about the purposes of schooling, the decline of school standards, and the relevance of traditional school curricula, and in the challenging climate of increasing participation rates, the TAFE, Secondary and accreditation authorities were able to agree to attempt something different. Notwithstanding our remarks in the previous section, we consider the trial to have been valuable and to be a step in the direction of opening up wider curriculum options and further study and work options for senior secondary students and hence has made a contribution to increasing students' equity in education.
Endnote:

Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.7 Profile and Commentary on the Integrated Studies Programs (ISP) in SA

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the authors of the case study, Darryl Alfred & Lindsay Tonkin of the SA Department of Education. We would like to acknowledge their work and thank them for their contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.7.1 Profile of ISP

Program Title: Integrated Studies Programs (ISP)

Program Location: Elizabeth/Salisbury, South Australia

Participating Colleges/Schools: Elizabeth TAFE College
Elizabeth, Craigmore, Fremont, Gawler, Parafield Gardens, Paralowie, Para Vista, Salisbury, and Smithfield Plains High Schools

This State and Commonwealth PEP funded program is located in the lower socio-economic Northern area of metropolitan Adelaide. This area suffers one of the highest rates of youth unemployment in South Australia. The ISP was conducted as a pilot program in 1984, and was offered again in 1985 in a revised format.

The ISP is a 30 week (1 day/week) program, and in 1985 was offered to students attending Years 11 and 12 at nine High Schools in the area. One of its aims is to provide curriculum extension to specific secondary school studies already undertaken by students. Attendance in the program in 1985 was essentially during school hours on either Mondays or Fridays. Students undertook TAFE studies in one of three study areas as follows:

(a) Technical Studies Extension -- which comprised six units of study each of 30 hours duration. The six units were

* Aviation
* Electrical
* Metal Fabrication
* Fluid Power
* Building Construction
* Automotive.

(b) General Studies Extension -- which comprised two units of study each of 90 hours duration. The two units were

* Garment Construction
* Health and Care.

(c) Business Studies Extension -- which comprised three units of study each of 60 hours duration. The three units were

* Retail Sales
* Introductory Accounting
* Business Law.

TAFE teachers delivered the program to 51 students in 1985 -- 40 from Year 11, 11 from Year 12. 33 students were female; 18 were male.

As with the Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE), another SA program case studied for this project, the ISP was designed and managed by the Elizabeth-Salisbury Transition Education Project (ESTEP), which was established
in 1982. Also, as with CAVE, the ISP was open to all students, although students from a number of targeted categories were counselled to consider ISP as an option. Included amongst those targetted were students judged to be 'at risk' of leaving formal education before the completion of Year 12. Priority was also given to older students. Participating schools were visited on two occasions by a counselling team.

Unlike CAVE, the ISP does not earn a successful student a discrete TAFE award. Students undertaking the ISP attend school four days/ week, during which time they study subjects accredited (or registered) by the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of SA (SSABSA). Lessons missed at school (on TAFE days) are made up in students' own time. Students receive a Year 12 certificate from SSABSA as a result of their school studies, although this certificate does not record TAFE studies. However, because the TAFE units undertaken are parts of accredited courses, successful students gain credit in these courses if they choose to pursue these TAFE studies (except in two cases where students earn a TAFE 'statement of achievement').

4.7.2 Commentary on ISP

The Integrated Studies Program has a number of characteristics we feel are worthy of comment. In part, some of these features are shared with the Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE) -- such as the design, management and funding processes related to the ISP. The ISP case study also highlights the considerable effort devoted to student counselling and selection for the program, as well as the on-going support system provided for students during the program. These are considered exemplary. Like CAVE, although in a different way, the ISP does not lead to a joint Schools/TAFE credential. We feel it is in this area that further improvements could be made, which would then provide an excellent model for the development of other cooperative programs.

Design, Management and Funding Processes

The ISP piloted in 1984, and offered in a revised form in 1985 resulted from a period of planning, negotiation and cooperative initiative undertaken by ESTEP. An outline of the issues addressed, of the policies and philosophies debated and of the working activities undertaken during this period are provided in the ISP and CAVE case studies. We have referred to the exemplary nature of these processes in our commentary on CAVE. There we highlighted the advantages of the ESTEP management model -- its administrative flexibility, regional coordination function, public face, community representation and its part in establishing policy at both the regional and state levels. The reader wishing to examine that management model in more detail is referred to our CAVE commentary, and to the two case studies -- for ISP and CAVE.

Student Support and Curriculum Design

The ISP case study describes the student counselling effort of course planners, prior to students commencing the program. It is clear this effort was well organised and was designed to achieve specific goals. Some of the goals were student-centred; others were staff-centred. Included amongst these were:
* delivery of information to students about the TAFE college
* delivery of specific course information to potential students
* provision of "in-service" to school staff
* identification of organisational arrangements required to run program
* provision of curriculum information, relating particularly to course assessment
* negotiation of student selection criteria
* identification of potential target students
* provision of guidance to students in the selection of school and TAFE subjects to achieve optimum benefit from the 'extension' concept.

It is apparent to us that the counselling effort described here is the most substantial identified in any of the cooperative programs reviewed in this project and could serve as a model for planners of cooperative programs. It is also apparent that the emphasis placed on counselling of student choice was central to the design of the ISP. That is to say, to achieve the integration aimed for in the program, it was essential that students be provided with the opportunity to select both school and TAFE subjects so that one was an 'extension' of the other. Curriculum extension was achieved, for example, by students selecting Technical Studies Extension as an adjunct to their secondary technical studies. Similarly, Business Studies Extension served as an opportunity to broaden their practical understanding and skills in secondary business studies.

The concept of curriculum extension, using existing TAFE programs to deepen understanding, and to illustrate practical relevance of studies, is one that a number of educational commentators (referred to in Chapter 1) have identified. It has the educational advantage of facilitating student learning; it is also suggested by some commentators that, within the context of public education, it provides an opportunity to make more efficient use of the state's wider educational resources. TAFE resources are brought to bear on achieving the educational goals of students in the secondary sector; school resources are brought to bear on achieving the educational goals of students in the TAFE sector.

The attentive student support environment, described above in relation to student and subject selection, appears also to have benefitted students during their study. Different emphases in subject content, and teaching styles suitable to school students were able to be negotiated because of the ongoing involvement and evaluative enterprise of program coordinators, teachers and students. The caring environment established at the beginning of the program, carried over into its delivery, and provided a valuable 'pastoral care' function for students.

Implementation of a Philosophy

It is useful to note the common philosophical origins of the ISP and CAVE. These are described in the two case study documents. In essence they are concerned with broadening curriculum options for students, and providing students seeking employment with more 'power' in the job market, and with the achievement of these aims by combining the scarce educational resources of TAFE and schools. In seeking to implement this philosophy, the CAVE initiative resulted in an integrated program of which the major component is vocationally oriented study, leading to a TAFE award. The ISP initiative resulted in an integrated program of which the major component is secondary study, leading to a SSABSA award.
Both CAVE and ISP open pathways to TAFE (through the achievement of credit in existing TAFE courses) — in fact in some instances in the same TAFE courses. CAVE centres on TAFE studies, and provides support to these studies through the balance of the curriculum. ISP centres on secondary studies, and provides support (or extension) to these studies through the balance of the curriculum. In both cases, the stated program goals are being achieved, by dint of an extensive cooperative effort between Schools and TAFE.

Like CAVE, ISP also opens pathways to work (the reader is referred to the section in our CAVE commentary on 'pathways'). It would seem likely, however, that the CAVE may have greater power in the employment market place, essentially because it affords a TAFE credential, which could be expected to have credibility with employers who have particular work requirements. By contrast, students completing the ISP are able to gain a senior school credential (from SSABSA). This could provide greater employment potential depending on the work preferences of students and the selection requirements of employers.

The contrast between CAVE and ISP, stemming from a common philosophical base, shows that alternative Schools/TAFE cooperative curriculum designs are possible. We believe this is an important finding, resulting from an examination of the curriculum initiatives of ESTEP in the northern area of Adelaide. Here, students are able to choose from a range of study patterns, each with different emphases, designed to meet their different needs and aspirations. The choice for students is not simply one between 'tertiary entrance' studies and secondary studies combined with TAFE studies.

Accreditation of ISP

It has been noted already that students completing ISP are able to earn a SSABSA Year 12 certificate. The award of this certificate results, however, from studies successfully completed from the range of school subjects accredited by SSABSA. The extension (TAFE) studies are not accredited — these are not recorded on the student's secondary certificate. The secondary studies (upon which the extension studies are based) are accredited — these are recorded on the student's certificate. In this way, the ISP has not served to enhance the secondary credential earned by the student.

While the ISP does not earn a discrete TAFE award (as CAVE does) it does lead to the gaining of credits in accredited TAFE courses. In this sense, ISP is an accredited TAFE program. Clearly, however, the program is not jointly-accredited. Students are thus rewarded by the TAFE accreditation process for their ISP study, but receive no reward from the secondary accreditation agency for their ISP study. It would seem to us that there is ample justification for the ISP to be acknowledged by both accreditation bodies — by TAFE because it includes approved TAFE studies; by SSABSA because it includes studies which enhance SSABSA approved studies. There would seem to us to be inequities in the accreditation of a program which is recognised by educational authorities, indeed designed by them, to enhance (or extend) approved studies, while not providing any formal joint acknowledgement of the extension curriculum.

Within SA itself SSABSA has the credentialling framework to accord subjects the status of 'accredited' or 'registered' subjects. These subjects are recorded on a student's Year 12 certificate, and are thus acknowledged formally. This framework allows for other than 'tertiary entrance' subjects to be acknowledged in a formal sense — such subjects may be 'registered' with SSABSA. It would
seem that a strong case can be made for the registration of the appropriate elements of ISP.

By contrast with some other Schools/TAFE cooperative programs described in this report, jointly-accredited at the equivalent of 'registered' level (Level 2 in the terms used by us elsewhere in this report), a stronger case can be made for SSABSA 'registration' of ISP, as a minimum, because of its close relevance to and enhancement of secondary studies. Often, with other programs identified, the relationship between secondary studies and the TAFE studies undertaken to complement them is not apparent. In these cases certainly, the two study areas (secondary and TAFE) have not been integrated in the manner of ISP.

Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.
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4.8 Profile and Commentary on the Joint Secondary Schools/TAFE Program, Port Kembla Cluster in NSW

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the authors of the Port Kembla case study, Dr. David Laird and Dr. Robert Baker of the Centre for Curriculum Studies of the University of New England. We would like to acknowledge the work of David and Robert and thank them for their contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.8.1 Profile of Port Kembla Program

Program Title: Joint Secondary Schools/TAFE Program (Port Kembla)

Program Location: Illawarra Region, NSW

Participating Colleges/Schools: Wollongong College of TAFE
Port Kembla, Warrawong, Smith’s Hill High Schools.

This program provided, during 1985 as a pilot, the opportunity for Year 11 and 12 students to study between one and four TAFE units/courses as part of their two year course of study leading to the award of a Higher School Certificate (HSC). The TAFE units offered were approved by the Board of Senior School Studies in NSW as Other Approved Studies (OAS), i.e. they appear on a candidate's senior school certificate (the HSC), but do not contribute towards tertiary entrance.

The city of Wollongong is the centre of the Illawarra region in NSW, located some 80 km south of Sydney. The Wollongong and metropolitan area, of which Port Kembla, Warrawong and Smith’s Hill High School are a part, is heavy industrial and suburban – much like Newcastle in the Hunter region of NSW. The local economy is heavily reliant upon the steel industry – mining, processing and manufacture. The unemployment rate in the region is above the state average and retention of students in school from Year 10 to 11 has generally been low.

The three High Schools participating in this program in 1985 were administered as a 'cluster', with Port Kembla High School as the managing school. Included amongst the responsibilities of the managing school is administration of funds for the program. The substantial management duties for the cluster were performed in 1985 by the Schools/TAFE Coordinator at Port Kembla.

During 1985, students from all three schools in the cluster participated in only one TAFE unit. This was a unit in child care studies designed to run at 2.5 hours/week for two years. The unit comprised study of the existing TAFE accredited courses Craft and Creative Activities for Children; and Effective Care for Growing Children. As these TAFE courses are short self-contained courses they each attract a TAFE "Statement of Attainment" - a recognised TAFE credential. As such, school students successfully completing these courses earn these credentials in the same way as any other TAFE student. However, they do not earn credits or exemptions in the TAFE Child Care Certificate Course, which in NSW is a two year full-time course of study.

There were three other TAFE units undertaken as part of the 1985 joint program. These were taken by students of Port Kembla High School only. These were:

* Accounting
* Fashion Technology, each ran for 3 hpw for 72 weeks spread over Years 11 and 12
* Clerical Assistance

Accounting comprised study of the existing TAFE accredited subjects Business Communication; Commercial Law; Introductory Accounting; and Commercial Law.
These four subjects are part of the Accounting Certificate Course in NSW TAFE (a four year part-time course), and their successful completion earns credit for Stage I (one year) of that certificate course.

Fashion Technology included study of the existing TAFE accredited subjects Garment Assembly, and Clothing and Fabric Selection. These two subjects are part of the Fashion Introductory Course in NSW - which, as with the child care studies, entitle students to a TAFE Statement of Attainment, rather than credit in a certificate-level course in fashion.

Clerical Assistance studies included the existing TAFE accredited subjects Keyboarding; Office Communications; and Office Procedures. These three subjects are part of the core studies of the Secretarial Studies Certificate and Office Studies Certificate in NSW TAFE. Their successful completion earns credit of 11 points out of 56 points for the Secretarial Studies Certificate, and 11 out of 37 points for the Office Studies Certificate.

The four TAFE study areas described above in child care, accounting, fashion and clerical assistance were all classified OAS and as such earned a Level 2 secondary credential as part of the HSC.

TAFE teachers were responsible for delivering the four TAFE units at the TAFE college. During 1985, TAFE units were timetabled on three afternoons per week - a student enrolled in one TAFE unit being required to attend one afternoon per week. Each afternoon attendance at the TAFE college extended beyond normal school hours because of the time requirements of the TAFE subject. As well, a tutorial period was timetabled elsewhere in the school week for each participating student - subject coordinators in the school (one for each of the four TAFE units) were appointed to conduct tutorial sessions.

The joint program was open to all students in 1985 - timetabling arrangements were designed to permit every student at Port Kembla to select at least one TAFE unit. 36 students (out of a total Year 11 enrolment of 46 at Port Kembla ) participated in the joint program in 1984; approximately 50 Year 11 or 12 Port Kembla students participated in 1985; approximately 75 Year 11 or 12 students from the three school cluster participated in 1985. Approximate gender distribution, for Port Kembla School in 1984 was females: 24, males: 12; and for 1985, females: 30, males: 20.

The design of the joint program for the Port Kembla cluster began in 1983. Head Office, regional and local officers played a part in the design process. The Port Kembla Careers Advisor carried a major responsibility for the initiative - and led a participative and consultative process comprising working parties and an evaluation committee through to the program launch in 1984. The Careers Advisor led the program management team during most of 1984 until the appointment of a half-time Schools/TAFE Coordinator was made for Term 3 1984. This coordinator continued to play a leading role in the on-going management and substantial revision and development of the program during 1985.

4.8.2 Commentary on Port Kembla Program

The Joint Secondary Schools/TAFE Program conducted in the Port Kembla cluster is just one of very many such programs operating in NSW. It represents many features that are in common with other joint programs which occurred in NSW - indeed it could be argued that the 1984 form of the program served as the prototype for the substantial growth in joint programs which occurred in NSW in 1985. In turn the 1985 modified form of this program, and the planned
developments for its conduct in 1986, appears to have served as a model for the quite remarkable expansion of joint programs that is planned (in excess of 200 in 1986) in NSW.

For these reasons much of the commentary which follows might provide the reader with a general picture of how cooperative programs have developed in NSW as a whole. We consider it very important to establish this picture as a part of our national study on cooperative programs, because from a national perspective NSW is providing pro-rata more programs than any other State or Territory.

In this way, the Port Kembla case study serves as a vehicle for describing at least in part, the development of Schools/TAFE cooperation in NSW. Because of this, we will not limit our commentary to the 1985 form of the Port Kembla program, but will also refer to its 1984 form and proposed 1986 form where these are indicative of the development of programs in NSW.

There are a number of features of the Port Kembla program that we wish to highlight. These include the program rationale, the design and evaluation process, management of the program, program implementation, and access to and accreditation of the program.

Program Rationale

The case study of the Port Kembla program records that one of the locally perceived factors leading to the conception of the program was recognition of the limited curriculum choice available for Year 11 and 12 study at Port Kembla High School. In 1984 only 46 students were enrolled in Year 11. Such a small number clearly places resource constraints upon the number of subject choices that can be offered, relying only upon the expertise and facilities available within the school. Resulting from the launching of the pilot joint program, subject choice was extended from eight subjects in 1983 to 13 in 1984. This represented a significant increase in curriculum choice - and some 80% of Year 11 students availed themselves of the opportunity to choose more widely. It is clear from this that joint Schools/TAFE programs are a very effective means of widening curriculum choice for senior secondary students even in the face of resource constraints within the school.

Design and Evaluation Process

As already noted above the Careers Advisor at Port Kembla High School played a crucial role in conceiving, designing, implementing, modifying and evaluating the joint program during 1983 and 1984. The case study also identifies the very substantial role played by Schools and TAFE officers at central and regional levels, and within the School and TAFE college.

Within the school the design process was highly consultative and participative. Teachers at Port Kembla were involved in the design from the outset - in curriculum development activities and in the establishment of an evaluation committee. Student interests were also canvassed as part of this process. The very positive evaluative feedback from both students and staff involved in the program would seem to provide some measure of the success of the design process.

It is interesting to reflect upon the function of the office of Careers Advisor in NSW schools as it related to the initiation of the joint program. We think it likely that a creative educator, whose duties include the examination of post-school options for students, might be in a stronger position than a
classroom teacher, to introduce and manage such an educational innovation. (The reader might note that it is reported in our commentary on the Vocational HSC case study that the Careers Advisor at Walgett High School was instrumental in designing and managing the joint program offered at that school).

Perhaps the most noticeable feature of the development process at Port Kembla during 1983-86 had been its flexibility. We believe this is directly related to the early establishment of an evaluation committee which provided formative advice to the designers of the program during 1984 and 1985. We will comment further on the evaluation strategy below.

Suffice to say here, Port Kembla program divides into three distinct phases – each phase representing a significant development or refinement on the one before it. In each phase, the refinements made were based largely upon substantial evidence provided by the evaluation mechanism. Importantly, the curriculum design process was managed in a way which was responsive to this evaluative feedback.

Some of the changes evident across the three phases are characterised in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 school</td>
<td>3 schools in a cluster</td>
<td>7 schools in a cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TAFE units</td>
<td>4 TAFE units</td>
<td>9 TAFE units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting (extra content)</td>
<td>Accounting (Extra content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>Child care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion technology</td>
<td>Fashion technology</td>
<td>Fashion retail (different subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist/typist</td>
<td>Clerical assistance (different subjects)</td>
<td>Clerical assistance (different subjects) + 5 other TAFE units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE units offered on 5 days/week</td>
<td>TAFE units offered on 3 afternoons/week</td>
<td>TAFE units offered on 2 afternoons/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE units extend over 6 terms</td>
<td>TAFE units extend over 6 terms</td>
<td>TAFE units extend over 5 terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion classes integrated with regular TAFE students</td>
<td>Fashion classes integrated with regular TAFE students</td>
<td>Fashion classes self-contained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management undertaken by Careers Advisor</td>
<td>Management undertaken by Schools/TAFE Coordinator</td>
<td>Management undertaken by cluster Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion unit earns short course TAFE award</td>
<td>Fashion unit earns short course TAFE award</td>
<td>Fashion unit earns credit in TAFE certificate course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other changes to the program were also made 'on-the-run'. TAFE teachers modified teaching styles to suit the needs and abilities of the secondary students. In one case at least (accounting), additional tutorial time was arranged for students in school time, in order that accounting simulation exercises could be undertaken, to compensate for the absence of relevant work experience. These tutorials were taken by a suitably qualified Port Kembla teacher.
It is our view that the number and nature of changes made to the original program design were a function of the thoroughgoing evaluation strategy adopted, and of the flexibility in the design process. The most obvious factor contributing to the design flexibility during 1984 and 1985 was the availability of an officer acknowledged as responsible for coordinating the program. In 1984, a non-teaching Careers Advisor undertook this task. In 1985, a Schools/TAFE Coordinator (with a 0.5 teaching load) fulfilled the role. It can be argued from this, that non-teaching support enhances the development of such an educational innovation - especially where the innovation involves a complex network of interactions as is the case for curriculum cooperation between a cluster of schools and a TAFE college.

Management of the Program

Management of the program is undertaken at three levels: Education and TAFE headquarters; regional administrations; and schools/college level. A number of the program management functions undertaken at the schools/college and regional levels have been identified in the case study. This commentary has referred to some of these, especially at the schools/college level as they related to the design and evaluation process. It is also important to note the role of the central administration in the management of joint programs in NSW.

This management role is performed by an Inter-Departmental Committee (IDC) - a committee comprising officers from Department of Education headquarters and Department of TAFE headquarters. The IDC is responsible for policy and a statewide monitoring of the Joint Secondary Schools/TAFE program in NSW. Its interest in the Port Kembla program has been keen - and it has strongly supported the developments that have occurred in that program.

The schools cluster model which was piloted at Port Kembla has, for 1986, been adopted as a matter of general policy for the very many other pilot joint programs in NSW. This bears testament to the IDC's conviction that the cluster model is an efficient way of approaching schools/TAFE cooperation. The particular cluster concept employed in NSW therefore warrants some examination as it contrasts markedly to the cluster concept used in South Australia (see our commentary on the Course Award in Vocational Education case study), yet resembles closely the cluster concept used in some parts of Queensland (see our commentary on the Gold Coast case study).

The rationale for the type of cluster arrangement used in NSW seems to be based upon both economic and educational considerations. Schools which are geographically close are clustered for administrative purposes. The cluster size varies from two up to twelve schools. One of the schools is then designated as the managing school, which carries a responsibility for fund administration, liaison with the TAFE college, and coordination of efforts by other schools in the cluster. It also acts as a central point of contact for the Regional Consultants on Schools/TAFE programs, appointed by the Department of Education. In this way, the initiation and monitoring of joint programs in NSW has been arranged for administrative efficiency. It is our view that by comparison with other States/Territories, this arrangement has been successful. With the aid of a centralised team comprising both Education and TAFE officers, a highly structured information and communication network has been established. With the aid of a fairly simple centralised computing facility, data on joint programs for planning and monitoring purposes are now becoming available.
This communication network in NSW could be depicted as follows:

```
IDC  -- Centralised Working Unit --> Managing School --> Cluster Schools
            ^                    ^
            |                    |
            |                    |    Regional Consultants
```

The structure has also been successful in the provision of support and guidance to people in the field through provision of seminars and meetings. It is clear that a considerable effort (in resources and person-power), as well as a strong commitment by officers concerned in each stratum of the structure, has been devoted to the statewide program. Interestingly, while NSW was a relatively late starter in the field of schools/TAFE cooperation, by comparison with some other states, its systematic and centralised approach to coordinating these endeavours now places it at the forefront of such educational activities in Australia.

As well as the administrative advantages described above, however, the cluster system has enabled individual schools to offer a curriculum choice to its senior students which is substantially wider than would otherwise have been possible. This is the advantage of 'scale'. Its impact on a single school's curriculum offerings is exemplified by comparing the breadth of curriculum choice available at Port Kembla in 1983, in 1984, and then in 1986. This advantage, and its capacity to enhance participation and equity in a full secondary education is particularly evident for schools with small enrolments and the teaching resources available to them.

Mention has been made of the structured program management network in NSW. A critical strategy in that network has been the development and dissemination of policy on joint programs. Our national study has demonstrated that for many educators involved in cooperative programs, one of the most prohibitive barriers to initiating and implementing a program is the lack of clear statements of policy in this area. In NSW, more so than in any other State/Territory to our knowledge, this barrier has been overcome.

The IDC and centralised working unit depicted in the diagram above adopted as a priority function, the development and promulgation of joint schools/TAFE policy. In 1984, a draft policy document had been prepared. This was revised in 1985 and jointly approved by the Directors-General of Education and TAFE. It is fairly prescriptive, but more importantly addresses the majority of issues faced by educators in the field. The policy and its accompanying guidelines provide the most highly developed working blueprints for administrators and practitioners (both Education and TAFE) that we have been able to identify at the central level in Australia.
Our final observation relating to program management in such a highly populated state as NSW is that the substantial and rapid statewide growth in the number of joint programs would not have been possible without the structured management framework, the commitment of considerable human and material resources, and a determination to develop policies that are able to be interpreted by field practitioners.

Program Implementation

A number of aspects of the implementation of the Port Kembla program have already been reviewed in the section on the Design and Evaluation Process. Suffice to say for these, the coordinators of the program were resourceful in overcoming difficulties arising from timetabling and scheduling conflicts, transport problems and a number of curriculum delivery issues. (These issues are identified in the case study).

We consider that two issues warrant particular comment. The first relates to the provision of a tutorial period built into the school timetable for students studying TAFE units. One reason for this, provided in the case study, was the weekly duration differential between the two school periods set aside (a total of 80 minutes instruction time) and the duration requirements of a TAFE unit of study (180 minutes per week). A large part of this difference was made up by students remaining at the TAFE college beyond school hours. The school tutorial period was set aside to make up the balance in some instances.

This tutorial arrangement is noteworthy in itself because it provides evidence of secondary trained teachers contributing to the delivery of a TAFE accredited unit. It is further noteworthy in two other respects. It provides a means for delivering compensatory tuition to students who were found to be having difficulty with some of the TAFE subjects in accounting. Because school students lacked accounting work experience, simulation exercises were designed and conducted in the tutorial period. This adjunct to the program, which would not have been as possible without the in-built tutorial strategy, was considered to be successful by students and teachers.

The other benefit of the tutorial arrangement has been its contribution to the pastoral care of students attending the TAFE college. It provided for teachers and students a time to work out problems of a curriculum and administrative nature which would result because students used to a school environment, were studying in a TAFE environment.

Another matter which results from an examination of the implementation of the Port Kembla program and from the evaluation information collected during its conduct is that of student 'attrition' from the joint program. The case study records that from 1984 to 1985 the number of students who continued from Year 11 to Year 12 was less than 30%. We understand that from 1985 to 1986, the comparable figure was of the order of 50%, and that this figure is generally applicable to other programs in NSW for 1985 to 1986.

Such a high discontinuation rate may cause alarm to program observers, including administrators, especially those unfamiliar with TAFE. A number of explanations for the rate at Port Kembla are proffered in the case study. These include the fact that a student load drops from 12 units of study in Year 11 to 11 units of study in Year 12. In 1985, many students found it least disruptive to their total study program to discontinue their TAFE unit. Other reasons given include students leaving school altogether to take up employment or pursue TAFE studies in a conventional way. Other students left school for health or economic
reasons.

It is our view that none of the reasons cited above is a negative reflection upon the joint program per se - each seems more likely to be a reaction by the students concerned to their own schooling and personal experiences. Indeed, some of the reasons cited would seem to point to a measure of success of the program - example, taking up employment or pursuing TAFE studies. However we endorse the case study writers' note of caution against placing too much meaning on such limited evaluation evidence. One further factor in relation to discontinuation rates, will be important for schools/TAFE cooperative program observers to consider when assessing their worth to students over the next few years. This factor relates to viewing retention or attrition (discontinuation) rates for cooperative programs in the context of first stage TAFE attrition rates which are relatively high, and of Year 11/12 school attrition rates. Low retention rates for cooperative programs should not be viewed independently from the absolute attrition rates of each of schools and TAFE.

Access to and accreditation of program

Integral to the initial program design for Port Kembla, and now as a matter of policy to joint programs in NSW, is the determination to ensure joint programs are equally accessible to all senior school students. Program initiators at Port Kembla believed it was a mistake to limit the joint program to students judged to be academically 'at risk'.

Whilst a number of other program initiators identified in our national study have contended that their programs were in theory open access, the instances of counselling of 'at risk' students and the placement of the program in the school timetable, show that in practice such programs are restricted to a limited number of students.

As well as accessible timetable placement, the crucial factor in enhancing program accessibility to all students in NSW has been the status of the secondary credential earned by students completing the program. This credential is a Level 2 secondary credential and as such is included on the students' HSC award. This factor would certainly have encouraged some tertiary-bound students to study a TAFE unit when otherwise they may not have done so. In this way, the program's credibility is enhanced - it becomes evident to students, parents and employers that the joint program is not an 'alternative' program of study, but rather affords wider curriculum choice to all students, while at the same time leading to a credential which has found status accorded by the Board of Senior School Studies.
Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.9 Profile and Commentary of Pilot Vocational HSC in NSW

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the authors of the Walgett/Orana case study, Dr. Robert Baker and Dr. David Laird of the Centre for Curriculum Studies of the University of New England. We would like to acknowledge the work of Robert and David and thank them for their contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.9.1 Profile of Pilot Vocational HSC

Program Title: Vocational HSC

Program Location: North Western NSW

Participating Colleges/Schools: Orana Community College (Dubbo)
Walgett High School.

This program provided, during 1985 as a pilot, an alternative full-time Year 11 course of study for students of Walgett High School (to extend into Year 12 in 1986). Walgett High School is in an isolated area some 700 km north-west of Sydney. Orana Community College (TAFE) is situated at Dubbo about 300 km from Walgett in a direction south of south-east from Walgett. The college at Dubbo is the regional headquarters of TAFE in the large widely dispersed Orana region in NSW.

The proportion of Aboriginal people living in the Walgett Shire is about 20%. Youth unemployment is high and around 45% of shire families (1981 figures) are on or below the poverty line. School retention rates for Year 10 to 11 are around 50%.

The Vocational HSC comprises studies in English and Mathematics (for six hours per week each) as matriculation Higher School Certificate (HSC) subjects, as well as Supplementary English (3 hpw), Career Education (3 hpw), Rural Employment Skills (6 hpw), Introduction to Computing (3 hpw), Art-Craft Studies (3 hpw), Personal Productivity (6 hpw), Rural Technics (3 hpw), and Community Studies (3 hpw) as non-matriculation subjects. These non-matriculation subjects are approved by the Board of Senior School Studies in NSW as Other Approved Studies (OAS), i.e. they appear on a candidate's senior school credential (the HSC), but do not contribute towards tertiary entrance.

Some of the non-matriculation subjects were selected from already established OAS courses; others were designed 'from scratch' by the staff of Walgett High School. In either case these subjects were chosen to meet the perceived needs of the students of Walgett. The cooperative character of the Vocational HSC is evident in that Orana Community College services particular components of the OAS courses. TAFE teachers deliver TAFE accredited units as parts of Personal Productivity, Rural Employment Skills, Introduction to Computing and Rural Technics. Delivery modes for the TAFE components vary from;

* weekly study at Walgett;
* block study at Walgett;
* block study at Orana.

These arrangements require travel by TAFE teachers to Walgett, and by Walgett students to Dubbo.

Fourteen Year 11 students enrolled in the Vocational HSC in 1985 (7 females and 7 males). By October, 7 students remained. The program was open to all students at the school, although some students were counselled to enter the program via student and parent interviews.
The program is managed by the Walgett Careers Adviser. As well, a program management group meets from time to time - this group comprises school course coordinators (Walgett teachers who teach the schools component of the program) and the senior teachers from Orana Community College whose teaching sections are involved in delivering the TAFE components of the program.

4.9.2 Commentary on Pilot Vocational HSC

The Vocational HSC is just one of very many joint secondary schools/TAFE programs operating in NSW. As such it has many features in common with other cooperative programs in NSW - curriculum and organisational features which are the product of a centralised policy on joint programs in NSW, agreed upon by the separate Departments of Education and TAFE. The Vocational HSC also represents a number of features that are unique within the NSW system.

The writers have commented upon these common features in their commentary upon the Port Kembla schools cluster case study, which is also included in this chapter. Readers wishing to seek an understanding of the 'typical' cooperative program in NSW should consult the Port Kembla case study and the commentary on that case study. In this commentary, we have attempted to focus only upon the unique features of the Vocational HSC program.

Context

The isolation of the township of Walgett is noted in the profile of the program. Walgett is quite a distance (300 km) from the nearest comprehensive TAFE college and is even further from the headquarters of educational administration for both schools and TAFE in NSW, located in Sydney. The Vocational HSC is one of the few Schools/TAFE programs identified in Australia that has been successfully launched in an area of such isolation.

To achieve this, the program's initiators have overcome significant curriculum and organisational barriers. Indeed a number of schools/TAFE commentators consulted during our study noted that schools/TAFE cooperation was limited to locations where the institutions involved were in close proximity. Unless this condition prevailed, the general view seemed to be that the costs and regulations associated with course delivery were prohibitive. The coordinators of the Vocational HSC have demonstrated that it is possible to broaden the curriculum options for Year 11 and 12 students by cooperation with TAFE, even in an isolated community.

In addition to this geographical context, other challenges for the introduction of the educational innovation at Walgett were represented by the high proportion of Aboriginal people in the shire and the low socio-economic condition of the area. It bears testament to the endeavours of the Vocational HSC coordinators and to the flexibility of the centralised policy guidelines that such challenges were able to be met. It is our view that the type of Schools/TAFE initiative launched at Walgett could serve as a prototype for other educators wishing to broaden curriculum choice for Year 11 and 12 students in similarly isolated and disadvantaged communities.

Design Process and Structure

The Other Approved Studies (OAS) program in NSW was designed to broaden, curriculum choice for Year 11 and 12 students. Within any secondary school in NSW, the selection of TAFE accredited courses/units offered to secondary students as OAS subjects seems generally to be based upon the following two
criteria:

1. availability and accessibility of the existing courses, including resources and teaching staff, at the TAFE college.

2. perceived suitability to school students of available TAFE courses.

Resulting from our national study, it is our impression that the first of these two criteria has been considered of primary importance in the design of cooperative programs. We feel the Walgett program affords one of the few exceptions to the general impression. With this program there is clear evidence that the specific needs and interests of Walgett students were the prime focus for planning the curriculum choices to be offered in the Vocational HSC.

The case study shows that after the concept of a Vocational HSC was first accepted in principle in mid-1984 by staff at Walgett High School, the process of course design that followed was characterised by a series of consultations with stakeholders to assess needs and gauge support for the proposed program. The process of assessing needs included meetings with students, parents and the community of Walgett Shire. Importantly, a number of those meetings were community-based. The community was not asked to attend a meeting at the school—rather the Walgett Careers Adviser visited employers and parents in the Shire and when meeting with Aboriginal communities, was accompanied by an Aboriginal liaison officer.

One of the clear purposes of these consultations was to determine what skills would be most relevant to helping young people in Walgett to pursue further TAFE studies or gain employment in the area. Another purpose of such consultations was to gain community support for the program, thus enhancing the status of the program in the eyes of the parents, employers and students, within the eyes of that community.

We believe the considerable efforts made to gain support for and recognition of the program in the area are noteworthy, particularly in an isolated community. The likelihood of the Vocational HSC being seen by the community as an 'alternative' or 'softer' option compared to a matriculation HSC is probably lessened when formal representatives of the schooling system are active in their support for it. As well, students are awarded an HSC upon successful completion of Years 11 and 12, and this is a feature of the statewide Joint Schools/TAFE Program in NSW.

There is no doubt, however that the criteria of availability and accessibility of existing TAFE courses also served as important considerations in the Walgett program. The case study indicates that, during the early planning stages of 1984, meetings were also held with TAFE staff from Orana College to identify suitable and available TAFE study areas.

The six TAFE study areas considered likely to be the most suitable during 1984 were those that were included in the program in 1985.

It is our view therefore, that whilst the criteria of availability and accessibility were important in designing the Walgett curriculum, substantial efforts were made by the designers to assess student needs early in the planning process. That considerable weight was placed upon the expressed needs of students is evidenced by the fact that some existing TAFE units included in the Walgett program were modified to suit the interests, abilities and learning styles of Walgett students.
The findings of the student needs assessment process had other important design implications for the structure of the Vocational HSC curriculum. The Vocational HSC curriculum comprises 10 subjects, eight of which are non-matriculation subjects, and seven of which are classified as OAS. Of these, four only are delivered jointly by the school and TAFE. Furthermore, TAFE teachers are responsible for delivering only part of these four subjects, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAFE Delivered Unit</th>
<th>Vocational HSC Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stretchwear (54 hrs)</td>
<td>Personal Productivity (246 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearing Shed Experting and Management (36 hrs)</td>
<td>Rural Employment Skills (246 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Welding (36 hrs)</td>
<td>Introduction to Computing (123 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboarding for Computers (36 hrs)</td>
<td>Rural Technics (123 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Construction (36 hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Maintainance (36 hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These TAFE units represent only about 30% (in duration terms) of the four Vocational HSC subjects of which they are a component. They represent around 15% of the total Year 11 study program. That is to say, even though six discrete TAFE units are being delivered as part of the program (up to five of which any student may study, depending on subject options), the great majority of Vocational HSC curriculum is delivered by the school. The designers of the program have therefore succeeded in substantially increasing curriculum choice and opening pathways to further TAFE study for the students in a comparatively time-efficient manner.

Not only is this curriculum arrangement time efficient, it has also been achieved in a manner which does not disturb the integrity of the aims of the broader Vocational H.S.C program. This contrasts with the many other cooperative programs identified in our national study that comprise a selection of four or five tertiary entrance subjects, plus one TAFE unit/course appended. Programs of the latter type are not integrated — are not focused on a cohesive set of program aims — in the way that is evident with the Vocational HSC.

The integrated structure of the Walgett program is perhaps best exemplified in the design and role of the TAFE units in the Vocational HSC subjects. Following needs assessment, the staff of Walgett High School, developed a set of aims for each subject. Then they set about determining the most effective way for achieving these aims. Only in some cases did they consider it most effective to draw upon existing TAFE resources and expertise to achieve the aims.

As a result, the program does not include the TAFE unit Stretchwear as such, rather the program includes the subject Personal Productivity. Personal Productivity has a set of subject aims, and in part these aims are met by the delivery of the TAFE curriculum for Stretchwear. Likewise, the Vocational HSC
program does not include the TAFE unit Motor Maintainance, rather the program includes Rural Technics which draws upon Motor Maintainance to best meet its aims. It appears that availability and accessibility of TAFE units were necessary but not sufficient conditions for their inclusion in the Walgett Program.

Student Attendance Patterns

Resulting largely from the isolation of Walgett High School from the nearest comprehensive TAFE college, the Vocational HSC designers needed to be resourceful in providing the means for students to attend the TAFE components of the Program. Travelling such a distance (300km) regularly poses considerable logistical and regulatory problems for students. If teachers travel, then mileage and time costs are incurred. For some TAFE units curriculum delivery is substantially dependent on TAFE facilities and equipment, which is difficult or impossible to transport.

A range of different attendance patterns was trialled in 1985. Two of the six TAFE units were conducted in classrooms at Walgett, each for one three hour session per week over twelve weeks. One unit ran for six weeks, one full day each week at Walgett. Two units were conducted in block attendance at Walgett - one of these was conducted in two blocks of three consecutive days, spaced three weeks apart; the other in three blocks of two full consecutive days over consecutive weeks. The last TAFE unit was conducted at Orana Community College in two blocks of three consecutive days, spaced three weeks apart.

For three of these six arrangements, TAFE staff travelled from Dubbo, and in some cases brought teaching equipment (e.g. motors) with them. For another, a part-time TAFE teacher living in Walgett taught the unit. For the other TAFE unit conducted at Walgett, a TAFE teacher travelled (about 100km) from the smaller TAFE college at Coonamble (a college within the Orana TAFE region). Because of the dependence on welding equipment, the farm welding unit was conducted at Orana College. For this, Walgett students travelled by school bus to Dubbo.

At least two of the features outlined above appear unique to the Walgett program. Firstly, the delivery of TAFE accredited units by TAFE staff in a secondary school is not to our knowledge evident in any other cooperative program in NSW. Yet this is the main mode of delivery for the Vocational HSC. Secondly, the resources of two TAFE colleges are brought to bear on one school - a cluster arrangement (typical of other programs in NSW) in reverse.

It is our view that the diversity and flexibility of attendance patterns characterised by the Walgett program could serve as examples to educators in other isolated communities.

Endnotes

1. Students do not study all the non-matriculation subjects listed. A selection is made according to the optional arrangements as set out in the curriculum profile on p.10 of the case study.

2. The durations in the right hand column of this table are estimates of the total duration of each Vocational HSC subject for Year 11 only, based on an effective school year of 41 weeks. These estimates were not provided by the case study writers, but were calculated for analysis purposes in this commentary.
4.10 Profile and Commentary of Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE) in SA

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the author of the CAVE case study, David Hailstone, of the SA Department of TAFE. We would like to acknowledge David's work and thank him for his contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.10.1 Profile of CAVE

Program Title: Course Award in Vocational Education

Program Location: Elizabeth/Salisbury, South Australia

Participating Colleges/Schools: Elizabeth TAFE College
Elizabeth, Elizabeth West, Gawler, Fremont, Craigmore, Playford, Smithfield Plains, Parafield Gardens and Salisbury High Schools

This State and Commonwealth PEP funded program is located in the lower socio-economic Northern area of metropolitan Adelaide. The area suffers one of the highest rates of youth unemployment in South Australia. The Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE) was offered experimentally during the second semester of 1985.

The CAVE is a 20 week full-time program (at around 35 hours per week), requiring attendance for 3 days per week at the TAFE College and 2 days per week in secondary school. Attendance outside normal school hours was required. The course was offered to students in Year 11 and 12 in 1985.

The CAVE comprises five components as follows:

* orientation and counselling (6 hours)
* major TAFE study option (240 or 304 hours)
* minor TAFE study option (120 or 152 hours)
* living skills (secondary) (203 hours)
* skill enhancement in major TAFE study area (38 hours).

The TAFE study options are offered in Business Studies, General Studies and Technical Studies. The Business Studies option includes studies in business and organisational structure, data processing and computer awareness. The General Studies option includes studies in health, food preparation and clothing. The Technical Studies option includes studies in engineering drawing and design and engineering skills. TAFE teachers were responsible for delivering these TAFE components.

The schools living skills component offers core and elective studies in individual and group relations, life and work patterns, work environments and personal life styles. Secondary teachers delivered the schools component.

Thirty five students attended CAVE in 1985 (20 females and 15 males); 25 students were from Year 11; 10 students were from Year 12. Over two thirds of these students attended a central 'hub' school (Elizabeth High School) for the living skills component. Most of the remainder attended a second 'hub' school (Elizabeth West High School).

The CAVE was designed by a specially established working party which was responsible to a management group entitled the Elizabeth-Salisbury Transition Education Project (ESTEP), a group representing institutions and authorities involved in the provision of programs and services for youth in the region. The CAVE developed over a period of three years from 1982, resulting from a range of cooperative initiatives taken by ESTEP. It was therefore the product of a great
deal of communication and negotiation between ESTEP members during that time.

The CAVE is managed and administered by ESTEP which has a direct membership link to the Central Schools/TAFE Coordination Committee, a committee with statewide policy and funding functions in SA.

Student access to CAVE was open, although students from a number of targetted categories were counselled to consider CAVE as an option. All participating schools were visited by a counselling team. Due to the limited number of student places available, a student selection process was adopted.

The CAVE is a program fully accredited by the TAFE accreditation agency in SA (SACOTAFE) as a Stream 4 award. The program is not accredited as a Year 12 course by the secondary accreditation agency SSABSA. Consequently successful students receive a TAFE Certificate, but do not receive a senior school certificate. Students do receive a locally-initiated "statement of achievement" outlining course details for both TAFE and school components.

Students gain credit in existing relevant TAFE courses at either trade, certificate, associate diploma or pre-vocational levels.

4.10.2 Commentary on CAVE

The Course Award in Vocational Education has a number of features which are worthy of comment. The writers believe that the design, management and funding processes relating to CAVE, as well as certain of its course design and implementation characteristics, are exemplary. CAVE also contributes a number of clear alternative education pathways in TAFE. However, the absence of a jointly (TAFE and Schools) accredited award is felt to lessen CAVE's impact as a model cooperative program which would aim to achieve greater equity in post-compulsory education.

Design, Management and Funding Processes

The CAVE trialled in 1985 was the end result of a considerable period of planning, negotiation and cooperative initiative under the ESTEP banner. The ESTEP group was established in 1982 and it has generated a range of Schools/TAFE cooperative endeavours since that time. The most substantial of those endeavours though is CAVE. That it took around three years to develop to the stage of its trial implementation in 1985, is testament to the number of issues that had to be resolved to reach that stage - especially so given the overt commitment to achieving Schools/TAFE cooperation that has been evident amongst the members of the ESTEP group.

During this three year period the ESTEP group has confronted administrative, funding, organisational, course design, accreditation and implementation issues, which was complicated by the absence of a clear and cohesive statewide policy on Schools/TAFE cooperation. During these years, the Central Schools/TAFE Coordinating Committee had begun to address some of these issues at the statewide level, but it was not until late in 1985 that statements of policy began to emerge. Consequently, for the greater part of this time, ESTEP identified problems and set about solving them at the regional level.

The establishment of ESTEP, by ESTEP seems to have provided a number of advantages to its problem solving capacity. The allocation of PEP state funds from the central authorities, for example, was made to the ESTEP body. This enabled ESTEP to take responsibility for the administration of funds for its
regional initiatives including CAVE. In this way, some of the problems encountered by program administrators in other states, such as what proportion of costs is met by the TAFE College vis-a-vis the participating schools, were more readily able to be overcome.

Other advantages in the establishment of ESTEP were realised by virtue of its representative and community-based membership. Such a group was in a strong position to reliably examine the needs of its young people, and to foresee and overcome barriers that would emerge at the local level - such as travel difficulties.

The major advantages, however, seem to have accrued from the identity that ESTEP established. As ESTEP is a body, it pervades a recognised identity that enables it to overcome certain difficulties that mere individuals, or even a collection of individuals with high status, would be unable to manage. It appears fairly evident that because of this ESTEP was able to experiment; and initiate in certain ways that may otherwise have been curtailed by the inflexibility of centralised systems and procedures. An example of one such initiative is the achievement of TAFE accreditation for an integrated program, part of which is taught by secondary teachers in schools. Another is the responsibility for funding administration being taken by a body, rather than a college or school Principal.

To some extent then, ESTEP adopted a 'vacuum approach' - viz. where there is no centralised policy defining acceptable and unacceptable practices, then determine a set of local practices that seem to be appropriate and implement them. This fills the vacuum, and meets immediate needs. It also establishes precedence which quite often points the way for the development of policy guidelines, after the event.

It is also quite evident that the vacuum approach suggested here, indeed the whole ESTEP development, was one that was acknowledged and supported by centralised authorities in SA. The tracking of new ground, undertaken by ESTEP, was supported centrally, through substantial funding (in the order of $60 000 for CAVE), and by the appointment of coordinating staff to support ESTEP's work. Importantly though, the central authorities seem to have provided some degree of freedom from the standard requirements of the centralised administration, which enabled ESTEP to innovate and experiment.

**Course Design and Implementation**

CAVE is an integrated cooperative program. This means that it is more than just the aggregation of a TAFE component and a schools component. The full-time program runs for 20 weeks. It therefore accounts for a substantial proportion of the immediate post-compulsory education of its students.

Unlike many other cooperative programs which are based on a substitution of standard senior secondary subjects with existing and accessible TAFE courses or subjects the CAVE program has been designed according to a set of perceived student needs. Both the TAFE and schools components have been developed to meet the established course aims of CAVE. In short, CAVE does not simply constitute a pot-pourri of existing accessible subjects.

Furthermore, CAVE has a structure which is flexible and modular. This permits wider student choice and not only within the TAFE component of the program. This flexibility and increased student choice is facilitated by the schools 'cluster' arrangement which operates for CAVE. The CAVE type cluster seems to
afford the widest possible student choice within the total offerings of the program. It is a cluster based on two 'hub' schools. Students from participating schools can attend one of two hub schools for the schools component of the program. Different school options are offered at each hub school - a selection of either the CAVE-derived living skills component, or subjects from the normal senior school offerings.

Curriculum documentation including aims, objectives, content and guidance for teaching method and assessment, was prepared for CAVE. This documentation evidences both the integrated design of the program and the uniqueness of the specific purpose of the program. During the trialling of the program, from July to December 1985, a number of modifications to the curriculum structure and content were made, in keeping with the emerging needs and abilities of the students. For example, the Technical Studies part of the TAFE component of CAVE was extended in duration, beyond normal school hours, in order to provide more time for students to acquire the requisite level of skills competence. In another instance, in the Business Studies part of the course, an additional option (Computer Awareness) was introduced when it was found that some students were having difficulty coping with one of the designed subjects (Introduction to Data Processing).

It is worthy of note that the cooperative climate for CAVE was such that these modifications to the curriculum design were able to be made during the trial implementation. Although in the case of Computer Awareness, students selecting this option lost the facility to gain credit for that subject in TAFE Business Studies Certificate courses.

**Pathways**

The curriculum for CAVE has been designed with the very clear purpose of opening up alternative pathways in TAFE. Depending on the student's choice from the major options available in the TAFE component, credit for TAFE certificate level courses is earned in

* Health and Care
* Clothing and Textiles
* Business Practice
* Business (Accounting)
* Business (Data Processing)
* Mechanical Engineering.

In addition, students selecting the Technical Studies option as their major study area, earn credit for a number of TAFE pre-vocational or trade courses.

Students successfully completing the CAVE program therefore may choose to pursue further TAFE studies with credit, across quite a wide range of occupational areas. They would do this by enrolling as a TAFE student in any of the range of existing TAFE accredited courses for which their CAVE studies have prepared them.

Alternatively, students successfully completing CAVE may wish to pursue employment. In this case their endeavours would necessarily be advantaged because they are able to present to employers with a TAFE accredited award (CAVE). Employment, based on their CAVE studies, could be sought for entry level positions in retailing, sewing machine demonstration, dressmaking, health and recreation, child care, hospital/nursing aid, hostel aid, accounting, clerical/office work, mechanical engineering, drafting metal fabrication,
fitting and machining, locksmithing and automotive parts interpreting.

The range of future TAFE and employment options afforded by CAVE is substantial. Indeed, no other cooperative program reviewed in our national study offers quite the range of alternative TAFE and work pathways.

**Accreditation of CAVE**

The advantage of TAFE accreditation to the CAVE student has already been outlined. This provides successful students with a credential that earns credit towards further TAFE studies, and which has creditability and marketability for seeking employment.

Unlike many of the other cooperative programs reviewed in our study, however, CAVE is not a jointly accredited program. It lacks any form of statewide secondary accreditation, and hence status, as a program of study within the domain of senior secondary schooling.

In addition to the TAFE accredited award, CAVE students receive a locally designed "statement of achievement" jointly issued by TAFE and schools in the Elizabeth/Salisbury region. But this statement of achievement does not accrue any kind of formal endorsement or recognition from the secondary accreditation agency for Year 12 studies in SA (SSABSA). Consequently there is no mechanism for acknowledgment of CAVE studies on the senior school certificate in SA at any of Levels 1, 2 or 3.

In effect then, Year 11 or 12 students who have opted to study the CAVE program, have excluded themselves from being eligible for a statewide senior secondary certificate. Because the study requirements for CAVE are substantial (in excess of 600 hours of instruction), insufficient time would remain for students to also pursue SSABSA accredited subjects leading to a senior secondary certificate. It would appear then that CAVE students have gained an advantage in opening TAFE and work options, but have foregone the opportunity to earn a credential which would represent to them, and to the community at large, the culmination of their secondary schooling at the senior level.

Now it could be argued that CAVE students have made a choice for TAFE and work options, rather than a senior secondary certificate. If at a later stage in life CAVE graduates wish to pursue further studies at the secondary level or in the tertiary sector, then they would be able to resume such studies via a number of second-chance routes already available within the overall adult education provision of the state.

In our view, however, to accept this argument is to concede that a CAVE-type post-compulsory education is no different than a TAFE-type post-compulsory education. (After all senior secondary students may already elect at any time during Years 11 and 12 to discontinue their secondary studies and seek enrolment in TAFE programs). And if this is the case, then what has been the point in designing an integrated Schools/TAFE program? The point has clearly been to design a program to meet the hitherto unmet post-compulsory educational needs of young people - young people for whom neither TAFE alone nor schools alone have been able to provide satisfactory educational options.

The traditional view that post-Year 10 options comprise senior secondary school studies, TAFE, work or employment, needs therefore to change. A fifth option (and there are of course others) is an integrated cooperative schools/TAFE program like CAVE. And if this fifth option is to be further developed in a way
which will encourage young people to enter it, then in our view it must be an option which carries the imprimatur of the public agencies responsible for accrediting educational programs - both in TAFE and in secondary education.

Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.11 Profile and Commentary on Farm Management Program in WA

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the contribution of Ray House of Christ Church Grammar School, Claremont in WA, in providing the minor case study for our project. We would like to acknowledge this work and thank Ray for his contribution.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.11.1 Profile of the Farm Management Program

Program Title: Farm Management Program

Program Location: Claremont, Western Australia

Participating Colleges/Schools: Technical Extension Service (TAFE)/Christ Church Grammar School

This school funded program commenced as a pilot in 1983 between the Technical Extension Service (TES), the TAFE external (or correspondence) studies facility in WA, and the independent boys school, Christ Church Grammar. The school is located in suburban Perth.

After a relatively successful pilot in 1983, modifications to the program were made, and it was again offered in 1984/5. Eight Year 11 and 12 students (all boys) undertook the program in 1985. Essentially the program involves students in private study for four hours per week during school time, using external study materials provided by TES. Subjects studied included the following from the TAFE Certificate Course in Agriculture:

* Agricultural Marketing
* Farm Finances
* Farm Budgeting
* Animal Husbandry
* Farm Development
* Grain Sampling
* Woolclassing.

A school Coordinator monitored student progress and attended to administration of the course in the school. The TES was responsible for course delivery in the same way as for other external students -- via module assignments and assessment procedures. The course was open to all students in the school; reference was made to a record of student aspirations and abilities kept in the school. The Farm Management Program is a TAFE accredited program -- leading to credits in the TAFE Certificate in Agriculture. Its secondary accreditation status was (at the time of writing) under review by the Secondary Education Authority in WA, although it appeared likely that a Level 2 credential would be granted.

4.11.2 Commentary on the Farm Management Program

The farm management program is of interest in this review of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs because it is one of the very small number we were able to identify which relies on cooperation with a TAFE external studies provider. Indeed, we were surprised not to find schools making greater use of existing TAFE external study provision in our study. It would seem to be a relatively low cost means of providing access for school students to TAFE courses, especially in isolated areas. We do understand that the practice of 'one-off' school students enrolling in TAFE externally is not uncommon. We did not seek to enumerate such individual instances in our study. We do understand, furthermore, that there is at least one other instance of 'organised' school enrolment in TAFE external study, of some scale, in Australia, but we were unable to gain access to sufficient data about that program to be helpful in this study.
It is unfortunate that more data on Schools/TAFE cooperation through external study were not available, because the system operating at Claremont does appear to have potential for providing senior school students with wider curriculum choice in a way which may open pathways to further education and work, while at the same time contributing to the students' senior secondary credential.

We would be cautious, however, in suggesting the widespread adoption of the Claremont approach as an exemplary model for Schools/TAFE cooperation, because of its dependence on the external study mode. It would be generally accepted that this study mode is not an optimum for all students. While it would appear to suit some student learning styles, it is a mode which requires a mature, independent and highly motivated approach to learning. As well, there are obvious difficulties in effecting student learning by external study in the practical components of many TAFE courses. Further, the level of educational technology successfully applied to external course delivery in Australia at present, is comparatively low. This is an area receiving considerable research and development effort in TAFE in Australia at present.

As a model for Schools/TAFE cooperation, the Christ Church study is valuable in showing that an external study means exists. It may in some cases be the only means, such as in some isolated regions. Although other alternatives for Schools/TAFE cooperation in isolated areas are presented in this study (see for example the case study on the Vocational HSC at Walgett in NSW).

Endnote:
Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.12 Profile and Commentary of Joint Horticulture Project in ACT

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the contribution of Carolyn Tweedie, PEP Coordinator, Youth Services Unit of the ACT Schools Authority, in providing the minor case study for our project. We would like to acknowledge this work and thank Carolyn for her contribution.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.12.1 Profile of the Joint Horticulture Project

Program Title: Joint Horticulture Project

Program Location: Woden, Australian Capital Territory

Participating Colleges/Schools: Woden TAFE College/ 11 local schools

This Commonwealth PEP funded project is not a program of study for students, as with all the other cooperative programs identified in this national project. Nevertheless, it is considered to be a Schools/TAFE cooperative program in terms of the inclusive definition used in the project. Reference to Chapter 2, where the project definitions are presented, shows that the Joint Horticultural Project exhibits the main characteristics of a cooperative program as defined. The Joint Horticultural Project reflects cooperative effort between Schools and TAFE where curriculum, resources and teaching inputs have been negotiated, and where a joint Schools/TAFE credential is in the process of negotiation. The essential difference between the Joint Horticultural Project and all other cooperative programs reviewed is that the Joint Horticultural Project is centred on teachers rather than students. Needless to say, the educational outcomes of the project are student-centred.

Briefly, the Joint Horticultural Project is a teacher development initiative. Horticulture teachers from Woden College of TAFE are providing curriculum support to Horticulture teachers in 11 schools. The curriculum support is in the form of

- advice on curriculum content and teaching methodology
- assistance in preparing curriculum (and teaching) materials
- development of the practical skills of schools teachers
- identifying ways of TAFE complementing facility/resource deficiencies in schools.

The project was jointly funded by Schools and TAFE at a total cost of approximately $18,000, the majority of which was expended on costs associated with a TAFE teacher visiting the schools involved to initiate the program.

The project arose from the curriculum support and professional teacher development needs of schools attempting to find ways to broaden their curriculum provision for students, with particular interest in vocational studies. The possibilities of providing students with the opportunity for "dual accreditation" in Years 11 and 12 are being examined as a part of the project.

4.12.2 Commentary on the Joint Horticulture Project

Our prime interest in the Joint Horticultural Project clearly relates to its unique focus on teachers as a means of opening student pathways to further education and work. We consider that an approach such as this, if developed to attend sufficiently to a number of organisational and educational issues, could be an 'exemplary' model for Schools/TAFE cooperation.

We have already noted the difference in the approach adopted in this cooperative program. The teacher-focus of the project should clearly lead to professional
development benefits for participating Horticulture teachers. This in turn should be expected to lead to improvements in the quality of existing secondary horticulture curriculum provision to students. Such an outcome would generally be the prime purpose for initiating any kind of professional development program for teachers.

In the case of the Joint Horticultural Project, however, we see the potential for considerable additional benefit to school horticulture students, in terms of further education and work pathways. If the potential joint Schools/TAFE accreditation arrangements for school horticulture students can be negotiated successfully, then such students will likely have also improved their employment prospects, have commenced an accredited TAFE horticulture course leading to the award of a TAFE credential, and be contributing to their senior school certificate. Further, if the Schools Authority in the ACT is able to accord such a joint course a Level 1 credential, then by definition, the credential so earned would also count towards tertiary entrance.

It seems to us that the Joint Horticultural Project has established a framework for the realisation of these potential benefits for students. Some of the organisational and educational factors that would be involved in building on this framework will now be discussed. The first of these is the design of a horticulture curriculum. It is likely the existing schools horticulture curriculum and existing TAFE horticulture courses would provide the framework for this curriculum design activity. Given the successful establishment of the Joint Horticultural Project, the beginning of an analysis of student needs and of the curriculum design process has been made. This would need to be carried through to the curriculum documentation stage.

Another factor involves planning for delivery of the curriculum. Here, location, facilities, resources, assessment and teaching would need to be addressed. Plainly, the Joint Horticultural Project has focussed on some of these elements of the curriculum design process already. Decisions on these elements would need to be made. It may be that, arising from the Joint Horticultural Project outcomes to date, and its review of horticulture facilities in schools, that some schools are adequately placed to deliver the course. This would need to be confirmed to the satisfaction of the TAFE and secondary accreditation agencies. Other schools may require material support from TAFE to deliver the course, especially to ensure TAFE's standards are maintained. In other cases, secondary students may have to attend TAFE colleges to ensure an appropriate standard of course delivery. Either of the first two scenarios above could be preferable from the point of view of schools relieving the current high level of demand for limited TAFE student places, in study areas where they (the schools) are able to meet appropriate curriculum standards.

The three possible course delivery scenarios outlined above imply the use of a mechanism for accrediting institutions as providers of accredited programs. The roving role of the TAFE horticulture teacher visiting schools to provide curriculum support, already established via the Joint Horticultural Project, would seem to provide the means for this type of accreditation to take place — at least as far as TAFE accreditation requirements are concerned. The notion of 'institutional accreditation' is also referred to in our commentary on the Kobeelya (WA) case study.

A third factor relates to achieving joint accreditation of the course, once it is designed. Other cooperative programs in the ACT are jointly accredited, by the ACT Schools Authority and by the Further Education Accreditation Committee — see the case study on the Electronics program included in this report. This
instance shows the procedures for achieving joint accreditation are available in the ACT. Our recommendation would be for joint accreditation of a horticulture program to be sought so that the Schools Authority granted a Level 1 credential. It appears from the accreditation developments likely to occur in the Electronics program during 1986, that Level 1 secondary credentialling is achievable for appropriate Schools/TAFE cooperative programs.

Endnote: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 are analytical terms adopted by the writers for the purposes of this study. They are generic terms designed to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the Australian States/Territories.

Their meanings are:

Level 1 - courses that are accreditation authority approved for State-wide tertiary entrance.

Level 2 - courses that are accreditation authority recognised (or registered) State-wide.

Level 3 - courses that are school based and school credentialled, and are acknowledged by the accreditation authority.
4.13 Minor Case Study of Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (PIPE) in NT

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the work undertaken by the author of the case study, Bill Doherty, Principal of Darwin High School. We would like to acknowledge his work and thank him for his contribution to our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.13.1 Profile of PIPE

Program Title: Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (PIPE)

Program Location: Darwin, Northern Territory

Participating Colleges/Schools: Darwin Institute of Technology/Darwin High School

This State and Commonwealth PEP funded program is located in metropolitan Darwin. It was initiated by the Principal of Darwin High School (DHS), Mr. Bill Doherty, towards the end of 1984 and was run as a pilot program in 1985. It was a joint venture between DHS, the Darwin Institute of Technology (DIT), formerly the Darwin Community College, and a number of employers in the Darwin metropolitan area.

During 1985 PIPE cost approximately $4300 to operate. (The amount of $4300 is in 'accounted' cost terms only. There were other costs involved in planning and delivering PIPE, such as 'hidden' clerical and administration costs borne by DHS or DIT, and 'unaccounted' costs borne by individual teachers in preparing to launch the program.)

PIPE is a one year full-time course of study for Year 12 students at DHS. In 1985, although PIPE was open to all students, it was offered in particular to students who had completed their Year 11 studies in 1984, but who, in the opinion of the Year 12 Coordinator, the Year 11 Homeroom Teacher and Student Counsellor of DHS, and the parent(s) of potential PIPE students, had "not yet reached a standard which is considered basic for employment". Students entering PIPE were also required to "undertake a contract of commitment with the school to conscientiously pursue all aspects of the course". The course aims to enhance the 'employability' of its students, to develop in students a positive approach to the teaching/learning process, and to develop students' life skills.

PIPE has eight strands, six of which are undertaken at DHS, one at DIT, and one in the workforce. These are illustrated in Table 1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRAND</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Mathematics</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>part of 3 days/week</td>
<td>Statistics, the four operations measurement, use of calculators, geometry, number plane, trigonometry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic English</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>part of 3 days/week</td>
<td>Writing, spelling, reading, comprehension listening, speaking, film and television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Basic Environmental Science</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>part of 3 days/week</td>
<td>Electricity, gravity household and industrial chemistry, biology, psychology, high school environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Careers and Personal Development</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>part of 3 days/week</td>
<td>Self analysis, job analysis, job seeking, world of work, alternatives to work, consumer skills, law politics, family, community relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Home Economics</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>part of 3 days/week</td>
<td>Organisation and food preparation, cooking, nutrition, etiquette, digestion, housing, budgeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student Initiated Project</td>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>part of 3 days/week</td>
<td>Recreational interest or community service activities approved by PIPE coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prevocational Trade-Oriented Program</td>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>1 day/week</td>
<td>Carpentry, sheetmetal, automotive, horticulture, welding, electrical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Experience Program</td>
<td>Workforce:</td>
<td>1 day/week</td>
<td>Each student is contracted to work for an employer. A supervisor is designated to oversee the training of the student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students undertake the DHS strands during normal school hours; they attend the DIT strand from 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. During the work experience strand students attend for the working hours applicable to the place of employment.

For the pilot run of PIPE in 1985, students successfully completing the course received a credential issued by DHS. The certificate carries comments from teachers of DHS, of DIT, and from the work experience supervisor. From 1986, the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA) has given PIPE the status of a 'registered' course, which will enable future PIPE students to earn a SSABSA Year 12 credential.

Seventeen students (8 girls and 9 boys) undertook PIPE in 1985. Most of these gained full-time employment after the first semester and their places were subsequently offered to students in Year 11.

PIPE was designed cooperatively between DHS and DIT. Its design began in a 'brainstorming' session attended by 15 staff members from DHS in late 1984. This meeting defined the aims of PIPE and the structure of the course. Following this, meetings were held with DIT staff to develop the vocational strand of the course in keeping with the stated aims.

The course is managed by a committee whose membership is the DHS PIPE Coordinator, the DHS teachers teaching PIPE, and two elected PIPE students. This committee resolves running problems that emerge in the administration and implementation of the course and has also set itself the task of on-going evaluation of the course. The DHS Coordinator is the formal link between the school and the DIT PIPE liaison officer. The participating DHS teachers provide the link with the employers to enhance the work experience strand of the course.

Operational difficulties which seem to have been overcome during the pilot include

* transportation of students to DIT (via a school bus)
* insurance of students whilst on work experience (by the Department of Education)
* apparent incompatibility of DHS's seven day cycle timetable with a regular one day/week attendance at DIT and on work experience.

4.13.2 Commentary on PIPE

Students and staff interviewed by the writers of this commentary were positive in their support for PIPE. We believe PIPE is a useful educational endeavour. Its consultative process of design, its participative management style (involving students), its inbuilt communication network and its relatively low cost are attractive features. Furthermore, it appears to have had considerable success during 1985 in 'improving the potential for employment' and in broadening the opportunities for participation in schooling of its students.

The main achievement of PIPE, however, in keeping with its intended goals, does seem to have been in clearing pathways to employment for persons who had been assessed as being underprepared for employment. This is evidenced in the case study by the majority of the 17 students reported to have gained employment during the PIPE course. The importance of this achievement, in the current job market climate should not be overlooked.
We feel, however, that in addition to enhancing students' employment marketability, Schools/TAFE cooperative programs have a great potential for clearing pathways and creating pathways to further education -- in school, in tertiary education (including TAFE), or in training in industry. It is unfortunate that the PIPE students, in gaining employment through PIPE, had to forego the completion of their senior school studies in order to take up that employment.

It would seem likely that, if the PIPE credential were enhanced, students would have a greater opportunity to gain from the advantages of both further education and employment. The PIPE credential could be enhanced in at least two ways -- one of which is already envisaged for 1986. Firstly the local school credential issued by Darwin High School in 1985 could be 'upgraded' in status to the level of one that has wider community recognition -- issued by the secondary accreditation agency in the NT (the NT Board of Studies). The case study reports that this kind of lift in status is planned for 1986. This suggested improvement may not be as critical in a comparatively small educational system (like that in the NT) as in larger state systems. It could be assumed that Darwin High School would have a substantial credibility in the territory's community, and that the school credential would therefore carry status in the eyes of that community. It would, however, be an important improvement to make if the PIPE model were to be adopted in other States/Territories. Further, it would seem to improve the further education and work prospects of NT students who may seek to move interstate.

A second enhancement of the credential earned via PIPE could be gained through TAFE accreditation of the program. At present PIPE does not earn credit in TAFE courses offered by the DIT, yet 20% of the program's time is devoted to TAFE studies, and a further 20% to 'work experience' as a support to the studies in the program. Forty per cent of the program (two days per week -- a total of some 200 or more hours) is therefore spent on vocationally-oriented coursework. This presents considerable potential for TAFE accreditation. Perhaps, if the current number of TAFE study areas (viz. carpentry, sheetmetal, automotive, horticulture, welding and electrical) included in PIPE were narrowed, there would be greater opportunity for the vocational component of the program to be designed to lead towards a TAFE credential -- either as an award in its own right (as with the CAVE in SA) or to the gaining of credit in existing TAFE courses (as with the ISP in SA).

If both the 'improvements' suggested here were made, PIPE would be a jointly-accredited program. As such it would have wider application to its students, and importantly, would not only serve to increase participation in education, it would be achieving greater educational equity for those students for which it was designed.
4.14 Profile and Commentary on the Minor Case Study of South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program (with comparative comments on the Yeronga Pre-Vocational Flexi-Mode Program)

This profile and commentary were written by the project team for the TAFE/Schools Programs and Credentials Project. These would not have been possible without the contribution of Colin Marsh, Principal of South Brisbane College of TAFE, and Harry Ruddy, Principal of Yeronga College of TAFE, in Queensland. We would like to acknowledge their contribution and thank them for the information provided for our national study.

The commentary below is based upon the contents of the South Brisbane case study, but also draws on other data collected in our study. The views expressed are those of the project team.
4.14.1 Profile of the South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program

Program Title: South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program

Program Location: South Brisbane, Queensland

Participating Colleges/Schools:
South Brisbane TAFE College/
Loganlea, Camp Hill, and Balmoral State High Schools

This Commonwealth PEP funded program was piloted in 1984, and run again in 1985 at South Brisbane College of TAFE. Initially it was offered to Year 11 students who chose to enrol in the pre-vocational program rather than to pursue studies accredited by the Board of Secondary School Studies (BSSS) in Queensland. As such, it was an alternative Year 11 program. (Students in Year 12 subsequently undertook a specially designed Electronics program, also recorded in the case study document -- our remaining comments refer only to the pre-vocational program.) Approximately 50 students undertook the program, which required TAFE college attendance for 4 hours per week -- the remaining time was spent studying school subjects and support subjects for the TAFE pre-vocational studies.

The pre-vocational program was derived from the existing Queensland TAFE Engineering/Construction Pre-Vocational Course which has been offered successfully in Queensland for a number of years. This state-wide accredited course is depicted in Figure 1 below.
The South Brisbane pre-vocational program focussed on modules 1 and 2 of this course structure, and incorporated studies in

* motor mechanics
* welding
* fitting and turning
* bricklaying
* painting and decorating
* glazing
* carpentry and joinery.

Of these, carpentry and joinery were delivered by the school; the school was also responsible for delivering the trade science and drawing components of the studies. The pre-vocational program was thus intended as both a 'link' to further TAFE studies, and as an 'extension' to secondary school studies already selected by students as part of their school program. Completion of the pre-vocational program earned a 'statement of attendance' from the TAFE college.
This means that the student does not receive credit in TAFE for the studies completed. Nor is the pre-vocational program accredited by the BSSS.

4.14.2 Commentary on the South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program (with comparative comments on the Yeronga Pre-Vocational Fleximode Program)

The South Brisbane pre-vocational program is essentially a 'link (awareness)' program. As such it is a type of program that has not been part of the focus for our study -- the working definition of cooperative program adopted for the study tended to exclude such programs due to the absence of accreditation for the program. It has been included in the study, however, because it has a number of interesting features, and importantly, because it allows us to compare some of its features with the Yeronga program, which is a cooperative program in the sense defined for our study. Some of the elements of the South Brisbane program, in combination with the Yeronga program, provide the basis for a model of Schools/TAFE cooperation which could be useful.

The Yeronga pre-vocational flexi-mode program is, like the South Brisbane pre-vocational program, derived from the Engineering/Construction Pre-Vocational Course. The Yeronga program differs from the South Brisbane program, however, in its structure. The Yeronga program has been designed to provide students with the opportunity to study the entire TAFE accredited Engineering/Construction pre-vocational course, or modules of that course in combination with secondary school studies. Figure 2 shows some of the range of flexible study patterns potentially available to students in the Yeronga program.

**Figure 2**

Examples of flexible patterns are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-program</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Post-Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Pre-voc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>1.5 Years</td>
<td>0.5 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>0.5 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>0.5 Year</td>
<td>0.5 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.5 Year</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>0.5 Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Apprenticeship
- Balance of pre-voc-
- Apprenticeship
- Balance of pre-voc-
- Apprenticeship
- Balance of pre-voc-
- Apprenticeship

Note: While students attend the TAFE pre-vocational component of the program, attendance at the college is full-time.
Students from Year 10, or ex-school, are able to select a combination of school and pre-vocational studies, which lead directly to an apprenticeship, or to TAFE studies to complete the pre-vocational course and then to an apprenticeship. The program requires that students are permitted entry mid-year. Some advantages to this approach would seem to be

1. The program incorporates TAFE accredited study
2. The program can lead to the award of a senior secondary certificate
3. Students may begin one combination and change to another during the program.

The prime benefit of this approach would be that it earns students credits in the Engineering/Construction pre-vocational course. A disadvantage may be that some students may tend to feel locked into the apprenticeship pathway. This same difficulty arises with pre-vocational courses in general. The Yeronga program, however, does not close off other work or educational options.

Another feature of the design of the Yeronga program is that it enables students to 'bridge' into TAFE studies without the commitment of continuation. This is also a feature of the South Brisbane program, but in the case of the Yeronga program, the bridging experience also accrues credits to further TAFE study. The notion of bridging is not new to these two programs -- it has been one of the goals of a number of PEP initiatives for some years. It would seem to be particularly suitable to students at school who are not 'ready' to choose between senior school studies, work, and vocational studies.

The flexibility of the Yeronga program would also seem to have more universal application. Figure 2 illustrates the potential for students who have left school to begin the program. As well, students who have undertaken Board accredited studies in Year 11, have the option to discontinue or vary these mid-year or end-year, while remaining in the organised environment of the cooperative program.

Our observation of the two programs suggests that at least two aspects of the South Brisbane program could be built into the design of the Yeronga program -- and contribute to the achievement of a more integrated study program. Secondary teachers delivering appropriate components of the program in the school would relieve TAFE of this demand on its resources; further it could reinforce the extension studies concept -- TAFE studies extending, in a practical sense, secondary studies.

We consider a Schools/TAFE cooperative program approach, along the lines described above, has considerable potential for many students. It has a capacity to provide educational options for young people in and out of school which lead to work, and further education (in school or in TAFE). It also appears relatively easy to design -- this being contingent on the existence of a well established TAFE pre-vocational course.
CHAPTER 5

THE SECONDARY ACCREDITATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

Introductory Note

The review of Secondary accreditation arrangements presented in this chapter is based on the data that were accessible during the data collection phase of our study. As with any research undertaking which attempts to examine an educational innovation in its early stages of development, the innovation itself is in a state of constant and considerable change. This presents difficulties for researchers endeavouring to draw conclusions from data which are in a state of flux. This difficulty was particularly apparent with the secondary accreditation practices of the States/Territories, because these too have been undergoing significant change during recent years.

Assessment and credentialling procedures in the Australian States/Territories have been recently reviewed by McGaw and Hannan (1985), in the Curriculum Development Centre publication, "Certification in Upper Secondary Education". We have referred to that publication in the assembly of data for Section 5.1, as it relates to Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. As in previous chapters, we are not concerned with making comparisons between States/Territories per se, but rather with identifying issues and points of guidance that emerge from an analysis of the procedures and practices adopted by any or all of the States/Territories. Each State/Territory operates a system of accreditation, and has adopted educational policies that have arisen out of its own needs and circumstances.

5.1 Accreditation of Senior Secondary Education in the States/Territories

In attempting to understand the development and nature of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in the Australian States/Territories, it is important to consider the particular arrangements that exist in each for the accreditation of senior secondary education. These arrangements are important to consider because they play a necessary part in the achievement of joint accreditation for cooperative programs -- i.e. accreditation by secondary accreditation and TAFE accreditation agencies. Differences in senior secondary accreditation arrangements between the States/Territories have had some influence in determining the different approaches to Schools/TAFE cooperation that are evident in the States/Territories.

The different arrangements, that also exist for TAFE accreditation between the States/Territories, do not appear to have had a great deal of influence on these different approaches towards Schools/TAFE cooperation. Only a small number of cooperative programs have been implemented, for which independent de novo TAFE accreditation has been sought -- one or two in SA, and one of which we are aware in Queensland. The great majority of cooperative programs identified in this study that carry TAFE accreditation (as part of a joint accreditation) do so by dint of an already established TAFE accreditation for the program concerned. Consequently a comparative review of TAFE accreditation procedures amongst the States/Territories is not included in this chapter.
The accreditation arrangements that existed in each of the States/Territories in 1985 for senior secondary education are shown in Tables 5.1 through 5.8. These tables contain information, descriptive of these arrangements, which is considered by us to have influenced the development and nature of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs.

5.1.1 Agency Membership: Line 2 from Tables 5.1 to 5.8 shows that the size of membership of senior secondary accreditation agencies is generally large, up to and greater than 20 in most cases. (The ACT relies on a smaller group, but this group in turn, relies on a network of 'course accreditation panels'; Victoria likewise has a smaller central group which coordinates a network of 'committees'.)

Of these rather large memberships, TAFE appears to have direct representation in all cases. (In Tasmania, the Director General of Education, who is responsible for the administration of both secondary education and TAFE, appoints four representatives.) The relative size of that TAFE membership, however, is small when compared to the representation of other educational providers in the tertiary sector. In Queensland for example, TAFE has one representative; other tertiary providers have six. In WA and SA, TAFE has two; other tertiary providers have eight.
<p>| 1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency | The ACT Schools Accrediting Agency. |
| 2. Membership of Agency | Membership includes seven people experienced in either curriculum development and evaluation, or student assessment and certification. |
| 3. Duration of Study for Senior School Certificate | Based on studies in Year 11 and Year 12. Results are recorded for these two years. |
| 4. How many levels are offered | Three levels of subjects are offered. Accredited courses are approved by the Agency as being educationally sound and appropriate for study at Year 11/12. TES Classified courses are accredited as above and in addition are approved on the advice of an ANU representative on the Agency's course accreditation panel for use in calculating the ACT Tertiary Entrance Score (TES). Registered Courses/Units are developed and approved by the college/school board and include cultural recreational and general courses. |
| 5. Percentage of internal/external assessment | Assessment is internal to the school. |
| 6. Mode of recording results | Results are recorded on the Secondary College Record on a five point scale from A to E. For Accredited courses, scores are allocated within a mean of 65 and a standard deviation of 15 and recorded on the students Record. |
| 7. Purpose of Certificates | Three certificates are issued as appropriate. The Secondary College Record may be issued when a student leaves school at any time in Years 11 and 12. The Tertiary Entrance Statement is for selection to the ANU and CAE. The Year 12 Certificate is awarded only to students who complete at least five of the six terms of study. |
| 8. How the Tertiary Entrance Score is determined | For each TES - classified course, the course score is adjusted by scaling the distribution of course scores to the distribution of results obtained by the students on the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test. |
| 9. Co-operative Programs | Some co-operative programs have been developed and submitted for accreditation. To date no co-operative programs have been accredited as TES classified courses. Others have been classified as Accredited courses, or Registered courses/units. Advanced credit is gained from TAFE for courses classified as Accredited. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</strong></th>
<th>The Board of Senior School Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Membership of Agency</strong></td>
<td>22 Members with representatives from the following institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Colleges of Advanced Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW Teachers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Council of Professional Teachers Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent and Employer Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Duration of Study for Certificate</strong></td>
<td>Based on studies in Year 11 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. How many levels are offered</strong></td>
<td>Three levels of subjects are offered. Board subjects, with centrally determined syllabuses and examinations, provide explicit preparation for higher education. Other Approved Studies (OAS) subjects are developed by individual schools or groups of schools, and submitted to the Board for approval. These subjects do not count towards the &quot;score&quot; a student acquires to determine entry to Institutions of Higher Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Percentage of internal/external assessment</strong></td>
<td>For Board subjects a common scale for results in all subjects is proposed without regard for differences between students taking different subjects. School assessments are moderated by being scaled to the distribution of the adjusted external examination marks obtained by the students. Other Approved Studies are internally assessed by schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Mode of recording results</strong></td>
<td>Marks are awarded, with a maximum possible mark for each unit being 50. The marks awarded are derived from a 50:50 combination of external assessments and school predictions of these assessments. Moderation occurs against scaled examination results in an attempt to make them comparable across schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Purpose of Certificate</strong></td>
<td>A Higher School Certificate is awarded to students who have studied at least 11 units, of which five must be in Board subjects and the units taken in Year 12 must also encompass at least four separate subjects areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. How the Tertiary Entrance Score is determined</strong></td>
<td>Result notices, which precede the issue of the Higher School Certificate, show the composite mark for each subject, together with the percentile ranking of the student, an aggregate mark, a ranking based on it, and tertiary institutions to which the candidate may be considered for admission. The aggregate mark is the sum of the student's ten best unit scores in Board subjects, and is provided only for students attempting at least ten of such units. The aggregate is the basis for tertiary selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. CO-operative Programs</strong></td>
<td>A large number of co-operative programs have been developed jointly by clusters of schools and TAFE Colleges. These have been submitted for accreditation under the Other Approved Studies category. Advanced credit is gained from TAFE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.3
ACCREDITATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST-COMPULSORY SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE NORTHERN TERRITORY IN 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</th>
<th>Northern Territory Board of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Membership of Agency</td>
<td>20 members including the following offices and institutions: Deputy Secretary, Policy Planning and Services of NT Dept of Educ. Deputy Secretary, Schools of N.T. Department of Education. Superintendent Curriculum of N.T. Department of Education. Principal, Darwin High School Director, Professional Services Branch of N.T. Dept of Education Principal, Jabiru Area School Darwin Community College Council, Community College of Central Australia Chairman, Katherine Rural College Council FEPP (Aboriginal Representation) Council of Government Schools Organisations Northern Territory Teachers Federation Northern Territory University Planning Authority Batchelor College Principal, St.Johns College Isolated Children’s Parents Association Northern Territory Confederation of Industry &amp; Commerce Federation of Parents &amp; Friends Association of the Catholic schools in the Northern Territory Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Duration of study for Senior School Certificate</td>
<td>Based on studies in Year 11 and Year 12. Accredited Two levels of subjects are offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many levels are offered</td>
<td>G: Indicates a General Course of study. PS: Year 11 Preparatory Courses for subjects of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA) PC: Preparatory Courses for Certificate Courses offered by Northern Territory TAFE institutions and SA TAFE. C: Units of Certificate courses of SA TAFE S: Subjects assessed by SSABSA at the end of Year 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percentage of internal/external assessment</td>
<td>Registered Registered subjects are schools based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mode of recording results</td>
<td>Five point grading: Excellent, Above Average, Average, Below Average, Poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Purpose of Certificate</td>
<td>A Senior Secondary Studies Certificate is awarded to all students undertaking Year 11/12 studies. The certificate has two sections. One listing the subjects accredited or registered by the N.T. Board. The other lists the subjects approved by SSABSA in S.A. SSABSA arrangements apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How the Territory Entrance Score is determined</td>
<td>A small number of co-operative programs have been developed in the registered category. Advanced credit is available from TAFE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Co-operative Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TABLE 5.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACCREDITATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST COMPULSORY SECONDARY EDUCATION IN QUEENSLAND IN 1985</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</td>
<td>The Board of Secondary School Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nominees of Director General of Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Director General (Schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private College Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Director Secondary (Curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Director Educational Services (TAFE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Membership of Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on studies in Year 11 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many levels are offered</td>
<td>Two levels of subjects are offered. Board subjects, arranged in semester units and Board registered school subjects for which a work program is developed by individual schools and registered by the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percentage of internal/external assessments</td>
<td>Board subjects are entirely school assessed. Comparability of assessment is achieved through District and State review panels which consider submissions from school submitted student work. The review panels offer advice to the school on their proposals, awards of levels of achievement to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mode of recording results</td>
<td>Five categories of results are used: very high achievement, high achievement, sound achievement, limited achievement and very limited achievement. A single assessment is given for each subject at the end of the two years of study in Years 11 and 12 with a statement of semesters of work covered in the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Purpose of Certificate</td>
<td>The Senior Certificate is a formal record to indicate that a student has completed secondary education to Year 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How the Tertiary Entrance Score is determined</td>
<td>Students take the Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test, (ASAT) during Year 12. Schools assign a mark from 1-99 for each Board subject studied by the student. All student assessments are scaled so that their mean is the same as the results obtained in the ASAT, with a standard deviation of 12. A student aggregate score is obtained by adding adjusted scores for subjects studied for a total of 20 semester units (at least three of the subjects included need to have been studied over four semesters): Aggregate scores for all students in a school are rescaled to a distribution with the same mean and standard deviation as ASAT scores of all students in the school receiving Tertiary Entrance Scores. Students are then ranked in order of merit and Tertiary Entrance scores are assigned as percentile scores of the 17 year old population in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Co-operative Programs</td>
<td>Many co-operative programs have been developed. Many have been submitted to the Board to be registered school subjects. Most have gained advanced credit with TAFE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 5.5
ACCREDITATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST COMPULSORY SECONDARY EDUCATION IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA IN 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</th>
<th>Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Membership of Agency</td>
<td>Director of the Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominees of Director General of Education (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director General of Technical &amp; Further Education (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of University of Adelaide (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Flinders University (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of S.A. Institute of Technology (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Roseworthy College (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.A. Institute of Teachers (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.A. Commission for Catholic Education (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.A. Independent Schools Board Inc. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.A. Association of State Schools Organisation Inc. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Independent Schools of S.A. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federation of Parents and Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of South Australian Catholic Schools (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce and Industry S.A. Inc. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Trades and Labour Council of S.A. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner for Equal Opportunity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Territory Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 3. Duration of study for Certificates      | Certificate is awarded on studies undertaken in Year 12. Prerequisite subjects are studied in Year 11. |
| 4. How many levels are offered             | Three levels of subjects are offered - Publicly examined subjects, school assessed subjects, general experience subjects. |
| 5. Percentage of internal/external examination | For publicly examined subjects, a 50:50 ratio is used. |
| 6. Mode of recording results               | A grading scale, A,B,C,D,U (unsatisfactory) is used. Tertiary institutions apply a conversion score to enable comparison with students who have a matriculation aggregate. |
| 7. Purpose of Certificate                  | A single certificate is used to record the types of subjects studied. Subject descriptors also appear on the certificate in order to provide further information about the subjects a student is studying. |
| 8. How the Tertiary Score is determined    | University entrance is based exclusively on publicly examined subjects. Colleges of Advanced Education consider school assessed subjects, but down grade their result for comparability (ie. A=B). Five publicly examined subjects must be presented in one year (12) at least one subject must come from the science group of subjects and at least one from the humanities group. To matriculate an aggregate score of 295 or better must be obtained for five subjects. This score is printed on the students certificate. |
| 9. Co-operative Programs                   | A small number of co-operative programs have been developed. They are recorded on the certificate. No process of accreditation has been developed to accommodate co-operative programs. Advanced credit has been obtained from TAFE. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</th>
<th>The Schools Board of Tasmania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Membership of Agency</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominees of Council of the University of Tasmania (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Advanced Education (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director General of Education (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasmanian Teachers' Federation (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Catholic Education (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Headmasters and Headmistresses of Independent Schools of Tasmania (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor-in-council (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Duration of study for Certificate</td>
<td>Based on studies in Year 11 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many levels are offered</td>
<td>Most subjects are available at two levels - Level II, and level III (higher standard).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percentage of internal/external examination</td>
<td>25% - 50% weighting is given to a standardised school assessment component. The exact percentage of the weighting is determined by the Schools Board of Tasmania on the recommendation of the appropriate subject committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mode of recording results</td>
<td>Awards available are Credit (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Pass (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Pass (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failure (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Purpose of Certificate</td>
<td>An 'N' award is not recorded on the Higher School Certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How the Tertiary Score is determined</td>
<td>Higher School Certificate is awarded to students who complete Year 11 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculation to the University of Tasmania requires 4 Pass or better awards in approved level III subjects and 2 lower pass or better in two further level III subjects, either approved or non approved or of a Pass or better in two level II subjects for which there are corresponding Level III subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Co-operative Programs</td>
<td>The possibility exists for co-operative programs to be accredited within existing categories. A small number exists. For these, advanced credit has been obtained from TAFE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</td>
<td>Victorian Institute of Secondary Education: Curriculum and Assessment Branch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Membership of Agency</td>
<td>Up to six members of VISE Council. Three members with substantial experience in secondary teaching appointed on the recommendation of - the Assessment Procedures Committee - the Accreditation Committee - the Advisory Committee on School - Based curriculum development. Two members from the area of post-secondary education. Two members with substantial experience in student and/community affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Duration of study for Certificate</td>
<td>Based on studies in Year 11 and Year 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many levels are offered</td>
<td>Approved study structures comprise Group 1 subjects, Group 2 subjects, and Group 2 single units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percentage internal/external assessment</td>
<td>Group 1 subjects comprise 70% core and 30% optional unit. No more than 2/7 of core assessment is internal and individually stated in accredited course descriptions, while the optional unit is school assessed. Group 2 subjects and Group 2 single units are internally assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mode of recording results</td>
<td>Letter grades on a six-point scale, A-F, as well as scaled marks on a 100-point scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Purpose of Certificate</td>
<td>A number of certificates exist. These are a Higher School Certificate, (STC) Technical Year 12, Tertiary Orientation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How the Tertiary Score is determined</td>
<td>5 Group 1 subjects are necessary, with a grade D or above in four approved Group 1 subjects, including English. Admission is based on an aggregate determined by adding the marks in the students best four Group 1 subjects and adding, to a maximum of 40, 10% of the marks in other approved group 1 subjects for which the student achieves a minimum score of 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Co-operative Programs</td>
<td>The possibility exists of co-operative programs to be accredited within existing categories. N.B. From 1987, changes based on the Ministerial Review of Post-Compulsory Schooling Report recommendation's and subsequent working party developments will be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5.8: Accreditation Arrangements for Post Compulsory Secondary Education in Western Australia in 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Name of Secondary Accreditation Agency</strong></td>
<td>The Secondary Education Authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2. Membership of Agency** | Ex-Officio: Director General of Education  
Director of the Authority  
Ministerial Appointments:  
Director General of Education nominees: (4)  
Secondary Teacher Union nominees: (4)  
Independent Schools: Director of Catholic Education nominee  
Association of Independent Schools nominees (2)  
Independent Schools Salaried Officers Association nominee  
Post Secondary Education: Murdoch University nominees (2)  
University of WA nominees (2)  
WACAE nominees (2)  
WAIT nominees (2)  
Technical Education: Director TAFE nominee  
TAFE Teachers Union nominee  
Community Representatives: (4) |
| **3. Duration of Study for senior school certificate** | Based on studies completed in Year 11 and 12.  
Recording results from Year 9 - 12 |
| **4. How many levels are offered** | Two categories of subjects are offered - a reduced set which may count for tertiary admissions.  
- a set of all other accredited subjects. |
| **5. Percentage of internal/external examination** | 50:50 internal/external weighting for Tertiary Admissions subjects.  
General subjects used various forms of moderation to ensure comparability of assessments among schools, including moderation tests with statistical adjustments to the school's assessments to match students performance on the moderation tests; reviews of student's work and teachers' assessments by teachers meetings at visits to the schools by moderators.  
Grades are used A, B, C, D, F scale, with F being fail.  
100 point scaled marks are provided as additional information for Year 12 performances in subjects which may count for tertiary admissions. These marks will be a 50:50 combination of scaled external examination marks and school assessments moderated against the external examination marks.  
Certificate of Secondary Education may be issued at any time student leaves secondary education. Secondary School Graduation requirement in selection of students for higher education, includes achievement of a satisfactory literacy level, satisfactory performance at Year 12 in six subjects, of which at least five must be at Year 12 level with at least three subjects from the set which may count for admission to higher education.  
Selection is based on aggregates of scaled examination marks with no component of school assessment. Universities aggregate performances in six subjects, while Colleges aggregate performances in five subjects.  
A small number of co-operative programs have been developed. The possibility exists for accreditation to be granted within the existing categories. Advanced credit has been obtained from TAFE. |
| **6. Mode of recording results (Grades/Scores)** | |
| **7. Purpose of Certificates** | |
| **8. How the Tertiary Entrance Score is determined** | |
| **9. Co-operative Programs** | |
These examples of how tertiary representation on senior secondary accreditation agencies is distributed amongst the different tertiary providers, seem to reflect the traditional view of senior secondary education as a preparation for 'higher education' studies, rather than for 'tertiary education', in the broader sense -- which includes TAFE. This skewness of representation on senior secondary accreditation agencies is well known. It is worthy of note here, however, because it is a factor which is likely to influence the type of secondary accreditation that is determined for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs.

Within the broader context of ensuring the maintenance of general educational standards at the senior secondary level, one of the purposes of 'sector' representation on senior secondary accreditation agencies is to represent the particular institutional concerns of tertiary providers for ensuring students entering tertiary studies are adequately prepared academically. These concerns for adequate academic preparation also have a wider audience, relating to the status of the credentials awarded by the tertiary institution, as perceived in the community at large. This status is dependent upon the academic standards, at both entry and exit points, of courses offered by the tertiary provider. Largely, however, these concerns remain an institutional interest.

This raises two related questions as follows: Does TAFE have an analagous institutional interest? and: What are the senior secondary students' interests? The first of these questions is not of itself the subject of this study. The second question is, and it seems to us is related to the first question, because of our purpose in examining Schools/TAFE cooperative programs.

In Chapter 1 we reported the comparatively large proportion of Year 10 students who ultimately seek entry into TAFE courses (27% in TAFE cf 19% in other tertiary institutions). That distribution of student destinations is markedly different to the relativity of 'sector' representation on senior secondary accreditation agency. It would seem therefore that the present sector representation arrangements for senior secondary accreditation agencies are not influenced by the post-school study aspirations or choices of students. It also appears that, in those States/Territories where senior secondary accreditation agencies are currently being reconstituted, there is no significant change in the balance of sector representation.

It is interesting to speculate on the reasons for the large majority of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs identified in this study being accredited by senior secondary accreditation agencies at less than Level 1 (shown in Table 3.21 in Chapter 3). It could be argued that, the influence and interest of senior secondary accreditation agency representatives from institutions of higher education, in maintaining their academic entry standards, has acted against the accreditation of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs at the 'tertiary entrance' level. The 93% of cooperative programs shown in Table 3.21 accredited at Level 2 or 3 were, in the main, programs administered by NSW, WA, and Queensland, where the numerical dominance of senior secondary accreditation agency membership, by institutions of higher education, is pronounced.

There is further evidence of this effect in one of the case studies documented in Chapter 4 -- that of the Basic Electronics program in the ACT. As well, a number of interviewees referred to their awareness of this effect, arising from their negotiations with the senior secondary accreditation agency in their State/Territory.
5.1.2 Duration of Study: The duration of study required for the award of a senior secondary certificate is shown in Line 3 of Tables 5.1 to 5.8 to be two years, with the exception of SA, where the duration is one year only. There a Year 12 certificate is awarded on the basis of studies in Year 12 — Year 11 is a year where students undertake prerequisite studies. As such, we consider the difference between SA and the other States/Territories, in this regard, to be nominal only. It is rather a technical difference in length of candidature for the senior certificate.

It is likely, however, that the truncation of candidature for the award of a SSABSA Year 12 Certificate in SA from one to two years, may have been one reason for the limited development of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in that State, along similar lines to the other States which have also been supportive of Schools/TAFE cooperation.

Evidence presented in Chapter 3 (in the discussion of Tables 3.23 and 3.24 on p.65) shows that, nationally, approximately 80% of students participating in Schools/TAFE cooperative programs are in Year 11. The Year 11/12 distribution of students in SA is consistent with this national picture. Two of the major South Australian programs reviewed in this study, the Course Award in Vocational Education, and the Integrated Studies Program, attended by students from both Years 11 and 12, do not contribute to the SSABSA Year 12 Certificate — nor are they accredited at any level by SSABSA. (One leads to a TAFE award; the other gains certain credits in TAFE subjects.) This absence of secondary accreditation would seem to be due, at least in some part, to the relative non-participation of Year 12 students in the programs.

The units or subjects undertaken in Year 11 are not, for either of these programs, seen to be prerequisites to subjects or units to be undertaken in Year 12. In this way, they are not, in the terms of SSABSA, contributing to the Year 12 Certificate. Rather, they are part of an 'integrated' program of study which involves both secondary and TAFE studies. Indeed these two cooperative programs have been designed expressly to provide wider educational choice for students contemplating remaining at school beyond Year 10. Necessarily then, these programs, as with the majority of cooperative programs identified in the study, will tend to attract more Year 11 participants than Year 12. SSABSA's reduction of the period of candidature for senior secondary studies to one year would seem to act, in principle, against the achievement of widespread participation by Year 11 students in cooperative programs, whilst at the same time making it difficult to design cooperative programs which are likely to lead towards a Level 1 secondary credential.

5.1.3 Levels of Subjects: Line 4 of the tables shows that senior subjects are offered at either two or three levels in the eight States/Territories. We have referred to these levels throughout this report as Levels 1, 2, or 3 (and these are defined in Chapter 2). In the case of all States/Territories the meaning of Level 1 is the same. This refers to a subject that is approved by the senior secondary accreditation agency for tertiary entrance. Levels 2 and/or 3 refer to subjects that are 'registered' by the senior secondary accreditation agency, and to subjects that are school-based. In either case, these two levels of subject do not contribute to a 'tertiary entrance' score (used by institutions of higher education to determine student entry).

We have discussed, in Chapters 3 and 4, the influence we consider this hierarchy of subjects has on the kind of credential earned by students undertaking Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. It will be taken up again in Chapter 6.
5.1.4 Assessment, Certification and Determination of Tertiary Entrance: Lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Tables 5.1 to 5.8 evidence that the States/Territories have adopted a range of approaches to assessing senior secondary school studies, some of which are quite complex. These are also in a state of flux. The methods used by States/Territories to record results on certificates and to calculate students' tertiary entrance scores are likewise varied, often complex, and seem to change frequently.

All States/Territories have built into their 'formula' for calculating the tertiary entrance score a small 'margin' which allows the study of other than Level 1 subjects. In most cases, however, this arrangement is such that students accumulate sufficient points or marks from studying the requisite number of Level 1 subjects — other subjects studied are, in effect, in addition to these studies. They do not count towards the tertiary entrance score. In the case of those States/Territories where significant Schools/TAFE cooperative program development has occurred to date, the Schools/TAFE cooperative programs fit into this 'margin'.

It is apparent that the formula for calculating tertiary entrance scores used in both Tasmania and WA is different to this. In both those States there is the provision for undertaking studies at Levels 2 or 3, but with the additional flexibility in the formula which allows for these studies to contribute to the tertiary entrance score. In the case of Tasmania for example, the formula for calculating the score can be depicted as follows:

\[ T.E. \text{ score} = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4 + Y_1 + Y_2 \]

where \( X_1 \) through \( X_4 \) are marks (beyond a prescribed minimum grade) achieved in four subjects accredited at Level 1, and \( Y_1 \) and \( Y_2 \) may be marks (beyond a prescribed minimum grade) achieved in two subjects accredited at Level 2.

This kind of formula would seem to overcome some of the difficulties and disadvantages for cooperative programming that we have attributed to the established means of determining tertiary entrance scores in the other States/Territories. In regard to Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, this approach would seem to have considerable potential to encourage senior secondary students to explore beyond the traditional mix of academic subjects.

Even if Schools/TAFE cooperative programs were constrained to lead only to senior secondary accreditation agency awards at Level 2, as is the case with the great majority of programs identified in Australia to date, the \( 4X + 2Y \) (or perhaps \( 3X + 3Y \), or even \( 5X + 1Y \)) formula means that many students undertaking Schools/TAFE cooperative programs could do so without a cost to their broader tertiary entrance options. At the same time it would seem to provide greater equity for students preferring to concentrate their studies in the domain of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, especially if the \( 3X + 3Y \) formula were adopted. This position is taken up again in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The data presented, especially in Chapters 3 and 4, show that there is considerable diversity in the nature of cooperative programs that have been offered in the States/Territories. The range of programs canvassed in this study differ in terms of their conception, institutional arrangements, curriculum strategies, funding, duration, place of delivery, type of credential earned, and in relation to the student groups targeted. We feel that it is important for Schools/TAFE observers in Australia to acknowledge this diversity because it helps provide the realistic impression that there have been, at different places and times, different reasons for the development and introduction of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. It is also important, from the point of view of research activity, to acknowledge and analyse this diversity, because such analysis is an essential means to achieving an explication of the key cooperative elements of exemplary Schools/TAFE programs.

6.1 The Typical Schools/TAFE Cooperative Program

Notwithstanding this diversity it is possible to construct a description of a 'typical' or 'generic' cooperative program, as they currently exist, by drawing on those commonly occurring characteristics of the range of programs identified. The construction of a typical program description is useful as a first step for the discussion presented in this chapter because it then serves as a frame of reference for the reader, when considering the differences that are discussed in the balance of the chapter. As well, the constructed picture of a typical program should serve to inform the reader who is unaware of recent Schools/TAFE cooperative developments what at least some practitioners mean by the term Schools/TAFE cooperative program. The typical program described below is not, however, meant to represent a recommended model - model approaches will be presented in a later section of this chapter. Rather it is the result of a process of 'aggregating' and averaging the main characteristics of the majority of those programs identified in this study.

The typical Schools/TAFE cooperative program comprises an existing accredited TAFE course or subject of approximately 180 hours duration (which equates closely to the duration for both a typical year-long TAFE unit of study and for a typical year-long senior secondary subject). It is delivered in a TAFE college, by TAFE teachers, partly in school time, and partly out of school hours. It is offered to Year 11/12 students who travel to the college from a nearby geographical cluster of some four to six secondary schools. The participating schools are in a metropolitan or country area of above average youth unemployment, and below average Year 10 to 11 retention rates. The typical program derives from an established TAFE study area, is funded largely from PEP sources, and is jointly administered by Schools and TAFE officers. It is jointly accredited by TAFE and secondary accreditation agencies, so that upon successful completion, a student gains full or partial credit or exemption in the TAFE course from which the program has been derived, and recognition on his/her senior school credential. This credential does not, however, count for the purposes of 'tertiary entrance' to institutions of Higher Education. The
program is offered in government secondary schools, is nominally open to all students, and attracts an enrolment of some 2% of the national population of Year 11/12 students. 53% of its students are female.

The central purposes in undertaking this national project were the identification of "exemplary" Schools/TAFE cooperative practices, and of the ways such practices had been, and may be achieved. In Chapter 2, it is reported that we adopted a working definition for "exemplary" practices, as these related to cooperative programs. This definition referred to five important attributes. These were:

1. Provision of a joint Schools/TAFE credential
2. Provision of additional study options
3. Capacity to attract students who would otherwise discontinue secondary education
4. Systematic analysis of student needs
5. Curriculum negotiation between Schools and TAFE.

Our efforts to examine cooperative programs that have demonstrated these attributes have resulted in the identification of many programs which manifest some of these qualities. An important outcome of our research, however, has been the recognition that, considered alone, these five attributes cannot account adequately for judgements about the worth of cooperative programs. After all the needs and interests of students are different at different times and places. Nor can these attributes, stated in such simple terms, account for the complex array of issues that arise in relation to the design and implementation of these programs. Questions about the appropriateness and effectiveness of established educational priorities, about the allocation of scarce resources, about the respective roles of senior secondary education and TAFE, and about student equity in education bear on, and complicate one's wish to reduce to simple terms a consideration of what might constitute exemplary Schools/TAFE cooperation.

We do not consider it useful therefore to analyse the 'typical' program encapsulated above in terms of this definition of "exemplary". Rather, the purposes of the project are better served by an examination of the issues that have been shown to relate to the design and implementation of cooperative programs, and by an analysis of those attributes of individual programs that appear to lead towards a resolution of the issues. The following sections of this chapter will consider these issues and in so doing, will focus on the findings from Chapters 3, 4 and 5. The last sections of this chapter will attempt to describe what we consider to be a range of exemplary Schools/TAFE cooperative approaches, derived from our review of cooperative programs existing in Australia in 1985. The extent to which these approaches will be considered exemplary by practitioners will depend on the particular needs and circumstances of their students.

6.2 Rationale for Schools/TAFE Cooperation

The rationale, or justification, for Schools/TAFE cooperation has been perceived to rest on a number of factors. Some of these have been canvassed in Chapter 1, which describes the context of this research project. In brief, these factors
have related to criticism of the adequacy and effectiveness of existing secondary schooling provisions which have pointed to the possible value in attempting to make schooling more employment-oriented. Likewise social and technological changes of the eighties, and the consequent problems of youth unemployment have encouraged educators and governments to seek broader curriculum options through cooperative measures between existing educational sectors.

As well, a wider appreciation of the existence and value of increasing school retention rates and in increasing participation rates in all forms of post-compulsory education have led to a reconsideration, particularly in the secondary sector, of the purpose of education. A coalescing of the compatible philosophies of some secondary and vocational educators has given impetus to the worth of Schools/TAFE cooperation. An acknowledgement that a minority of Year 10 school students eventually proceed to studies in Higher Education has encouraged educators to diversify senior school options to better serve the individual purposes and interests of those students facing the decision between more schooling, TAFE, work, or unemployment.

Lastly, educational commentators have pointed to potential economic advantages of greater cooperation between the existing sectors of education, particularly in times of financial restraint and raised consciousness about the accountability of public funds.

These perceptions of factors underlying Schools/TAFE cooperation do not of themselves constitute a rationale for cooperation. Clearly one or more of these factors forms part of the justification that practitioners have used in designing and implementing cooperative programs, at any particular place and time, and depending on the needs and interests of the students concerned. Where these have been evident in particular case studies undertaken for this project, they have been noted in our commentaries. A number of the issues which are the focus in later sections of this chapter have a bearing on the rationale for cooperation.

We feel that the conceptual and practical possibilities of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming, evidenced by the case studies, are also important factors in identifying a comprehensive rationale for cooperation. These will be examined from Section 6.3 onwards.

However, of the factors referred to above, it is our view that the single most important reason to explore the potential of Schools/TAFE cooperation is the limited range of immediate post-school destinations currently available to young people in Australia. The existing possible destinations for young people in Australia, immediately following their period of compulsory education, are depicted in Figure 6.1 below.
FIGURE 6.1
Existing immediate post-compulsory education destinations of young people
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Full/part-time Work
TAFE
Industry Training
Unemployment
```

These destinations are clearly not mutually exclusive, as is shown in the data presented in Chapter 1, the most commonly occurring linkages being between two or three of the 'work', 'TAFE', and 'industry training' destinations. Nor do they have equivalent take-up rates. The majority (65%) of post-compulsory education young people pursue the 'senior secondary school' destination.

Very many of the education and training initiatives of governments in recent times have been directed towards reducing the numbers of young people who find their way, for whatever reason, into the 'unemployment' destination. Such initiatives have arisen from an overriding concern for the perceived loss of value, both to the individual and to the community, that stems from pursuit of this destination. A number of the educational initiatives, which have resulted in an examination of the role of State/Territory educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE), through committees of enquiry, were outlined in Chapter 1. Some of these have led to changes in State/Territory educational policies resulting in diversification in senior secondary curriculum offerings. One of the curriculum diversification strategies that has been adopted has been the provision of "alternative" senior school curriculum options introduced under the Participation and Equity Program (PEP). The prime purpose of such curriculum diversification strategies has been to increase the rate of take-up of senior secondary schooling as a destination. In doing so, this achieves a lesser take-up rate of the 'unproductive' unemployment destination.

Likewise the introduction of training support programs (providing support to both employers and trainees), has been aimed at increasing the take-up rates of industry training and work as destinations, so reducing the number of young people finding their way to immediate unemployment. And in TAFE, PEP courses have enabled the TAFE destination to become a reality for larger numbers of young people who might otherwise have been destined for immediate unemployment.

Schools/TAFE cooperative programs have been but one of the educational initiatives arising from the range of programs sponsored by governments to reduce the take-up rate of the unemployment destination by young people completing compulsory education. As such they represent an educational strategy or approach which may help to achieve this broader social purpose. As they have been developed in most cases to date, their difference to other education/training strategies of recent times stems from their dependence on
cooperative effort between Educational and TAFE Authorities. They attempt to provide additional study options for students who have completed compulsory schooling, study options which enhance the opportunity of young people to pursue work and/or further education.

That the broader social purpose is a worthy one is not, for us, in question. As a result of our review, however, questions concerning the appropriateness and effectiveness of cooperative programming, as one of the means of achieving this purpose, do arise. Some of these questions relate to the concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation. These will be discussed in Section 6.3. Most of them, however, relate to the difficulties associated with the existing policies and practices of educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) which impinge upon both the philosophical and curriculum development character of Schools/TAFE programs. These will be discussed in Sections 6.4 and 6.5.

6.3 The Concept of Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programming

Broadly speaking, our review has identified two different conceptions of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming that currently exist, although the two are not exclusive, and have elements in common with one another.

6.3.1 Two Conceptions of Cooperative Programming

The first conception of a Schools/TAFE cooperative program accounts for the majority of the 234 programs identified in this study. We will refer to this concept of a cooperative program as the 'supplementary' concept. Cooperative programs which illustrate the supplementary concept are represented by the "typical" program description constructed and presented in Section 6.1. These are programs which provide Year 11 and 12 students with additional subject choices, from a selection of TAFE courses/units that have been made available as a result of negotiation between Schools and TAFE administrators. Here students undertake mainstream secondary studies for 80-90% of their senior course, and supplement these with a selection of one or two subjects from the TAFE units that have been made available.

We will refer to the second conception of a Schools/TAFE cooperative program as the 'alternative' concept. A number of the cooperative programs case studied (for example the Course Award in Vocational Education in SA, and the Walgett Vocational HSC in NSW) are in some ways illustrative of this concept. These represent a significant minority of the full range of programs identified in the States/Territories. The alternative concept leads to the development of integrated programs that incorporate components of secondary and TAFE study in varying proportions, depending on the assessed needs of the student group, and on the availability of Schools and TAFE resources to meet these needs. The aims and content of the programs, and the relative composition of Schools and TAFE components are generated largely 'from scratch' in accordance with the assessed student needs and in the light of available resources.

Some of the elements of these two conceptions of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming are compared in Table 6.1.
**TABLE 6.1**
Comparison of two concepts of cooperative programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Supplementary Concept</th>
<th>Alternative Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of concern with existing educational provisions</td>
<td>Response to criticisms of senior secondary schooling concerning lack of subject choice for students of varying abilities and interests</td>
<td>Response to unmet need for an alternative educational path other than the academic emphasis of senior secondary studies, or the vocational emphasis of TAFE studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the program</td>
<td>To provide additional/supplementary subject choice to senior school students</td>
<td>To provide an alternative pathway to work and/or further education in TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of the students for the program</td>
<td>Students located in Years 11 and 12, searching for additional subject options</td>
<td>Young people contemplating the decision between more schooling, TAFE, work or unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the program in terms of Schools:TAFE component</td>
<td>Based on selections from existing school and TAFE subjects/units, in approx. ratio of 8:2 or 9:1</td>
<td>Determined de novo, based on assessed needs of students - integrated components from Schools and TAFE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 compares the two conceptions of cooperative programming in terms of four elements. These are:

1. **Source of concern with existing educational provisions** - i.e. the identification of the problem in existing educational provisions that has led to the recognition of need for additional or different kinds of educational programs for young people who have completed their compulsory schooling

2. **Purpose of the program** - i.e. the intended goals of the program

3. **Status of the students for the program** - i.e. the identification of the students in terms of the educational/vocational decision-point they have reached
4. Structure of the program in terms of Schools:TAFE component – i.e. the classification of the structure of the program, according to its broad design principles, its two (Schools and TAFE) components, and to the weighting of, and relationship between these two components.

Considered together, these four elements constitute a reason, a purpose, an object and a methodology for cooperative programming – hence a 'concept'. Within each of these two concepts, it is possible to design a number of different types of program, to implement these in different ways, and to determine different accreditation arrangements for each. (Differences relating to detailed curriculum design and implementation characteristics, and the types of accreditation pertaining to cooperative programs borne from each of these two conceptions are discussed in Sections 6.4 and 6.5).

We believe these two different conceptions of cooperative programming are an important finding of our research. They encapsulate the two different approaches evidenced in the Schools/TAFE cooperative endeavours of the States/Territories. They also serve as a useful means for an analysis and comparison of the origins and intended purposes of the cooperative programs included in our review.

Whilst acknowledging that the two conceptions derive from our examination of the policies and practices of Schools/TAFE cooperation in the States/Territories, it is important to note that these conceptions are not directly articulated in any of the policy or guideline statements of educational authorities that were available to us during our research. The development of a concept of cooperative programming in the States/Territories has been evolutionary. Even in those States/Territories where Schools/TAFE cooperative policy had been formulated in 1985, the policy/guideline statements did not articulate one or other of the two concepts we have identified – indeed such policy statements tended to deal more with the financial, administrative and curriculum arrangements that were applicable to such programs. The differing philosophies of Schools/TAFE cooperation that have emerged, whilst in some cases initiated from centralised policies, have been modified substantially from the practices that have been trialled in the field by enthusiastic practitioners. We believe that Schools/TAFE cooperation in some States/Territories has not generally been a policy-driven educational initiative, emanating from central administrations. It has rather been a field-led initiative. In any case statewide policies on Schools/TAFE cooperation have tended to follow the locally-initiated field trials.

6.3.2 The Concept in the States/Territories

It would thus be possible to classify all of the 234 cooperative programs identified in this study in terms of the two conceptions that have been described. More useful for the purposes of analysis, however, is the classification of the cooperative programs that are the subject of our case study commentaries in Chapter 4, since the reader has available more information about these. (It should be noted, however, that the case study content derived largely from local perceptions of the programs. The classification system used also serves to compare the different conceptions of cooperative programming that have been most frequently evidenced in each of the States/Territories.

The comparative State/Territory concepts for cooperative programming are shown in Table 6.2.
TABLE 6.2
The concept of cooperative programming in the States/Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Cooperative Programming Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Both supplementary and Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Note: This general classification of cooperative programming approaches refers to the general approaches that have been identified in each of the States/Territories from our study. In the case of most States/Territories there are exceptions to this classification.

In the case of the three States where Schools/TAFE cooperative programming is most prolific - NSW, Queensland, and WA (which account for 94% of the programs identified in this study) - what we are calling supplementary concept has been adopted. In these States, a more centralised strategy for Schools/TAFE cooperation has been evidenced, in terms of both joint Schools and TAFE policy statements, and the existence of 'guidelines' for the development of cooperative programs. These policies and guidelines have encouraged the development of programs according to the supplementary concept because, although unwritten, the policies and guidelines appear to have been based on this conception of a Schools/TAFE program. As well however, in these three States, a small number of programs have been developed according to the alternative concept of cooperation - deriving from an identification of strong student need, and enthusiastic curriculum development effort by teachers and administrators (both Schools and TAFE) at the local level.

In SA, in 1985, centralised policy on Schools/TAFE cooperation was less evident than in NSW, Queensland, and WA. However, there were a number of instances of considerable cooperative effort at the local level to conceptualise, design and
implement pilot programs according to the alternative concept. These have been identified in our study, and account for how we have classified SA in Table 6.2. We have classified the concept of cooperation evidenced in the other States/Territories on a very small number of instances.

6.3.3 The Concept in the Case Study Programs

Table 6.3 classifies the cooperative programs that were the subject of case studies (reported in Chapter 4) for this project.

**TABLE 6.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Program</th>
<th>Cooperative Programming Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Electronics Program (ACT)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business Studies Program (SA)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Colleges (Tas)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Course Award in Vocational Education (SA)</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Equine Management (WA)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Farm Management (WA)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gold Coast Program (Qld)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hervey Bay Senior College (Qld)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Integrated Studies Programs (SA)</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Joint Horticulture Project (ACT)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Port Kembla Cluster Program (NSW)</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (NT)

South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program (Qld)

Vocational HSC (NSW)

Yeronga Pre-Vocational Fleximode Program (Qld)

**Table Note:** Three of the entries in the table are not, strictly speaking, classifiable in terms of a conception of cooperative programming because they are not 'programs' in the sense that the other entries are 'programs'. These are Nos.3, 8, and 10. Nos.3 and 8 (Community Colleges in Tasmania, and Hervey Bay Senior College in Queensland) refer to the educational initiatives mounted in those locations - to establish post-compulsory education colleges to cater for young people. These initiatives embodied Schools/TAFE cooperative programming, as is reported in our commentaries in Chapter 4. No.10 (the Joint Horticulture Project in the ACT) refers to the particular educational initiative, mounted in the ACT during 1985 - it involved a teacher development program which embodied Schools/TAFE cooperation. These three entries have thus been classified in terms of 'best-fit', based on the type of post-compulsory educational provision that evidently had or would be available as a result of the initiative.

**Programs of the Alternative Concept**

Four of the programs in Table 6.3 have been classified as alternative in concept. These are the Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE), the Integrated Studies Programs (ISP), the Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (PIPE), and the Vocational HSC. The case studies of these programs provide evidence that each was the direct result of the recognition by local educators, of the perceived need for an 'alternative' educational provision for students judged to be "at risk" of leaving school. These programs were generally designed in response to the perceived need for students facing a decision between more schooling, work, a TAFE course, or unemployment. The particular students identified in these instances were those for whom school has not been easy, either academically or socially, for whom employment would not be easily secured, and for whom a TAFE course would likely also be difficult because of either lack of maturity or a disinterest in institutional education. There was no evidence to suggest that these programs were conceived, in any direct sense, to provide a route to tertiary studies other than in TAFE. Whilst it was made clear to us in our research that the programs were nominally accessible to all students, targeted students were often counselled by school staff to consider the program as a post Year 10 (or post-Year 11 in the case of PIPE) option.
In each case these programs were designed as a result of some kind of student needs assessment. In the case of the CAVE, the ISP, and the Vocational HSC, officers from the Schools and/or TAFE were actively involved in an examination of the needs and interests of the targeted student group — through interviews or meetings arranged for the purpose. With PIPE, teachers of the one school concerned met to discuss what they considered these needs to be. Arising from these needs identification activities, the teachers designed the program aims and structure. In the case of the CAVE and the ISP, regional school consultants also participated in this process. For the Vocational HSC, the School Counsellor coordinated the needs assessment and design processes. In each case the program was designed as an integrated whole. The relative weightings of Schools and TAFE components, and curriculum selections from Schools and TAFE offerings were then determined in accordance with the aims and structure, and in the light of availability of TAFE resources.

The most important, and exemplary, feature of these programs is, in our view, their integrated design. It results in a course of study in which the parts are related to one another, are employment-oriented, and are selected on the basis of student interest. The most unfortunate feature of these programs, and of other programs identified in our study which are borne of the alternative concept, is their failure to lead to credentials which are of value to the student in the post-school market place. This difficulty will be discussed in detail in Section 6.4 which focusses on the accreditation of cooperative programs.

One other related feature of these four cooperative programs deriving from the alternative conception, which severely limits their generalisability as an exemplary model of Schools/TAFE cooperation relates to the targeting of students judged to be "at risk". This practice raises a number of questions concerning the equity of the alternative conception of cooperation. In a number of our case study commentaries, we noted that the case studies had provided evidence of the program's potential for leading to increased participation rates in senior schooling and/or enhanced job seeking prospects. As with the PIPE, CAVE and ISP, these purposes are articulated in the curriculum documentation for the programs. And there is no question in our minds about the value of achieving these purposes.

Our concern is for the responsibility of the judgement of "at risk" students. Who makes this judgement, how is it made, what value system governs the judgement, and what are the consequences of the judgement to the student, are some of the questions which may need to be considered. It is possible that in some circumstances the answers to these questions could be as follows: Teachers make the judgement in isolation from the student and his/her parents, or expert educational counselling; the judgement is made on the basis of a student's previous poor academic record; the values governing the judgement are those deriving from a "classical" (or elitist) view of the purpose of schooling; as a consequence of the judgement the student so judged is regarded by peers and community as 'second-rate'.

There is some evidence that for the four programs case studied the second and fourth questions are answered, at least in part, in the way asserted above. A student's previous academic record is at least one of the judgement criteria, and a student's peers (or family) may regard the alternative program as "mickey mouse". In this way cooperative programs of the alternative conception, and also for that matter other forms of 'alternative' senior secondary courses of study which do not rely on Schools/TAFE cooperation (such as some PEP courses),
are viewed with a lesser status in the wider community than traditional senior school studies. We believe that the single most significant cause of this devalued perception of such programs is their failure to lead to the kind of marketable credentials that the community expects schooling to deliver to its young people.

As a means of diversifying post-Year 10 educational options for young people therefore, alternative programs present a dilemma of conflicting values to educational authorities. Such programs afford an opportunity for governments to increase participation rates in education, and to open potential pathways to employment for the young people who are considered at risk, thereby reducing the take-up rate of the unemployment destination for these people. At the same time, however, successful completion of such programs does not lead to the award of the credential which traditionally represents the culmination of a student's additional years of senior secondary schooling.

Indeed the student who takes up the option of one of these alternative programs is necessarily foregoing the opportunity to be awarded a senior school credential - as the attendance requirements for them are substantial (600 hours, a full two year duration, a full year duration, and 180 hours in the case of the CAVE, the Vocational HSC, the PIPE, and the ISP respectively). Now it is possible to argue that students who, at the completion of Year 10 schooling, opt for an alternative study program, are registering their right to choose between a senior school credential on the one hand, and the pursuit of employment/TAFE pathways on the other. In our view, to accept this argument is to concede that alternative programs are not substantially different to a TAFE-type education, except that they are still conducted within the relatively more supportive environment of the school. After all, TAFE is already an available option to these students when they complete Year 10. And even for those students entering Year 11 of schooling, the opportunity to leave school during Year 11 or 12 and enter TAFE exists through a range of vocational and pre-vocational courses. The purpose in designing alternative cooperative programs has been to provide an additional option, other than either TAFE or more traditional schooling, otherwise what has been the point in their provision?

The central purpose therefore, of cooperative programs borne of the alternative conception is, as identified in Table 6.1, and in our view should be, the provision of the additional (or alternative) post-Year 10 option. Such a conception should aim to create a realistic and equitable range of potential post-compulsory school destinations as depicted in Figure 6.2 below. (Figure 6.2 is an extended model of Figure 6.1, which depicted the existing post-compulsory education destinations of young people.)
At the present time, in what we consider are the formative stages of alternative Schools/TAFE cooperative program developments, the provision of the sixth option (alternative Schools/TAFE) appears to be realistic for too narrow a selection of students, and as far as we are concerned, does not deliver the successful student an equitable option. We will return to this issue of equity in Section 6.4, which discusses the accreditation of cooperative programs. Arising from that discussion we will propose a significant modification to the 'alternative' conception, which we believe overcomes the difficulties outlined above.

Programs of the Supplementary Concept

The majority of cooperative programs that were case studied have been classified in Table 6.3 as being of the 'supplementary' concept. In general terms (with the exception of the three programs referred to in the note to Table 6.3), these programs derived from a perceived narrowness of subject choice for Year 11 and 12 students, and the cooperative program, as such, constitutes for the student a traditional selection of subjects offered by the school, supplemented by one or two subjects/units made available by the local TAFE college.

The "typical" cooperative program described in Section 6.1 exemplifies the supplementary concept in general terms. This is more so the case in relation to the Basic Electronics, Business Studies, Equine Management, Farm Management, Gold Coast, Port Kembla, South Brisbane, and Yeronga programs. In different ways, and with differing weightings, these programs constitute a combined selection of existing school and TAFE offerings. With the exception of the Yeronga program in some instances, students involved in these programs are also pursuing school studies that will lead to the award of a senior school certificate, and are hence eligible for 'tertiary entrance'. The TAFE accredited component of the program is a supplementation to the student's tertiary-oriented school studies. Business Studies aside, the supplementary TAFE studies do not count for tertiary entrance purposes - they are accommodated in the minor non-tertiary accredited component of a student's senior school course.
As a means of achieving this subject supplementation, and hence providing additional curriculum options that the school has been unable to offer effectively or efficiently, these programs appear to have met with a considerable degree of success. Their recent expansion in NSW, Queensland, and to a lesser extent in WA, and their expanded take-up rate of senior school students provides some measure of this. Students are able to gain insights into one or two TAFE study areas, they are able to experience a different (TAFE) learning environment, and they earn credit in a TAFE course or unit. For the educational providers, these programs represent a means of avoiding duplication of scarce human and financial resource allocations, and opportunities for economies of scale both between Schools and TAFE, and between schools and schools, as well as opportunities to broaden the school's range of curriculum offerings.

Despite these apparent advantages, there remain a number of policy, resource, and curriculum design and implementation difficulties, in the provision of supplementary cooperative programs. Yet a number of the States are sufficiently committed to the supplementary conception of Schools/TAFE cooperation to tackle these difficulties. For these States, the introduction of pilot cooperative programs are resulting in the refinement of the programs, in the formulation of policies and in the development of guidelines and mechanisms for their expanded provision. The difficulties and the strategies being employed to overcome them will be taken up in detail in later sections of this chapter. Suffice to say, that as a concept, and for the reasons outlined above, supplementary Schools/TAFE cooperative programming is considered to have exemplary features.

However, we also consider that supplementary cooperative programming has some inequitous accreditation implications which stem from the status of the joint credential that is awarded to students successfully completing its programs. These will be taken up in Section 6.4.

Leaving issues relating to accreditation aside for the purposes of the present discussion, a number of the cooperative programs reviewed show evidence that a modification or diversification of the supplementary concept could strengthen its value to students. We refer here to adoption of the notion of curriculum "extension" - where a student is able to select as part of his/her senior school studies, via a cooperative Schools/TAFE arrangement, a number of accredited TAFE units which complement or extend his/her selection of school subjects. This notion is pertinent to the South Brisbane Pre-Vocational, Farm Management, Business Studies and Joint Horticulture supplementary programs. It is also germane to the conception of the CAVE, ISP, and Vocational HSC alternative programs. In the CAVE, and ISP for example, students select TAFE studies in the business, technical or general studies areas. In so doing, they have an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding, and to appreciate the practical relevance of some of their school subjects.

We see considerable value in this extension notion as a means of enhancing the students' learning of school subjects. In practice it may not be possible to offer extension studies through TAFE in all school subject areas, but it does seem possible in many areas where TAFE and Schools currently offer courses/subjects in associated areas, such as business (including secretarial/office) studies, computing, building construction, engineering, and in the sciences (physical, biological) and electronics/electrical.

A supplementary concept of cooperative programming, which embraces the extension studies notion, thus resulting in what we might term a 'complementary' conception of cooperation, would have considerable educational value to the
student, could promote increased cooperative curriculum planning between Schools and TAFE teachers, and a sharing of resources, and strengthen the integration of a student's program of senior school studies.

Towards a Different Concept of Cooperative Programming

Our discussion of the foregoing two conceptions of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming records what we consider to be exemplary features of each. It also records that we believe each has conceptual drawbacks, although the full explication of these must necessarily wait until we have discussed the accreditation mechanisms that pertain to each in Section 6.4, because it is the accreditation of the programs that we feel holds the key to the equity concerns that we have signalled.

However, the foregoing discussion does enable us to point to what we consider is a conceptual flaw in cooperative programming as it is represented by many of the 234 programs reported in Chapter 3, and a number of those that were case studied, and reported in Chapter 4. This flaw is in the 'conceptual logistics' of the approaches to cooperative programming that have been adopted. By the term 'conceptual logistics' is meant the integrity or logic that exists between the four elements which comprise a "concept" of cooperative programming as depicted in Table 6.1, or between these four elements and the implementation of the concept.

Such a flaw is particularly evident in the case of the "alternative" conception, where there is a disjuncture between at least two of the elements of the concept. Likewise the disjuncture is evident between the elements of the concept on the one hand, and the implementation of the concept on the other. Reference to Table 6.1 shows that the alternative concept has arisen from a need to provide an alternative post-Year 10 pathway for students facing the decision between more schooling, work, TAFE or unemployment. Yet the structure and implementation of the concept has in practice meant that the programs deriving from this concept do not actually afford students an alternative or different pathway. What they do afford is a pathway which constitutes an aggregation of the existing available pathways.

The four programs (CAVE, ISP, PIPE and Vocational HSC) combine schooling and TAFE in differing ratios. In the case of PIPE a work component is also included. The program curricula are designed in an integrated manner, to meet the assessed needs of the local students, they provide an opportunity to sample TAFE (and in one case work), and they provide support to the students before and during the program. These are exemplary features. Yet the preferred rationales for these programs are founded on the principle of providing an alternative, different option. Where then is the essential difference?

Furthermore, in the case of the ISP, PIPE, and Vocational HSC, the very definite locus of identity for the program is the school. For the ISP, students are out of the school one day per week for about a year; for PIPE students two days a week for a year; for Vocational HSC students the equivalent of less than one day a week for two years. In the case of the CAVE, students attend the TAFE college for three days a week for 20 weeks. Over an equivalent two year period of senior schooling, these non-school inputs are not substantial. These quantitative measures, however, are merely indicative of the relative durations for instruction purposes. With the exception of CAVE, students undertaking one of these programs study traditional school subjects (e.g. Mathematics, English) either as a part of the designed curriculum for the program, or in addition to
the program. In the case of CAVE, once students have completed the CAVE program (20 weeks), they study traditional subjects if they choose to remain at school.

The point about these observations is that they demonstrate the programs' locus of identity is the schools. As such the programs are conceptual addenda to the traditional schooling provision. How satisfactory are they then, in affording an alternative to schooling which would be perceived by students as a real alternative? For the student who has not shown interest in more schooling, how much is achieved by offering an "alternative" program that is largely school-based, school-derived, school-delivered, and school-controlled. For the student the program starts and ends in school!

And what of the pathways? For some of the alternative programs described, students earn exemptions in TAFE courses. But what if the student was not particularly interested in a pathway to TAFE? So where is the real difference, where is the real alternative? If it is that students choosing to study these alternative programs, do proceed to enter TAFE and/or employment, directly after completion of the program (or during it), and it could be shown that they would not have secured these destinations without the program, then it could be concluded that the programs have had a measure of success in providing an alternative pathway. In the case of the PIPE and the Vocational HSC, there is evidence in the case studies that a number of students who were studying the program left mid-stream to secure work. There is also evidence that a number left with no firm destination. There is no evidence of students leaving to enter TAFE, although this might be expected since advanced entry to TAFE would be dependent on successful, not partial, completion of the program. These instances provide very limited data - we were not able to examine the post-program destinations of students as part of our study. In any case, it is probably too early in the development of such programs to be sure of their effect in assisting successful students to secure entry to TAFE or work.

In the case of the supplementary cooperative programs reviewed, we consider there is a disjuncture between the elements of the preferred programming concept and the implementation of the concept. This relates to the extent and nature of the provision of additional subject choice, via TAFE, for senior school students. In general terms the students taking up the TAFE subject options do so in a very limited way (to the extent of mostly one, sometimes two single year subjects), and in Year 11 rather than Year 12. These restrictions or limitations arise because a student, in wishing to retain the option of pursuing 'tertiary entrance', is required to gain a statewide senior school certificate. This credential is a pre-requisite to gaining a tertiary entrance score.

The disjuncture here is a more subtle one than is the case for alternative programs because it seems to be an indirect product of an inflexible senior secondary accreditation system. The student's wish to gain a senior school credential (and possible tertiary entrance) precludes the undertaking of more extensive studies from the TAFE offerings that are available. Could it not be possible for a student to retain tertiary entrance options, and at the same time pursue a greater number of available TAFE studies? At the present time, the component structure of supplementary programs (refer to Table 6.1), i.e. in an approximate Schools:TAFE ratio of 9:1 or 8:2, restricts this more flexible pattern.

This restriction does not result directly from Schools/TAFE Authorities, who have determined that the TAFE component should be so limited; rather it results from the inflexible formula for calculating tertiary entrance scores used by senior secondary accreditation agencies in the States/Territories. In study
unit terms, if a tertiary entrance score is dependent on eight or nine units out of a total of (say) ten, over a two year study period, then only one or two units remain for supplementary studies of any kind (including supplementary cooperative programs as these are presently offered in Australia). This limitation will continue unless the accreditation systems of the States/Territories change, and/or unless supplementary programs are accredited at the tertiary entrance level. This discussion will be developed further in Section 6.4.

The two conceptions of Schools/TAFE cooperation discussed in this section have strengths. A number of these have been noted — other exemplary features will be articulated in later sections, where refinements to the approaches borne of these concepts will be proposed. The two conceptions also have, in our view, some conceptual weaknesses. A number of other weaknesses will also be discussed in later sections.

What then of a different conception of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming? In its ideal form, we believe the concept of a post-compulsory educational institution, which provides a range of post-compulsory educational options offers solutions to many of the difficulties that have been noted in the foregoing discussion. Such an institution would provide for young people a range of educational programs leading to the award of a common post-compulsory educational qualification. The concept of the Hervey Bay Senior College, established at Maryborough in Queensland in 1985, has many of the conceptual elements of this ideal.

Reference to the case study of the Hervey Bay Senior College in Volume II of this report, or to our commentary in Chapter 4, shows that the senior college concept there makes provision for five different post-Year 10 programs of two years duration, at least three of which would rely on Schools/TAFE cooperative programming as we have defined it. Five such programs are depicted in Figure 6.2, which represents a general extraction from a table in the Hervey Bay case study.
Figure 6.3

Five possible programs offered in a post-compulsory educational institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary entrance senior program consisting of tertiary entrance subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General senior program consisting of school subjects (both tertiary entrance and non-tertiary entrance) and other units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive program consisting of a selection of school subjects (both tertiary entrance and non-tertiary entrance) and TAFE units</td>
<td>Post-compulsory education certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary/vocational program consisting of a combination of school and other subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational program consisting of core and elective subjects designed for entry to TAFE or work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structurally, such a range of post-compulsory provisions go a large part of the way to providing the means for overcoming a number of the difficulties that have been noted with the other concepts of cooperative programming. All students start at the same place, with the same status, they are able to choose from different alternatives, and they all earn the same statewide credential in a common location.

This structure also seems to avoid the schools’ locus of identity difficulty noted in our discussion above. The individual programs depicted in Figure 6.2 do not give an impression of being addenda to the school’s major business. They are not school-based, school-derived, school-delivered and school-controlled. Due to their common structural location, and common end point, programs offering tertiary entrance emphases, vocational emphases, and those with combined emphases are likely to be perceived by students and the community as relevant alternatives which have equivalent status.

In so far as the Hervey Bay College concept embodies this structure of post-compulsory educational provision, we consider it to be exemplary. We would wish to propose refinements to the curriculum design and accreditation arrangements that we understand accompany this concept as it is being implemented in Queensland. However, as a model of educational provision, which allows many of the noted difficulties of cooperative programming to be overcome, it is exemplary. In later sections of this chapter we will propose these refinements.

Some observations regarding the generalisability of the post-compulsory educational institution concept should, however, be made at this point. Clearly, due to the high costs of implementation of the concept, at least as it is being implemented in Queensland, its widespread introduction would appear to
be financially prohibitive to governments in Australia. It is likely such a cost could be justified if, as was the case in the Hervey Bay area, the educational authorities, have already acknowledged the need for a large financial resource commitment to post-compulsory educational provision in the area. In the case (say) where a government has recognised the need for a new or refurbished TAFE college and/or secondary school, and possibly for the establishment of additional community/adult education opportunities for the local community, then the economics of a Hervey Bay-type college could in fact be justified.

It is also likely that a number of the other particular circumstantial characteristics of the Hervey Bay initiative would not be readily generalisable to other locations in the States/Territories. Included amongst these would be its considerable distance from the centre of the state’s population (nearly 300 km in the case of Hervey Bay), the particular distribution of existing educational providers in the region, and the population in the region.

In any case, the preparedness of governments (and Education and TAFE authorities) to seriously contemplate this type of post-compulsory educational institution would also depend on a number of other important ingredients. These would include a strong commitment to providing real alternatives to the existing range of post-Year 10 educational provisions, a significant reconstruction of some of the prevailing ideologies, philosophies and priorities of Secondary Education and TAFE Authorities and senior secondary accreditation agencies, and a vigorous community awareness campaign.

Finally, notwithstanding any concerns about the difficulties of generalising the Hervey Bay Senior College initiative, we see it as an important contributor to the subject of our research because it embodies a number of exemplary cooperative programming principles. If it is possible to conceive of a post-Year 10 educational provision that draws on these, and puts these into practice even without the commensurate establishment of a new institution, then its review will have been valuable to educators in Australia.

6.4 The Accreditation of Cooperative Programs

6.4.1 The Accreditation Levels of Cooperative Programs

To aid in the discussion in this section, some relevant definitions (from Chapter 2) will be re-stated. These are the definitions of the terms "Level 1", "Level 2" and "Level 3" which we have used in Chapters 3 and 4, and will use in this chapter. They refer to the level of the secondary credential awarded to a student undertaking study at senior secondary school. They are analytical and generic terms designed by us to permit a comparative analysis of secondary credentials across the States/Territories, for the purposes of this study. They are

A Level 1 credential is earned by successful completion of a course or subject of study if the course or subject has been approved on a State-wide basis by the secondary accreditation agency to count in full towards a student’s tertiary entrance score.

A Level 2 credential is earned by successful completion of a course or subject of study if the course or subject has been recognised (or registered) by the secondary accreditation agency on a State-wide basis.
A Level 3 credential is earned by successful completion of a course or subject of study if the course or subject is school based and school credentialled, and has been acknowledged as such by the secondary accreditation agency.

It is important to note that this 'hierarchy of credentials' does not derive from cooperative programming practices. It is built into the secondary credentialling practices of the States/Territories, and it applies to all subjects offered in secondary schools in the senior years.

In Chapter 3 we reported that 88% (205) of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs identified in this study were "jointly accredited", i.e. accredited by both the senior secondary accreditation agency and the TAFE accreditation agency in the responsible State/Territory. Two of these were accredited by the secondary accreditation agency at Level 1, the remainder at Level 2 or 3. And of the programs accredited at Level 2 or 3, the great majority were accredited at Level 2. This quite simply means that for the great majority of cooperative programs, students who undertake them are not earning credit for that study towards tertiary entrance.

As we have indicated in Section 6.3 this feature is a part of the concept and design of most of the programs reviewed. Indeed for programs of the supplementary concept, this feature (with two exceptions) is an integral part of the program design. We have commented on the disjuncture identified between the rationale for supplementary cooperative programs, and the practice - which severely limits the extent of supplementation (TAFE studies) available to a student who wishes to keep the option of tertiary entrance open. We have suggested this arises from inflexible senior secondary accreditation systems which determine the formula for calculation of students' tertiary entrance scores. We will return to this suggestion when discussing the accreditation arrangements that pertain to the case study programs.

The particular accreditation arrangements that apply to the cooperative programs which are the subject of our case study commentaries in Chapter 4 are depicted in Table 6.4. We will discuss these in Sub-sections 6.4.2 and 6.4.3 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Program</th>
<th>Accreditation Arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Electronics Program (ACT)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business Studies Program (SA)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Colleges (Tas)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Course Award in Vocational Education (SA)</td>
<td>Accredited by TAFE only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Equine Management (WA)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Farm Management (WA)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gold Coast Program (Qld)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hervey Bay Senior College (Qld)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Integrated Studies Programs (SA)</td>
<td>Partial TAFE accreditation only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Joint Horticulture Project (ACT)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Port Kembla Cluster Program (NSW)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (NT)</td>
<td>Accredited by school only - Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. South Brisbane Pre-Vocational Program (Qld)</td>
<td>Accredited by school only - Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vocational HSC (NSW)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Yeronga Pre-Vocational Fleximode Program (Qld)</td>
<td>Jointly accredited - Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Note: Three of the entries in the table are recorded as "not applicable", because they are not 'programs' in the sense that the other entries are 'programs'. These are Nos. 3, 8, and 10. Nos. 3 and 8 (Community Colleges in Tasmania, and Hervey Bay Senior College in Queensland) refer to the post-compulsory educational initiatives mounted in those locations. These initiatives embodied Schools/TAFE cooperative programming, as is reported in our commentaries in Chapter 4. No. 10 (the Joint Horticulture Project in the ACT) refers to the particular educational initiative, mounted in the ACT during 1985 - involving a teacher development program which embodied Schools/TAFE cooperation.

6.4.2 Accreditation of Supplementary Programs

Programs numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, and 11 in Table 6.4 exemplify the difficulties related to the accreditation circumstances of "supplementary" programs referred to in Section 6.3 - these programs are accredited at Level 2, and so do not in general terms contribute to the tertiary entrance score of participating students.

As has been noted in Chapter 5, the senior secondary accreditation 'systems' in WA and Tasmania are different in this way to those of the other States/Territories. Because of this, it is difficult to generalise about the senior secondary accreditation systems in the States/Territories. Such generalisation is further complicated because accreditation is a process which relies on many factors, requirements and circumstances, which differ from State to State.

For the purposes of this discussion, however, we feel it is useful to represent the pattern of a student's senior school course of study, from which the tertiary entrance score is determined, over either one or two years depending on the different systems in the States/Territories, as an 'equation' of the following kind:

\[ \text{Course of study} = \sum A_i + \sum B_j \]

where each of $A_i$ are subjects/units of study accredited at Level 1, and $B_j$ are subjects accredited at Level 2 (or 3).

In the same way, it is possible to represent the means for determining a completing Year 12 student's tertiary entrance (T.E.) score as an 'equation' as follows:

\[ \text{T.E. score} = \sum X_i + \sum Y_j \]

where each of $X_i$ are adjusted marks (beyond a prescribed minimum grade), achieved in subjects/units accredited at Level 1, and each of $Y_j$ are adjusted marks (beyond a prescribed minimum grade) in subjects/units accredited at Level 2.
Using these 'equations', the possible patterns of study and the means of determining the tertiary entrance scores in most of the States/Territories could be depicted approximately as one of:

Course of study = A1+A2+A3+A4+A5+A6+A7+A8+A9+A10+A11

or

Course of study = A1+A2+A3+A4+A5+A6+7+A8+A9+A10 + B1

or

Course of study = A1+A2+A3+A4+A5+A6+A7+A8+A9 + B1+B2

or

Course of study = A1+A2+A3 + B1+B2+B3+B4+B5+B6+B7+B8

or

Course of study = A1+A2+A3+A4+A5+A6

or

Course of study = A1+A2+A3+A4+A5 + B1

or

Course of study = A1+A2+A3 + B1+B2+B3 ,

and

T.E. score = X1+X2+X3+X4+X5+X6+X7+X8+X9+X10

or

T.E. score = X1+X2+X3+X4+X5+X6

or

T.E. score = X1+X2+X3+X4+X5 ,

depending on the particular points or subject system adopted in each of the States/Territories to determine the tertiary entrance score.

In WA, the means for determining tertiary entrance scores could be depicted as:

T.E. score = X1+X2+X3 + Y1+Y2+Y3 ,
and in Tasmania as

\[ \text{T.E. score} = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4 + Y_1 + Y_2. \]

As we have already noted in Section 6.3, the means for determining tertiary entrance scores adopted in States/Territories other than WA and Tasmania, viz. the 10 X, 6 X, and 5 X, types, place a severe limitation on the extent to which students, wishing to retain tertiary entrance options, are able to take up the opportunities provided at school to include B-type studies in their total course of senior studies. B-type studies include Schools/TAFE cooperative programs because, by and large these are accredited by secondary accreditation agencies at Level 2.

In effect then, while students may choose from a flexible range of study patterns (in different combinations of A-type and B-type subjects), if they wish to retain full tertiary entrance options, they are constrained by the tertiary entrance score formulae which either totally or partially discount the value of the B subjects.

At least two important concerns stem from such means of determining tertiary entrance scores. One of these concerns relates directly to cooperative programs - a concern as to the justification for accrediting cooperative programs, as a matter of course, at Level 2 (or 3). The other concern relates to the inflexibility of the methods themselves. We will consider these concerns together because they are inter-related.

There appear to be a number of reasons for the preponderance of supplementary cooperative programs we have identified with Level 2 secondary accreditation. Reference has been made to one of these in Section 6.3 above, and it relates to the underlying concept of 'supplementation'. This concept, as evidenced by the practical examples of it that we have identified, is premised on the existing inflexible accreditation 'systems' that already exist. In most States/Territories supplementary cooperative programming can not therefore have been designed as a strategy for providing 'real' choice for all students in senior school years, regardless of their interests, abilities and aspirations for further education. The choice of B-type subjects/units is limited by the difference in 'value' accorded to them as Y-type, as distinct from X-type subjects, in the tertiary entrance score formula.

More than a marginal selection from available supplementary cooperative programs is thus limited to those students who have already made a decision to limit their possible range of tertiary study options - to TAFE, and in the case of some States/Territories, to particular Colleges of Advanced Education who have modified the entrance 'equations' described above to permit a greater number of X-type subjects. That is to say, in large part, the opportunity to take advantage of supplementation (or extension studies) is afforded to those students who perceive limited further education pathways for themselves. This points to two questions. Do these students have an accurate perception of their own potential for further studies (including those in Higher Education)? And should accreditation systems be structured so as to encourage many more students to compete for full tertiary entrance than there is likelihood of many of them gaining it?

We do not know the answers to these questions. Suffice to say however, we do not consider a student's accurate or inaccurate perception of his/her own potential for tertiary studies at the age of 15, 16 or 17 should lead to an irrevocable decision affecting their immediate future educational possibilities.
It should be noted here that recently introduced changes in some States/Territories, to base the senior school credential on Year 12 studies only, does seem to provide more flexibility in this regard. It remains to be seen whether educational authorities take advantage of this potential flexibility by designing program structures which reduce the irreversible impact of this decision on a young person's immediate future education. In any case, for the majority of subjects, the choice in Year 12 is still largely dependent on subject choice in Year 11 because of the need for pre-requisite studies to be successfully completed.

In relation to the second of these questions, the statistics on ultimate post-school destinations of Year 10 and 11 students, presented in Chapter 1, show that less than 20% of Year 10 and less than 30% of Year 11 students proceed directly from school to studies in Higher Education. Comparatively, a much higher proportion of Year 10 and 11 students continue in senior schooling to compete for a limited number of total places available in tertiary institutions, and an even more limited number accessible in Institutions of Higher Education. For the institutions themselves, interested in granting admission to students who have attained the requisite academic standard in order to maintain their institutional standard of educational achievement, the competition for entry could probably be considered a healthy market force. Although, it could also be speculated that their institutional interest in maintenance of academic standards would be better served by greater qualitative competition between a more concentrated and smaller population of tertiary education aspirants.

Senior secondary schooling is not intended to have the singular purpose of providing a route to tertiary education. It is also intended to provide students with a breadth of educational experience to enable them to begin to pursue a rewarding and constructive adult life in a world which manifests a whole range of different ideologies, philosophies, economies, and societies, and in which they will be able choose from and contribute to these dimensions of life. For some students this will mean pursuing tertiary studies; for others it will mean seeking work; for others it will mean something different. And some will pursue tertiary studies at a later time in life, when their circumstances, needs and interests have changed. We therefore believe that the present tertiary education focus for the senior years of schooling is too pronounced. The design constraints placed on the senior school curriculum, to cater for a minority of students who are bound for tertiary entrance, are deterring from the benefits that could be more effectively provided for a majority of students who also wish to seek a senior secondary education.

We feel more needs to be done to overcome the tertiary education influence on the senior school curriculum. Indeed we feel that Schools/TAFE cooperative programming, in its exemplary form, is one of the means for achieving this aim. Now this would be made easier if secondary accreditation agencies were to adopt more flexible systems, and/or if Institutions of Higher Education were to adopt more open admission requirements. These changes need to occur, in our view, because at the present time the spectre of tertiary entrance is restricting many of the curriculum diversification initiatives (including cooperative programs) of educational authorities in Australia.

At least one means for attempting to overcome this constraining influence on senior school curricula would be to alter the balance of representation that currently exists on the "boards", "authorities", and "committees" that are responsible for accreditation of senior secondary courses in the Australian States/Territories. Data presented in Chapter 5 show that the representation on these agencies, from Institutions of Higher Education, is as high as 40% in the
case of some States/Territories. By comparison the representation from the State/Territory TAFE Authorities is of the order of 10%. Representation from other sections of the community with an interest and investment in the standards of senior secondary education, including industry/commerce and parent groups are likewise small, ranging from 5% to 10%. In at least one case there is no representation from other than educational agencies. In most cases, the group with the single largest representation is the Secondary Educational Authority.

In the larger States, there is a larger number of individual tertiary education providers with differing philosophies and admission requirements. For these, there would seem to be some rationale for individual representation, to ensure the particular interests and standards of their institution was accounted for, but the effect of this would seem to be a disproportionate influence on the balance of senior school curricula. The comparative under-representation of TAFE Authorities and other community groups with a stake in senior secondary education does, we consider, require review. Such a review should in turn lead the way towards a review of the criteria employed to determine appropriate levels of accreditation for senior school studies. In so doing, these criteria need to take greater account of the other than tertiary education destinations of school leavers, and of the different purposes that exist between different providers of tertiary education (such as between TAFE and Higher Education).

Notwithstanding possible changes to the balance of power in the secondary accreditation arena, and the provision of more flexible systems for determining tertiary entrance scores, we also consider that Level 1 secondary accreditation should be sought and gained for a greater number of supplementary cooperative programs. Here we are simply suggesting that, as appropriate, the curriculum documentation for such programs should be submitted by the responsible educational authority to the secondary accreditation agency, and that it should be reviewed and a level of accreditation determined on an individual basis, according to the existing criteria set for this purpose. If this were done, rather than it being accepted or assumed by program initiators that Schools/TAFE cooperative programs were appropriately accredited at Level 2 (or 3), then we believe a greater number than is presently the case in Australia would have earned the status of Level 1 accreditation.

We feel that a number of the observations made through two of the case studies (reported in Chapter 4) bear evidence to this. Firstly, our review of the Business Studies Program (Blackfriars' Model) in SA has shown that it is possible to gain Level 1 accreditation for a Schools/TAFE cooperative program. In this particular case, and prior to the development of the program, both Schools and TAFE were offering courses/subjects in the business studies area. Resulting from a thoroughgoing process of curriculum (including assessment) negotiation, involving both TAFE and Educational Authorities, and the senior secondary accreditation agency in SA (SSABSA), this program was jointly accredited, by TAFE, and at Level 1 by SSABSA. As such it earns a successful student credit in a number of accredited TAFE business studies certificate courses, and it also contributes to that student's senior school certificate for tertiary entrance purposes.

Given the restrictive secondary accreditation systems in the States/Territories that have been described above, we feel this achievement is exemplary. It would not, in our view, have been possible without the strong cooperative effort of the two educational authorities (Schools and TAFE), and the instrumental involvement of the SSABSA. As well, and importantly in this particular instance, it would not have occurred without the determined initial efforts of the teachers of a number of the independent schools involved in the program.
Our case study of this program points to the importance of curriculum negotiation in the design process - this and other aspects of that process will be taken up in Section 6.5.

The case study and our commentary of the Basic Electronics Program, offered by Bruce College of TAFE to students from Hawker College (a senior secondary school) in the ACT, provide evidence that inflexibilities in the accreditation systems there (both secondary and TAFE) contributed to a classification of this cooperative program at Level 2, rather than Level 1. As in the case of the Business Studies example above, both Hawker College and Bruce TAFE offered courses/subjects in the electronics study area prior to the introduction of the cooperative program. Once introduced, the Hawker students attended Bruce to undertake the TAFE Basic Electronics Course. Despite general agreement amongst the teachers of Hawker and the students of the program that it resulted in enhanced curriculum delivery, and was of at least equivalent "conceptual difficulty" to the previously offered Level 1 subject at Hawker, the secondary accreditation agency in the ACT was only able to "provisionally approve" the program at Level 2 for 1985. (It was expected this provisional status would be reconsidered in 1986.)

It is apparent from the case study, that at least part of the reason for the decision to accord Basic Electronics the Level 2 accreditation status resulted from complications in the accreditation process. These would have required delicate negotiations between a number of the parties to the accreditation decision to have been overcome. It is also apparent that a number of the parties to the accreditation decision were uncertain as to whether the level of "conceptual difficulty" of the Basic Electronics program warranted its accreditation at Level 1. This uncertainty would also have required negotiation.

For us, however, even the possibility that the criterion of "conceptual difficulty" could play an important role in determining level of accreditation of a cooperative program, with its consequent effect of reducing the availability of the program to a wide range of students, is a matter of concern. Indeed we consider the imputed link between a subject's conceptual content and its suitability for tertiary entrance bears testament to the existence of the traditional view of senior schooling that we referred to in Chapter 1.

In considering other reasons for the large number of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs we have identified that are accredited at Level 2, it is likely some are attributable to the still formative stage of development of cooperative programs in Australia. In the present climate of turbulent social, economic and technological change, there has been considerable pressure on educational planners to find educational solutions to alleviate the circumstances and demands of young people which could be implemented without delay. We believe this has encouraged too much acceptance of existing educational systems and mechanisms as they are, to be used as a framework for the design of such solutions. Particularly in those States where considerable cooperative effort has been launched from the central administrations of Education and TAFE, it is evident that standardised approaches to supplementary cooperative programming have been adopted. These have necessitated a heavy reliance on the existing systems and mechanisms, especially for accreditation purposes. In NSW and Queensland for example, a large number of Level 2 cooperative programs have been introduced with relatively short lead times.

We believe these efforts have been exemplary in so far as they have resulted in the provision of wider curriculum choice to participating students. As well,
they represent substantial innovations in curriculum development which have been achieved quickly in response to the prevailing pressures. Given this, we consider it is now important for these States to re-examine their supplementary conception of Schools/TAFE cooperation, with a view to ensuring it is one that nurtures the development of programs that provide equality of educational opportunity to all students.

We have noted that much of the difficulty associated with Level 2 accreditation of cooperative programs referred to in this section stems not from the development of these programs per se; rather it results from inflexibilities in the existing accreditation systems of the States/Territories. These inflexibilities are not just procedural as we have attempted to show. They arise from an established set of tertiary entrance assessment principles and practices which are norm-referenced rather than criterion-referenced, and which lead to the aggregation of marks for individual and different subjects to arrive at a tertiary entrance score. We have neither the data nor the expertise to undertake a detailed examination of these practices. They are practices, however, which have a considerable influence on all senior secondary curriculum provision, including, as we have shown, Schools/TAFE cooperative programming. We feel the problems arising from these practices need to be examined, not just because of the constraints they place on the development of equitable cooperative programs, but because they are instrumental in the sphere of curriculum change in secondary education.

6.4.3 Accreditation of Alternative Programs

Programs numbered 4, 9, 12, and 14 from Table 6.4 typify the difficulties we have suggested relate to accreditation of "alternative" programs. Two of these programs, viz. the Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE), and the Integrated Studies Programs (ISP), do not lead to a joint credential - they are accredited by TAFE only. The Programs for Improving Potential for Employment (PIPE) is accredited by the school only - i.e. earns a Level 3 credential. The Vocational HSC is jointly accredited - at Level 2 by the senior secondary accreditation agency.

In Section 6.3 we noted what we considered to be a major disadvantage of this program concept, which derived from the practice of 'targetting' students judged to be "at risk". There we raised a number of questions concerning the making of this judgement. In this section we will focus on the particular accreditation arrangements that pertain to these programs, and in so doing will take up the theme we have introduced in Section 6.3, that of a different concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation.

There are highly commendable grounds for the attempts of educators to target programs to students, who for a variety of reasons, may be contemplating leaving school with little prospect of gaining employment or of securing a place in an increasingly competitive TAFE market place. Indeed, in large measure, these grounds constitute the rationale for the Commonwealth Government's Participation and Equity Program (PEP) - from which the Schools/TAFE cooperative programming initiative has been substantially derived. It is our view, however, that Schools/TAFE cooperation is a purposeful endeavour in its own right, and that to date it has in practice been too submerged in the PEP framework and concept. Schools/TAFE cooperation should have, and does have to some measure, as we have shown in Sections 6.2 and 6.3, a different purpose and conception.

Our concluding remarks in Section 6.3 pointed towards the concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation as a means for providing real 'alternatives' to
students contemplating the choice between more schooling, TAFE, work, industry training and unemployment. Figure 6.2 depicted "alternative Schools/TAFE" as a potential sixth option for students who were at the end of Year 10 decision point. This concept should set Schools/TAFE cooperation apart from PEP. The notion and practices of "targetting" of students who are "at risk" are embodied in the PEP Guidelines. These are justifiable, and should be central to the educational strategies developed within the PEP framework. The purpose of providing alternatives to the existing post-compulsory education pathways, however, should be pursued independently of the targetting principle, otherwise, as we have shown in Section 6.3, the alternative options that are designed are accessible to too narrow a sample of the student body.

Real alternative options (via Schools/TAFE cooperation) at the post-Year 10 stage can be provided only if the options are accessible to the student body at large. So what are the existing barriers to such alternatives being openly accessible? We have suggested the practice of targetting effectively closes the option of cooperative programs, of the alternative concept, to very many of the students contemplating their post-Year 10 choices. Why does this occur? It occurs because the alternative programs of the type reviewed in this study do not earn participating students an appropriate senior school credential. None of the four programs of this type included in Table 6.4 leads to a secondary credential which has an established credibility in the wider community. Moreover, participation in these programs effectively forecloses the possibility of achieving tertiary entrance based on studies in the senior years of schooling. Why is this? This is because these programs are not accredited at Level 1 by the senior secondary accreditation agencies of the relevant States/Territories. Indeed three of these programs are not even accredited at Level 2. Further two of them are not accredited at all by the secondary agency.

It is the case that three of these programs are accredited by TAFE - so they may lead a participating student to further TAFE studies, by virtue of the credit in TAFE courses earned from the programs. We believe the TAFE accreditation does have considerable value - to the student - and that it has an established credibility in the community. It does not, however, constitute a different alternative for students. TAFE is already available to these students - through either mainstream or PEP (TAFE) courses. Nor do we consider the TAFE accreditation of these programs is sufficient. We believe that if a student has chosen a course of study from among the options available at the senior school level, then successful completion of that course should entitle the student to a school credential which the wider community perceives as signifying as such. This is the only way to ensure that alternative provisions at the level of senior schooling are equitable.

We strongly favour therefore the recently proposed senior secondary certification changes in Queensland - resulting in the award of a single Post-School Certificate or Senior Secondary Certificate to all students successfully completing any one of the post-Year 10 educational options that are offered by the educational authorities. The same certificate is awarded to students successfully completing one of these options, regardless of how the option is administered by the educational authorities - that is to say, whether the option is offered by Schools alone, or cooperatively by Schools and TAFE, or by a senior college or community college institution, or for that matter by TAFE alone.

Achievement of the equitable provision of alternative post-Year 10 educational options through adoption of this single certificate approach would, in our view,
have necessary implications for the "hierarchy of credentials" that we have noted currently pervades the secondary accreditation systems in the States/Territories. We feel the various post-Year 10 educational options will be available equally to all students only if the certificate earned records the student's course of study without recourse to such an hierarchy. Currently, and allowing for minor variations among the States/Territories, senior school certificates record the course of study successfully completed in a way which identifies subjects/units as one of Level 1 or 2 or 3. The terms Level 1, 2 and 3 are not of course used, but the use of different subject grading or coding systems, and/or different locations on the actual parchment, depending on the accredited status of the subject are, in our view, tantamount to the practice of using 'levels'.

Furthermore, these options will be available equally to all students only if they are not dependent on the existing hierarchical classification of levels. This hierarchy needs therefore to be dismantled. After all, as we have noted, it largely services the admission requirements of the Higher Education sector, and their quite understandable concern to maintain their institutions' academic standards. In so far as the existing secondary accreditation hierarchy achieves this purpose, then it serves the interests of that sector, and of students seeking admission to Institutions of Higher Education. We do not believe, however, that these interests, which provide for what we have shown to be a minority of post-Year 10 students, justify the continuation of a senior secondary accreditation system which we have shown effectively prohibits the initiation and development of equitable educational alternatives for all the student body.

As a result of the discussion presented so far in this Chapter, we have arrived at a position from which we are making observations and conclusions, and expressing points of view which appear to go beyond our project's charter of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. This has been made necessary by the dependence of cooperative programming concepts and practices on existing structures, mechanisms and practices of the educational authorities and accreditation agencies in the States/Territories. As we have shown, unless we were to settle for a rather narrow concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation as providing supplementation to the 'real' senior secondary studies already offered in schools, then it has been necessary to examine these structures and mechanisms because they are instrumental in attempting to design what we consider is a more worthwhile concept of Schools/TAFE cooperative programming.

6.5 The Design and Delivery of Cooperative Programs

The foregoing sections of this Chapter have focussed on the conceptual character of cooperative programming, and on an examination of the accreditation principles and mechanisms that exist, and would be required, in order to implement cooperative programs in accordance with these concepts. Effective implementation of cooperative programs will also be reliant on a number of other factors. These factors concern the design and delivery of the programs. In this section we will draw upon the descriptive review of programs in Chapter 3 and the more qualitative data derived from the case studies reported in Chapter 4, as a means of focussing on exemplary design and delivery practices.
6.5.1 Principles of Curriculum Design

Our review has identified at least two broad 'principles' of curriculum design that appear to have been employed in the development of cooperative programs, to a greater or lesser extent, in each of the States/Territories. These principles include the quite heavy reliance on existing TAFE curricula, and the adoption of an integrated curriculum design approach. These principles or approaches are not exclusive, and are also related to other curriculum development factors that we will discuss in following sub-sections.

The heavy reliance on existing TAFE curricula has been noted particularly in Chapter 3, where Table 3.11 shows that 93% of cooperative programs identified in our study comprise no more and no less than existing TAFE subjects or courses. These cooperative programs are exemplified by the Basic Electronics, Gold Coast, and Port Kembla programs also shown in Table 6.4, and by the description of a typical cooperative program provided in Section 6.1. In Chapter 3 we have noted the subject area focus for the great majority of these programs has been from the more prominent and longer established study areas in TAFE - such as the metal trades; and business/commercial (including secretarial) studies. There are a number of sound reasons for this dependence on selection of curricula from the 'tried and true' study areas in TAFE, especially for cooperative programs of the supplementary kind.

The first of these is quite simply that selection of curricula from the 'tried and true' TAFE study areas offers a measure of security both for the curriculum designers and the students of the cooperative program. For the designers, especially where these are unfamiliar with TAFE (such as might be the case with designers from the Schools sector) there is confidence in existing curricula that have been proven to meet the vocational needs of their TAFE clientele. Students would have confidence in TAFE study areas they are familiar with, and which they, their parents and employers identify with a TAFE college. Another reason for this approach would be the efficiency of a curriculum design process which was able to draw upon existing curricula - where little or no design needed to be mounted 'from scratch'. This would have been of particular advantage to designers in those States/Territories eager to develop and launch a range of programs with a short lead time.

The most significant reason for this approach, however, stems from the concept of supplementation as we have identified it. Because the supplementary concept is based on the design of a jointly accredited program - from Schools and TAFE - curriculum selection from accredited TAFE study areas ensured that, by definition, the TAFE accreditation was achieved. As well, this standardised means of curriculum selection facilitated the gaining of Level 2 accreditation for these programs as a general principle, from the senior secondary accreditation agency.

We therefore appreciate the advantages of this approach, particularly of its importance to achieving a standardised (and in many senses equitable) pattern of cooperative programming, in a short space of time. It is likely, however, that it also poses a number of inherent difficulties. One such difficulty relates to its likely reinforcement of existing barriers to access within TAFE. The very great majority of females in secretarial/business studies, and of males in metal trades courses in TAFE for example, is a pattern which will be replicated in cooperative programs unless appropriate curriculum design strategies are adopted. A further concern with this approach has already been noted in Section 6.3 - that the aggregation of two independently designed curriculum components (viz. a Schools component and a TAFE component) does not result in an integrally
different curriculum option for participating students; it merely results in a partialling of two already available options.

Our final concern with this approach is for its unfortunate link with selection of particular TAFE courses for which colleges have 'spare capacity'. It is inevitable that cooperative program designers in particular locations will be constrained by the capacity of the local TAFE college to provide a service in a range of study areas. After all, this is the case for all of TAFE's clientele - whether they be apprentices or housewives or senior secondary school students. At present in Australia, there are relatively severe levels of unmet demand for TAFE courses. This has resulted in TAFE Authorities implementing policies which set priorities for student enrolments, which most generally favour vocational courses for which there is a statutory requirement to provide courses (such as in apprenticeships).

During the interviews conducted as part of our study, a number of interviewees reported that this 'spare capacity' principle played at least some part in the choice of TAFE study areas made available for inclusion in cooperative programs. This is understandable in view of TAFE's unmet demand difficulties. In its favour, it has been asserted that this practice is a ready means of achieving more economic use of educational resources across the different sectors. We consider, however, that as a factor in the curriculum design process, where the designers should be aiming to design a program to best meet the interests and needs of the student group, it should rather be taken into account as a resource constraint in the same way as other constraints are considered as part of the context for the curriculum design initiative. It should not be adopted as a general principle of curriculum design for cooperative programs.

It is also evident in some States/Territories that the development and implementation of TAFE policies to prioritise student enrolments which, as we have noted has been necessitated by high levels of unmet demand for places in TAFE colleges, has further limited the potential for designing cooperative programs. In these, some interviewees from the central administrations of the TAFE Authorities reported that TAFE's enrolment priorities effectively precluded the introduction of the number and type of cooperative programs that might otherwise be offered. The demand for such programs was apparent, but the enrolment priorities of TAFE gave preference to mainstream vocational courses, which were also in high demand. Indeed in a number of instances we have noted, either in TAFE policy documents or from interview, that Schools/TAFE cooperative programs of the supplementary type have been accorded a lower priority than other types of Schools/TAFE cooperative endeavours, or than other TAFE courses. The setting of this lower priority has been based on the view that senior school students are already resourced through the school system, and therefore in a situation of limited recurrent resources, TAFE's resources should rather be directed to "adult" students who are seeking a place in a TAFE college.

We believe this view leads to the denial of learning opportunities to a group of post-compulsory school age students because of the particular fund allocation practices of State and Commonwealth Governments. Such students should not be denied an opportunity for educational provision from a TAFE college for this reason. After all, as has been shown by a number of the cooperative initiatives reviewed in this study, both at the central and local levels, it is within the power of educational authorities in the States/Territories to cooperate financially, as well as in the matter of curriculum design. The other question we would ask of the proponents of this view is 'what is the definition of an adult?' Is an adult any person who is not in receipt of the benefit of recurrent school funding from governments?
Lastly, we consider this view of Schools/TAFE cooperation results from a limited concept of cooperation which is based on a parochial view of secondary education vis-à-vis technical and further education. The concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation that we favour is one which provides a means for delivering an 'alternative' educational pathway to post-compulsory school students. Successful design and implementation of such an alternative will require the resources, expertise, and cooperation of both TAFE and School sectors.

In contrast to this fairly widespread approach to curriculum design for cooperative programs, a smaller number of programs have also been designed using an 'integrated' approach. We have made mention of this approach in Section 6.3 as it is exemplified by programs of the 'alternative' concept. Table 3.11 from Chapter 3 shows that only 3% of programs identified in our study are of this kind. This approach is typified by the Course Award in Vocational Education (CAVE), the Integrated Studies Programs (ISP), and the Vocational HSC programs depicted in Table 6.4. The curriculum design processes for these programs have evidenced considerable effort to assess the particular needs and interests of the student body concerned. (In addition, the curriculum design of the Port Kembla program, although of the supplementary concept, was characterised by determined needs assessment efforts.) By and large, these efforts have, as we have noted already, been associated with the practice of 'targetting' students deemed to be "at risk".

On the condition that the 'target' for cooperative programs can be broadened to include all post-Year 10 students equally, we consider the needs assessment practices resulting in an integrated design for such programs are exemplary curriculum design practices. The particular strategies used by the designers of the CAVE, ISP and the Vocational HSC are described and analysed in our case study commentaries in Chapter 4. Suffice to say, they bring about a course of study in which the component parts (from TAFE and School) are related to one another in order to achieve a cohesive purpose – in the case of the three mentioned, to lead to employment and/or further TAFE studies.

Typically, integrated programs also require a greater commitment to course-time by the students than is required by supplementary cooperative programs. We do not believe this necessarily has to be so, as is evidenced by the ISP, which requires only 180 hours study compared to the 500-odd hours of CAVE and the total two year period of senior study for the Vocational HSC. Although, in keeping with our expressed preference for alternative programs which provide substantive alternatives to the existing range of post-compulsory educational options, we do not see any reason not to aim to design a program which commits all of a student's study time over the two year period, so long as the circumstances and student needs warrant such a comprehensive program.

Our main point here is that design of an integrated Schools/TAFE program as an alternative option for post-Year 10 students, should require a process of needs analysis. If these programs are to overcome the stated difficulties of supplementary programming, they need to be carefully designed so as to ensure selections that are made from existing TAFE and School offerings are appropriate to the students' needs and interests - and are not simply an aggregation of a School's and TAFE component each of which might have been found inappropriate by the students concerned.

This generative approach is clearly a more difficult design path to tread. It requires careful needs analysis, consultation with students, parents, employers and the community, and the participation of a range of key educational and
community groups. Importantly, and as we have noted in Section 6.4, if the program is to be equitable, it will require significant changes to the accreditation practices in the States/Territories.

6.5.2 Program Management and Design Mechanisms

The fairly broad definition for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, adopted for this study, emphasises cooperative effort between Schools and TAFE in relation to curriculum, resources, teaching inputs and locations, as well as credentials. To achieve such cooperation clearly requires consultation and negotiation between the parties concerned. For all cooperative programs case studied as part of our work, consultation and negotiation have been evidenced to a greater or lesser extent. These have shown that, by and large, cooperative effort to achieve the design, implementation and ongoing management and administration of the programs have been undertaken at the local, regional and centralised levels in each of the States/Territories.

Both Schools and TAFE officers interviewed felt strongly that the joint or shared undertaking of these roles was important to the success of the programs. Table 3.7 in Chapter 3, for example, shows that the vast majority (79%) of programs identified were jointly administered. We are also aware that the very great majority of programs were designed in a joint consultative manner.

In a number of States/Territories, we were impressed by the program management mechanisms that had been established to oversee the design and ongoing monitoring of cooperative programs. In those States where the Secondary Education and TAFE Authorities are independent of one another, this was particularly evident. In NSW and SA for example, centralised management mechanisms had been established for this purpose. In NSW an Inter-Departmental Committee is the central focus for a management structure which is depicted and described in our commentary on the Port Kembla case study in Chapter 4. The structure has three levels - centralised; regional; and schools/college - serviced by a small centralised working group of 'project-type' officers from both Schools and TAFE (called the Joint Support Unit). This structure helps to promote the necessary consultation and participation of parties at each of these levels.

In SA, the Central Schools/TAFE Coordinating Committee performed a similar function to the NSW committee, although in 1985 its composition was more diverse and representative of stakeholder groups than the its NSW counterpart. The Coordinating Committee in SA was further responsible to a small joint committee of senior officers from TAFE and Schools. In SA also, there was a network of regional committees with joint membership. The case studies for the CAVE and the ISP in SA record how, in 1985, the regional group in the Salisbury/Elizabeth area of metropolitan Adelaide designed and managed cooperative efforts in its area. Our commentaries on these case studies show that we did not consider the purpose and approach of this group, the Elizabeth-Salisbury Transition Education Project (ESTEP), to be typical of other groups we had the opportunity to observe in SA. The achievements of ESTEP, from 1982 to 1985, were in our view quite remarkable.
The ESTEP management process is described in our commentaries. The elements of the process most directly related to our discussion at this point are its joint consultative mechanisms, and its promotion of student needs assessment as a critical part of the design process. The case studies of CAVE and ISP show there were a number of working groups set up under the auspices of ESTEP - each with Schools and TAFE representation, and each with a particular set of design, planning and administrative problems to overcome in order to implement the programs. The problems were jointly tackled and solved. In this way the quality of the programs was the responsibility of both Schools and TAFE - their need was not viewed parochially as arising from inadequacies in existing schooling provisions - rather they were viewed as a cooperative endeavour to improve the educational options available to a group of students for whom both TAFE and Schools Authorities had a common responsibility. Officers participating from the two authorities were not so much representing their sectoral interest, but were attempting, in common, to serve the needs of an age group of students in their local community. We believe the regional or local community focus exemplified by this approach was commendable. It further strengthens our favoured concept of an alternative cooperative program which seeks to provide educational choices which are more than Schools, or TAFE or an aggregation of the two.

The framework for consultation and negotiation provided by these structures is considered to be necessary for effective Schools/TAFE cooperation. The particular process established for curriculum negotiation in the design phase of the Business Studies program in SA is considered to be exemplary in this regard. In our commentary on this program (in Chapter 4) we referred to this as a "contract" approach to design. While we acknowledge the particular circumstances of the business studies area which set it apart from many of the other programs we have reviewed, viz. that business studies provision has an established history in both TAFE and Schools, we believe the contract approach has a lot to commend it in more general circumstances.

The contract approach has three stages:
1. Agreement 'in principle'
2. Developmental
3. Monitoring

The elements of each of these stages are presented in our commentary. In summary they involve recognition of the current curriculum provisions of Schools and TAFE, negotiation of an agreed curriculum and of the contribution each of TAFE and Schools can and should make to this, and a surveillance of the implementation of the agreed curriculum. Importantly, this approach accounts for appropriate concerns for maintenance of standards, especially as these are often expressed by TAFE Authorities. The surveillance mechanism ensures TAFE accreditation interests, and the credibility of TAFE courses in the eyes of industry/commerce, are satisfied - in this case to the extent of school teachers teaching an accredited TAFE course in a school environment.

The most significant finding of our study of this approach, however, relates to the role of the senior secondary accreditation agency in the negotiation process. The recently established Senior Secondary Assessment Board of SA (SSABSA) played a leading role in the negotiation process for the Business Studies program. Clearly, as an accreditation agency, it had an interest in the process that would determine arrangements for exchange of credit with TAFE, where SSABSA accredited subjects were involved - especially since a Level 1 accreditation was being sought. Its involvement in the design of the program went beyond the comparatively passive participation of other secondary accreditation agencies that we have observed in this study. SSABSA officers convened meetings, identified issues to be resolved, contributed to the detailed
analysis of curriculum documentation, and participated in (often initiating) the formal correspondences between SSABSA, and senior officers in the TAFE and Education Authorities.

We consider this involvement in, and commitment to, the development of the Business Studies cooperative program to have been exemplary. Indeed many of the credentialling barriers we have suggested need to be overcome before Schools/TAFE cooperation can be widely adopted in what we consider is the preferred manner, may be broached using a contract approach such as this – particularly where the secondary accreditation agency is instrumentally involved.

Our final comment on this approach concerns the length of time and human resources required to use it effectively. In the case of Business Studies both time and personnel commitments appeared to be extensive, certainly by comparison with many other programs reported in our study. These were most noticeable in the developmental and monitoring stages of the process. However, in view of the structure of the detailed "subject equivalences" that were determined between TAFE and Schools curricula (referred to in our commentary on Business Studies), it is likely that the cooperative program contract will be inexpensive and simple to maintain. Moreover, the Business Studies program's achievement of the nearly unique outcome of joint accreditation at Level 1, is in our view worth the effort.

The approach is most suitable for the development of cooperative programs of the supplementary type. It would seem to be applicable in most States/Territories in Australia in the case of the business study area – furthermore it would seem to have generalisability to other study areas. Where there are already established study areas that are common to Schools & TAFE, such as in business/secretarial, technical (drawing, drafting, carpentry, etc), computing, design (artistic or technical), & electronics, the contract approach would seem to be adaptable.

6.5.3 Delivery of Cooperative Programs

In Section 6.5.1 we noted the heavy reliance on existing TAFE curricula for supplementary cooperative program design. This characteristic is also evidenced in the delivery of these programs. Tables 3.9 and 3.10 in Chapter 3 show that in excess of 90% of such programs are located in TAFE colleges and are taught by TAFE teachers. This is not surprising given the nature of the supplementary concept of cooperation. And it is considered by some educators, both TAFE and Schools, that this characteristic is one of the benefits of School/TAFE cooperation – the student is able to sample a different learning environment and educational experience, while at the same time gaining credit towards a TAFE award. We certainly agree with this view. The weight of this benefit to many students should not be underestimated.

We do not, however, consider the issue of TAFE delivery of cooperative programs should become a necessary 'condition' for their introduction. Decisions concerning appropriate delivery strategies for Schools/TAFE programs should be made depending on the nature of the curriculum content and its standards, available resources and teaching expertise, as well as other prevailing circumstances that apply to each cooperative program. Clearly cooperative programs that rely heavily on vocational curriculum content and objectives will require TAFE resources and teaching expertise for effective delivery, and in order to meet the requisite TAFE accreditation standards. Likewise objectives and content relying on expertise and resources currently available in Schools...
should be delivered by drawing on those resources.

There are particular circumstances, some of which have been exemplified by a number of our case studies, under which effective program delivery can be achieved by cross-sectoral delivery. Each of the case studied programs – South Brisbane Pre-Vocational, Equine Management, Gold Coast, Joint Horticulture, Business Studies, Vocational HSC, Port Kembla, and Farm Management (depicted in Table 6.4) – evidence what we consider is cross-sectoral delivery to a greater or lesser extent. Our commentaries on these case studies describe the circumstances of each. Some of these are instances of program delivery by TAFE teachers in the TAFE college, supported by regular tutorial sessions at school by school teachers with expertise in the particular or related study area. One other (Farm Management) concerns the external delivery of a TAFE accredited course in the school. These informal cross-sectoral delivery arrangements are considered worthwhile, and would in our view be adaptable in many other study areas.

In the case of the Equine Management, Business Studies and Gold Coast programs, school teachers are also delivering TAFE accredited subjects in schools. In these cases, as we have noted, the authorities, either centrally or locally, monitor course delivery to ensure standards are met. These current instances of more formal cross-sectoral delivery occur in study areas where both TAFE and Schools have established expertise – such as in business/secretarial studies or in horse care. Other similar circumstances may apply in those study areas referred to at the end of Section 6.5.3. As well, for many special-purpose schools, both government and independent, such as those that have been established to specialise in rural, music or technical studies, cross-sectoral delivery arrangements for cooperative programs in the areas of specialism would appear to have considerable ready made potential.

The Joint Horticulture Project in the ACT (referred to in Table 6.4) is a specific cooperative endeavour involving cross-sectoral delivery. In 1985, when we observed it in its developmental stages, the project was aimed at providing curriculum support to Horticulture teachers in schools, in order that they would be able to improve the delivery of horticulture subjects to secondary students. It was anticipated this may lead to school teachers delivering parts of TAFE accredited courses to senior secondary students.

The noted success of some of these cross-sectoral delivery arrangements show they are worthy of consideration as a means of delivering a greater number of cooperative programs than have been possible to date within current resource limitations. Especially in view of TAFE's unmet demand difficulties, referred to in Section 6.5, cross-sectoral delivery techniques, in appropriate circumstances, could provide ready alternatives for the expansion and diversification of cooperative programming. Indeed, such techniques could lead to more economic use of the existing available resources within TAFE and Schools – where these are already in common in the two sectors.

Another possibility arising from a consideration of the economics of program delivery relates to the notion of 'institutional accreditation', already noted in our commentaries on the Equine Management and Business Studies programs and the Horticulture project. Circumstances where the Schools' and TAFE's teaching expertise, curriculum resources and materials, and assessment standards are common, or can be complemented in some way so that they are common, point to the possibility of (say) a school seeking approval as a provider of an accredited TAFE course. Institutional accreditation of this kind, particularly where TAFE resources are limited, is an effective means of offering supplementary
cooperative programs.

Whilst we expected industrial issues to be highlighted in general terms in our study, this was not the case. Although in so far as cross-sectoral delivery mechanisms may be considered by interested educational authorities, we can report that a small number of interviewees expressed concern for the likely industrial issues that might be implicit in school teachers (or schools) delivering accredited TAFE courses. These concerns centred on the perceived incapacity of Schools to deliver TAFE courses to the standards that would safeguard the accreditation of the course, and maintain the credibility of TAFE courses in general. It was initially suspected specific points of potential industrial conflict may result from the different industrial awards, working conditions and salary levels of Schools and TAFE teachers in most States/Territories. As well, it was thought the existence of separate teacher unions for Schools and TAFE teachers in most States/Territories would not facilitate the overcoming of any likely differences in union policy in respect of Schools/TAFE cooperation. We saw little evidence of this in our study.

Even in the case of the Hervey Bay Senior College initiative in Queensland, which involved the introduction of a unique set of "administrative arrangements" to accommodate the teachers of the college, no significant industrial disputation had to our knowledge occurred up to the beginning of 1986 when college operations were scheduled to commence. To this time there had been no effort by either educational authorities or the unions concerned to negotiate a separate industrial award for Hervey Bay staff - a stark contrast to the industrial conflict that seemed to arise from this source in relation to the Community College experience in Tasmania in the late 70's to early 80's. Our commentary on the Hervey Bay College and the Community Colleges initiative in Tasmania present a detailed account of the comparative industrial circumstances in the two locations.

Our comments so far in this section have focussed on the issues surrounding TAFE-oriented delivery of supplementary type cooperative programs, and on cross-sectoral delivery possibilities which emerge from our observations of a number of other programs. Perhaps the most dominating single strategy for cooperative program delivery, of either the supplementary or alternative type, that we have noted, however, is that of schools 'clustering'. In Chapter 3 we reported that 82% of programs identified adopted an approach which involved one TAFE college serving a cluster of geographically close schools. Such clusters have been identified, based on either formal 'regional' or 'area' lines determined by the educational authorities in the State/Territory, or on informally negotiated cooperative arrangements between schools in the same geographic location and/or with similar difficulties in providing adequate post-Year 10 curriculum choice.

Table 3.12 in Chapter 3 shows that most school cluster sizes were between two and ten schools. Effective operation of school clusters required specific administrative arrangements (such as synchronised student travel). These arrangements are described where appropriate in the case studies of programs in Volume II of this report. As well, our commentaries on the Port Kembla, CAVR, and Gold Coast case studies detail the different cluster approaches used in NSW, SA, and Queensland respectively. Despite some organisational difficulties of school clusters, evidence from these and other case studies show they have a number of educational and administrative advantages. The most significant of these, for us, is the provision of a focus for the administration of the schools involved in the cluster, at a single 'managing' school. Such a structure is able to facilitate the necessary organisational aspects of the program, and
importantly to provide a single point of contact and negotiation between the schools and the servicing TAFE college.

In addition to the administrative efficiencies that seem to be achievable via the cluster arrangement, it has provided educational gains due to the advantage of 'scale'. The curriculum choice available to individual schools in the cluster is widened because of the participation of other schools in the cluster. And the wider choice is over and above that derived from cooperation with the TAFE college. That is to say, the clustering of schools provides a larger pool of students to draw from in order to meet the TAFE college requirements for minimum class sizes. Hence the range of TAFE subject options available to the cluster as a whole is wider than could be achieved by any one school on its own - this feature is most noticeable in the case of the Port Kembla program.

The particular type of cluster arrangement adopted in the Elizabeth/Salisbury area in SA affords, in our view, additional advantages. The notion of a 'hub school' at the centre of the schools cluster is taken up in our commentary on the CAVE program. For CAVE, two schools are identified as hubs to the remaining seven schools in the cluster. This arrangement affords the advantages of organisational efficiency and scale of the conventional type of cluster, but also affords the participating schools the opportunity to concentrate specific curriculum offerings at the one or two hub schools. In this way, students may attend for part of their studies at their own school, at the hub school and at the TAFE college, depending on their selection of subjects. The kind of cooperative programming involved here, between TAFE and Schools, and between Schools and Schools, for the purposes of enhancing post-Year 10 educational options, would seem to be a strategy which takes optimum advantage of our preferred concept of alternative Schools/TAFE cooperative programming.

6.5.4 Program Monitoring and Student Support

Section 6.5.2 makes reference to a number of the management structures that were established to design and maintain Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in the States/Territories. Two important functions in the maintenance of the programs were monitoring and student counselling. Monitoring of the curriculum, of students' progress, and of implementation difficulties that arose, were achieved to some effect in a number of cases, through the management structure so established.

In NSW, for example, in relation to the Port Kembla program, the communication/management network that was established is depicted below:
With this framework, evaluative feedback was able to flow from the centre to the delivery points, and from the delivery points to the centre, and each level in the structure was involved along the way. An evaluation committee at the delivery point (in this case at Port Kembla High School) had been established early in the program's development cycle as a means of facilitating the program's effective implementation. We consider this network, especially as it promoted evaluative feedback, to have been exemplary. It is also notable by comparison with the very little evidence we were able to find elsewhere in our study of evaluative effort designed to focus on individual cooperative programs, either at the local or central level. The Vocational HSC, the CAVE, ISP and Gold Coast programs appeared to be exceptions to this.

Our commentaries on these programs describe the evaluative efforts for each. These show that in each case, one officer at the local level, played a major part in the evaluation effort. They also show that this officer was an instrumental part of a student counselling strategy which, especially in the case of the ISP, was built into the design of the program, and was designed as an ongoing student support system. Other features of these student support mechanisms were pre-program counselling, provision of in-service to Schools staff about TAFE, and organisation of regular student tutorial times, for both pastoral care and study purposes. These support services are considered exemplary, and would appear to be especially appropriate to students participating in alternative cooperative programs.

6.5.5 Provision in Isolated Regions

We became very aware of the specific difficulties in Schools/TAFE cooperation experienced by schools in isolated regions in the States/Territories during our study. The "tyranny of distance" was identified as prohibitive to an educational endeavour which relied upon cooperation between the school and the TAFE college, where the nearest college was several hundred kilometres away from the school.

Two of the case studied cooperative programs offered in isolated areas adopted different strategies to overcome these difficulties. The Equine Management program (a supplementary program), was offered at a school some 280 kilometres from Perth, which delivered the program (an accredited TAFE course of some 1200 hours duration) by means of its expertise in the area of equine studies, in which it had an established history. The specialist teaching undertaken by school teachers was complemented by casually employed locally based specialists (such as in farriery and veterinary science). As well, the inadequate program delivery resources of the school (such as curriculum materials) were supplemented by a TAFE college which had curriculum expertise in the field of study. Whilst it was not formally acknowledged as such, this kind of delivery arrangement had a number of the elements that would in our view constitute 'institutional accreditation' of the school. Further details of the program design and delivery strategies are provided in our commentary on this program in Chapter 4.

A quite different set of delivery arrangements was designed for the Vocational HSC program (an alternative program) situated at Walgett some 700 kilometres north-west of Sydney. The nearest major TAFE college was at Dubbo some 300 kilometres from the school. Delivery of the TAFE components of the program was effectively achieved using a variety of means. For some units, TAFE teachers travelled to the school to teach, using either a 'block' or weekly attendance
mode; for others, students travelled to the TAFE college to attend using a 'block' mode. (The size of the two different 'blocks' used was two and three days.) Further, in this case TAFE teachers from two different colleges were involved in delivery of the program at the one school - a converse delivery approach to the noted 'schools cluster' approach frequently used in very many other programs.

The diversity and flexibility of delivery strategies (and student attendance patterns) used for this program could serve as a model, we feel, for other educators in similarly isolated areas. The particular reliance on a close examination of existing resource constraints and practicalities of effective delivery in order to determine possible delivery strategies that will overcome isolation difficulties, is considered exemplary.

One other case studied program which adopted delivery strategies that we consider are adaptable to schools in isolated areas is the Farm Management program in suburban Perth. Here delivery relied on cooperation with a TAFE external studies provider - we were surprised not to find schools making greater use of existing TAFE external study provision in our study. It would seem to be a relatively low cost means of providing access for school students to TAFE courses, i.e. supplementary cooperative programming, especially in isolated regions, although we understand the practice of individual school students enrolling in TAFE externally is not uncommon. In any case the program delivery system operating, by external study, for Farm Management does appear to have potential for cooperative programming of the supplementary type.

Our commentary on Farm Management does, however, express caution regarding the widespread adoption of the TAFE external studies approach as a preferred form of delivery for Schools/TAFE cooperation. This is due to the particular requirements of students learning by external mode - these being for a mature, independent and highly motivated approach to learning. As well, there are obvious difficulties in effecting student learning by external study in the practical components of many TAFE courses.

6.6 Sharing Resources

We have referred to one of the perceived rationales for Schools/TAFE cooperation in Chapter 1 and at the beginning of this chapter in Section 6.2 - viz. the potential for sharing scarce educational resources. In Chapter 1 we noted the observation from the 1982 discussion paper on Schools and TAFE, of the Schools Commission and Tertiary Education Commission, that there was "little evidence that Schools and TAFE have made sufficient attempts either to minimise unnecessary overlap, or to work in collaboration to ensure that all potential students can be catered for in the most appropriate way...". Further, we noted the OECD's reference to the 'compartmentalisation' of educational provision in Australian systems, based on established demarcations (Review of Youth Policies, 1984).

Our study has pointed to substantial evidence of collaborative educational initiatives mounted jointly by Schools and TAFE under the banner of cooperative programming. We have not identified 'resource sharing' as being the primary objective of these initiatives, so far as the initiators have been concerned - nor would we suggest it should be so. It has, however, been viewed by some as a significant secondary objective to be attained. We support this view.

Whilst we have already made mention of economies it has been suggested can be achieved through Schools/TAFE cooperation, in our discussion in earlier sections
of this Chapter, we will review a number of the more substantial ones here. In terms of potential economic advantages, the most striking cooperative initiatives would seem to us to relate to the Hervey Bay Senior College in Queensland, and the schools clustering approaches employed most noticeably from our study in NSW and in SA.

The Hervey Bay concept, and to some extent the clustering notion, have the potential to overcome the 'compartmentalisation' of educational provision noted in the OECD Report. To do so would be an important conceptual breakthrough for Australian education systems - it would lead towards the concept of an alternative post-Year 10 educational option which is more than just an aggregation of existing Schools and TAFE provisions, an option for which we have expressed preference. In the case of the Hervey Bay endeavour, we consider the instrumental ingredient of a common resource base has been built into the implementation infrastructure for the college by the Queensland educational administration. The college is to operate from a college financial base, rather than be reliant on contributions from the TAFE and Schools sectors in that region. And whilst in either case the financial resources may stem from the same origins, the non-Schools and non-TAFE identity of the college, and of the educational programs that can be offered there, will we feel be enhanced by this autonomous common resource base.

The economic advantages of the clustering approach to program delivery, particularly of the more complex 'hub' cluster described in Section 6.5.5, would appear to stem from the rationalisation of administrative resources that is possible amongst the involved schools, and the wider curriculum options available from economies of scale arising from the creation of larger student pools amongst the schools.

A number of the inter-sectoral curriculum delivery strategies, also noted in Section 6.5.5, provide other means for overcoming resource duplications in Schools and TAFE, where there is common curriculum ground. In some cases too, these may be appropriate means for overcoming the current high levels of demand for TAFE courses, which are presently detracting from the capacity of educational systems to offer cooperative programs. The possibility of school teachers teaching TAFE accredited subjects in schools, particularly in isolated areas, has been demonstrated as feasible in the Equine Management program. Further, where strategies for the maintenance of TAFE standards have been developed, school teachers with expertise in the study area concerned are able to deliver TAFE accredited subjects, as has been demonstrated in the Business Studies program. Such examples raise the possibility of formally accrediting selected schools as TAFE course providers, in identified study areas where the school is able to demonstrate it has the teaching expertise and the curriculum materials.

Particular student learning advantages would also seem to accrue from the 'extension' studies notion illustrated in the South Brisbane and ISP programs. Here the Schools studies are enhanced or extended by selected relevant TAFE studies. These may lead to economic gains for the system as a whole, because of their potential to improve the amount of learning achieved by students whilst in school, and so cause savings if/when those students choose to pursue their studies further.

The Basic Electronics program provides perhaps the most clear-cut evidence of economic resource usage being considered a prime criterion for Schools/TAFE cooperation. The school concerned phased out its previously offered electronics subject in preference for a TAFE course which it considered would lead to
improved learning for the students. Here it was thought the improvements to learning would be attributable to the better curriculum resources and teaching expertise available at the TAFE college.

One final observation of cooperative initiatives relating to a consideration of resource sharing is of the Horticulture project in the ACT. This project involved the sharing of the valuable teacher resource between TAFE and Schools. The project's resource sharing manifestation was in the form of curriculum support and in-service provision to school teachers in Horticulture from TAFE teachers in the same study area. This was designed to lead to enhanced curriculum delivery in Schools, and may in time enable a greater number of students to pursue accredited TAFE studies in Horticulture.

6.7 ‘Models’ of Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programming

Early in the life of this project, the Project Steering Committee had expressed interest in identifying 'models' of Schools/TAFE cooperation. Part-way through the project, on the basis of data collected to that point, and without the advantage of a thoroughgoing analysis of all the data collected (especially the case study data), we had developed nine notional 'models' of Schools/TAFE cooperation. These are included as Appendix K in Volume IV of this report. They are, in large part, representations of particular styles of cooperation that we had observed in practice, or in the stages of development, during the data collection phase of our project. They are included in the Appendix to this report because a number of Schools/TAFE practitioners have since referred to them in their writings, or have adopted them (or modifications of them) in practice. As well, we consider they would be of interest to practitioners in certain circumstances.

We are not presenting and discussing these notional models in this main volume of the report because as we have indicated they have been superseded as a result of our analysis of the data in their entirety. Our major purpose in this section therefore is to suggest that models - all-embracing approaches to Schools/TAFE cooperation, complete with a conceptual framework, aims, curriculum and organisational strategies, resource requirements, and identified destinations - are not in our view an appropriate end point for our research. To present such all-embracing models would overlook another very important finding we have made. That is that the effective Schools/TAFE cooperative programs we have identified have been developed largely in the light of particularised local circumstances. We believe this feature is in itself commendable.

Successful cooperative endeavours should be conceptualised, designed, implemented and monitored in the light of local needs and circumstances. We are hopeful that our examination of the styles of cooperation evidenced in the States/Territories largely during 1985 will be useful to educators and administrators endeavouring to provide alternative educational pathways to post-Year 10 students.

As a result of our study, we are able to make conclusions concerning the rationale for Schools/TAFE cooperation, and resulting from this, conclusions concerning two conceptions of cooperative programming. In keeping with these conclusions, we are also able to conclude that particular curriculum and organisational strategies for the implementation of these conceptions of cooperation appear to be exemplary. The reader who is searching for a model as defined above will need to 'mix and match' from the discussion in this chapter and the conclusions that follow in Chapter 7. We would, however, suggest that
in doing so the reader should attempt to match the needs and circumstances of the location concerned with appropriate concepts, arrangements and strategies. And that if this matching is not possible on the basis of this report, then the reader should modify these or develop new concepts, arrangements and strategies, as was so often the case in programs we examined in this study.

Our conclusions and recommendations, derived from the discussion of findings presented in this chapter, are presented in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The Range and Nature of Cooperative Programs

7.1.1 There is considerable diversity in the nature of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in the Australian States/Territories. The cooperative programs reviewed in this study differ in terms of their conception, the supporting institutional arrangements, the curriculum design and delivery strategies used, and in terms of the type of credential earned from the program.

7.1.2 In 1985/6 there were in excess of 200 Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in Australia, as these have been defined for the purposes of this study. Over 5000 Year 11 or 12 students were participating in one of these years, representing approximately 2% of the national population of post-Year 10 school students. In excess of 70 TAFE Colleges and 300 secondary schools participated in such programs.

7.1.3 In 1985/6 the great majority of these programs (approximately 90%) were offered in NSW, Queensland and WA, where, compared to other States/Territories, there was more evidence of centrally organised and initiated cooperative programs.

7.1.4 The diverse nature of the programs identified in this study provides a wealth of information which enables observers to benefit from both the successes and failures that have been evidenced. The overwhelming picture formed of educators involved in Schools/TAFE cooperation is, however, one of professional and administrative initiative, commitment to the changing educational needs of the young, determination to overcome institutional barriers, and a commitment to enhance and broaden student's learning opportunities by implementing one of the identified forms of a Schools/TAFE cooperative program. These characteristics have been particularly noticeable amongst educators at the local level.

7.1.5 In 1985/6 the 'typical' Schools/TAFE cooperative program was a program which comprised an existing accredited TAFE course or subject of approximately 180 hours duration. It was delivered in a TAFE college, by TAFE teachers, partly in school time, and partly out of school hours. It was offered to Year 11/12 students who travelled to the college from a nearby geographical cluster of some four to six secondary schools. The participating schools were in a metropolitan or country area of above average youth unemployment, and below average Year 10 to 11 retention rates. The typical program was derived from an established TAFE study area, was funded largely from PEP sources, and was jointly administered by Schools and TAFE officers. It was jointly accredited by TAFE and secondary accreditation agencies, so that upon successful completion, a student gained full or partial credit or exemption in the TAFE course from which the program had been derived, and recognition on his/her senior school credential. This credential did not, however, count for the purposes of 'tertiary entrance' to institutions of Higher Education. The program was offered in government secondary
schools, was nominally open to all Year 11 and 12 students, and just over half of its students were female.

7.1.6 The 'typical' program described in 7.1.4 is but one form of Schools/TAFE cooperation. Its description results from a process of aggregating the main characteristics of the majority of cooperative programs identified in this study. In Section 7.3 below, a modified form of this typical program will be described – one which is preferred by the writers.

7.1.7 A national inventory of 234 Schools/TAFE cooperative programs has been compiled and is presented in Volume III to this report. Its compilation has relied upon data derived from incomplete sources that were available in 1985. Nevertheless it represents a first effort to bring together information about a group of educational initiatives that practitioners in this field should find useful. It has therefore been prepared as a 'first edition'.

7.1.8 The 'first edition' national inventory has been established as a data base on computer. Its continuing utility to practitioners depends on revised editions being prepared at regular intervals. The cost to maintain the inventory with annual editions would be of the order of $5000 per annum. Revised editions could be distributed to Schools and TAFE Authorities at low additional cost using microfiche.

7.1.9 Maintenance of such an inventory was felt to be worthwhile by practitioners interviewed in our study. It would help to inform practitioners, especially at the local level, and those in regions isolated from central offices, of the ways other Australian educators have sought to broaden educational options for young people.

Recommendation 1.

That Commonwealth educational authorities should provide joint funding for the maintenance of the 'first edition' national inventory of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, prepared as Volume III of this report, by the preparation of revised editions on an annual basis.

7.2 The Rationale for Schools/TAFE Cooperation

7.2.1 The primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation is considered to be the extension, through educational provision, of the current limited range of immediate post-Year 10 destinations of young people, particularly in relation to the undesirable unemployment destination. The current range of destinations is depicted thus:
CURRENT DESTINATIONS

Compulsory Education

Senior Secondary School | Full/part-time Work | TAFE | Industry Training | Unemployment

7.2.2 There are other appropriate means for attempting to extend this limited range of post-Year 10 destinations, such as through training support programs, PEP courses, and curriculum diversification in senior secondary schools. Schools/TAFE programs are the only means which rely on cooperation between these two educational sectors. Achievement of this primary purpose by Schools/TAFE cooperation would increase the range of potential post-Year 10 destinations to:

POTENTIAL DESTINATIONS

Compulsory Education

Senior Secondary School | Full/part-time Work | TAFE | Alternative Schools/TAFE | Industry Training | Unemployment

7.2.3 Secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation are considered to be

(a) provision of a means for curriculum diversification in senior secondary schools, particularly in view of the turbulent social, economic and technological environment, and

(b) achievement of economic advantages by cross-sectoral resource sharing, particularly in times of acknowledged resource constraints.

7.2.4 The stated primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation can be fostered by the adoption of a variety of approaches to cooperative programming. These
approaches share a common conception of cooperative programming — which is referred to as the preferred 'alternative' conception. Design, delivery and implementation of programs in accordance with this conception can be achieved using a variety of strategies. The preferred alternative conception will be described in Section 7.3. Appropriate strategies for design, delivery and implementation of alternative programs will be described in Section 7.5.

7.2.5 One of the stated secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation, that of curriculum diversification in the senior school, can be fostered by the adoption of what is referred to as the preferred 'supplementary' conception of cooperative programming, described in Section 7.3. Design, delivery and implementation of programs in accordance with this conception can be achieved using a variety of strategies that will be described in Section 7.5.

7.2.6 The other stated secondary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation, that of resource sharing, can be fostered through adoption of either the alternative conception or the supplementary conception of cooperative programming.

7.3 Conceptions of Schools/TAFE Cooperative Programming

7.3.1 This study identified two conceptions of cooperative programming that, during 1985/6, were evidenced in the States/Territories. These have been labelled the 'alternative' and the 'supplementary' conceptions of cooperative programming. These are current conceptions of cooperative programming. They have exhibited many exemplary features, both conceptually and in terms of the strategies employed to implement the conceptions, and these features will be noted in these conclusions. As means for achieving the primary and secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation, stated in 7.2.1 and 7.2.3, they also have conceptual and strategic drawbacks. Preferred 'alternative' and 'supplementary' conceptions will be proposed in later sections, as will strategies for their effective implementation.

7.3.2 The alternative conception of cooperative programming has emerged from a recognition of the unmet needs and interests of post-Year 10 young people for educational options which are different to those currently offered, either in senior secondary schooling or in TAFE. This conception is intended to provide potential pathways to work and/or TAFE for young people contemplating the decision between more schooling, TAFE, work or unemployment. The structure of programs within this conception is one that is integrated — the program of study is intended to have a cohesive purpose and as such is designed to draw from subject areas of Schools and TAFE to match the assessed needs and interests of students.

7.3.3 The supplementary conception of cooperative programming has emerged from a recognition of the need to diversify curriculum options already available in senior schooling. By making available studies from TAFE, it is intended to provide additional subject choice for Year 11 and 12 students of varying abilities and interests who may be considering the options of more schooling, further education in TAFE or Higher Education, work or unemployment. Students participating in programs structured according to this conception usually undertake the specified quota of tertiary entrance accredited school subjects, and in addition study one or two TAFE subjects/units.
7.3.4 By far the greatest number of cooperative programs identified in this study are of the supplementary conception. The 'typical' program described in 7.1.4 is based on this current supplementary conception of cooperative programming. Most States/Territories had during 1985/6 favoured supplementary programs, although in each case, a small number of alternative programs were also identified.

The Alternative Conception

7.3.5 As a means for achieving the primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation, stated in 7.2.1, the current alternative conception of cooperative programming has a number of drawbacks. These include

(a) the practice of 'targeting' students judged to be "at risk" (of leaving school without likelihood of securing one of the 'desirable' destinations depicted in 7.2.1), which has inequitable outcomes;

(b) the foregone opportunity to secure a senior school credential that is firstly regarded by most institutions of Higher Education as contributing towards a 'tertiary entrance score', and secondly is regarded by the community at large as a credential which signifies successful completion of senior schooling;

(c) the failure of these programs to shift the educational focus, and the responsibility for providing alternative post-Year 10 educational options, away from the Schools sector.

7.3.6 In relation to (a) in 7.3.5, a number of existing educational 'programs', sponsored by both State/Territory and Commonwealth Governments, are designed to overcome existing inequities in the educational provisions of educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE). Initiatives under the Participation and Equity Program (PEP) for example, employ the strategy of targeting identified student groups deemed to be at risk, in order to achieve their purpose. Schools/TAFE cooperation may be one of the means for achieving this purpose. The primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation is, however, fundamentally different to this. Indeed the concept of targeting, applied to the alternative cooperative programming concept, has effectively closed the option of an alternative to either more schooling or TAFE to those students who might wish to pursue such an option, whilst at the same time retaining their 'tertiary entrance' options.

7.3.7 In relation to (b) in 7.3.5, the concept of targeting in alternative cooperative programming has implicitly led to students participating in the program foregoing the award of an equitable senior secondary credential. The premise that the students targeted are not able to successfully undertake senior school studies at the 'tertiary entrance' level creates a self-perpetuating cycle which influences the design of the alternative program which then precludes students from undertaking the program because of the credential that would be foregone.

7.3.8 In relation to (c) in 7.3.5, current alternative programs have not evidenced any substantial conceptual shift away from a Schools focus. These programs are largely school-based, school-derived, and school-controlled. As such they appear as conceptual addenda to the existing schooling provisions. With a small number of notable exceptions,
the programs identified have shown little evidence of educators (in Schools and TAFE) joining forces on either a State-wide or localised basis to confront the problems of providing equitable educational alternatives to that are different to either Schools or TAFE.

7.3.9 The preferred conception of alternative Schools/TAFE cooperative programming is one that aims to meet the primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation as stated in 7.2.1. It overcomes the three major difficulties noted in 7.3.5. The preferred conception is therefore one of an alternative post-Year 10 educational option equally available to all students, regardless of whether those students may wish to seek tertiary entrance. It provides educational programs encompassing a range of study options, successful completion of any of which leads to the award of a common State-wide senior secondary credential. The credential so awarded does not preclude a student's option of pursuing tertiary studies in either TAFE or Higher Education. The programs of this conception can be offered in a school, in a TAFE college, or ideally in a post-Year 10 educational institution which is independent of both schools and TAFE colleges. If the programs are offered in a school, TAFE resources will be required; if they are offered in a TAFE college, Schools resources will be required.

Recommendation 2.

That State/Territory and Commonwealth educational authorities should recognise the importance of striving to achieve the primary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation stated in 7.2.1, and accordingly seek ways and means to encourage and promote the adoption of the preferred conception of alternative cooperative programming as stated in 7.3.9. In doing so they should take account of the conclusions and recommendations on senior secondary accreditation in Section 7.4 and of the exemplary design, delivery, implementation and program management strategies described in Section 7.5 of this chapter.

The Supplementary Conception

7.3.10 As a means for achieving the secondary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation, stated in 7.2.3 (a), viz. curriculum diversification, the current supplementary conception of cooperative programming has a number of conceptual and strategic drawbacks resulting from the practices that have been associated with this type of cooperation. These include

(a) the inequity of the joint Schools/TAFE credential that is earned as a result of successful completion of the program,

(b) the general failure of these programs to take full advantage of the opportunity to enhance the quality of a student's learning, or to extend the depth of learning, attained in school subjects.

7.3.11 In relation to (a) in 7.3.10, supplementary cooperative programs are almost universally accredited by both TAFE and Schools accreditation agencies. The TAFE accreditation generally ensures the successful secondary student earns credit for part or all of an existing TAFE course, which provides value for a student who later seeks to pursue studies in the TAFE area concerned. The Schools accreditation secures the student a 'Level 2' secondary credential - which in most States/Territories does not contribute towards the determination of a
'tertiary entrance score' for the student. In the case of many study areas (such as those common to Schools and TAFE), a 'Level 1' secondary credential may be an appropriate award. Inflexibilities in the secondary accreditation systems in the States/Territories present barriers to the accreditation of cooperative programs at Level 1. These barriers (which result in the prescription of a quota of tertiary entrance subjects or units to be studied) preclude students from gaining the full benefits of greater curriculum diversification potentially available in cooperation with TAFE.

7.3.12 In relation to (b) in 7.3.10, and in part arising from the barriers described in 7.3.11, the benefits of curriculum extension are not being fully realised by supplementary programming practices. Especially in curriculum areas common to Schools and TAFE, there are opportunities to offer relevant TAFE studies which would enhance student learning in Schools subjects. In determining selections from available TAFE subjects/units greater weight needs to be given to this criterion. Less weight needs to be given to the criterion of 'spare capacity' in TAFE colleges in determining subject availabilities.

7.3.13 The preferred conception of supplementary Schools/TAFE cooperative programming is one that aims to meet the secondary purpose of Schools/TAFE cooperation as stated in 7.2.3 (a). It overcomes the two major difficulties noted in 7.3.10. The preferred conception is therefore one which offers to students in Years 11 and 12 cooperative programs which are jointly accredited (by Schools and TAFE) leading to students earning a Level 1 secondary credential. The TAFE subjects/units which constitute the program are selected according to the criteria of student interests and needs, their capacity to enhance the student's school studies, and availability at the TAFE college.

Recommendation 3.

That State/Territory and Commonwealth educational authorities should continue to recognise the importance of striving to achieve the secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation stated in 7.2.3 (a), and accordingly seek ways and means to encourage and promote the adoption of the preferred conception of supplementary cooperative programming as stated in 7.3.13. In doing so they should take account of the conclusions and recommendations on senior secondary accreditation in Section 7.4 and of the exemplary design, delivery, implementation and program management strategies described in Section 7.5 of this chapter.

7.3.14 As a means for achieving the secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation stated in 7.2.3 (b), viz. cross-sectoral resource sharing, both the preferred conceptions of cooperative programming (alternative and supplementary) afford opportunities. These are most evident in terms of cross-sectoral delivery arrangements in study areas where Schools and TAFE have common or related curriculum offerings. These arrangements will be noted in Section 7.5.
Recommendation 4.

That State/Territory and Commonwealth educational authorities should continue to recognise the importance of striving to achieve the secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation stated in 7.2.3 (b), and to this end, seek ways and means to encourage and promote the adoption of both the preferred conceptions of alternative and supplementary cooperative programming. In doing so they should take account of the conclusions and recommendations on senior secondary accreditation in Section 7.4 and of the exemplary design, delivery, implementation and program management strategies described in Section 7.5 of this chapter.

7.3.15 Evidence from this study has shown the preferred conceptions of alternative and supplementary cooperative programming will not always be feasible. Different student needs and interests, and different circumstances in the local community where the cooperation is being planned, should continue to play a significant role in determining the nature of the cooperative relationship between Schools and TAFE. Where the preferred conceptions are not feasible, educational practitioners should strive to observe the principles embodied in the preferred conceptions.

7.4 Accreditation Practices Relating to Schools/TAFE Cooperation

7.4.1 The great majority (88%) of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs identified in this study are jointly accredited by Schools and TAFE. In the main the secondary accreditation occurs at Level 2 - accorded by the senior secondary accreditation agencies in the responsible States/Territories. A small number of cooperative programs are accredited at Level 3. A very small number are accredited at Level 1.

7.4.2 The existence of this hierarchy of secondary credentialling levels, and its application to Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, is creating barriers (noted in Section 7.3) to the effective achievement of both the primary and secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation through the two preferred conceptions of cooperation. In practice these barriers arise, in large part, from the disinclination of the secondary accreditation 'systems' to grant Level 1 status to cooperative programs of either the alternative or supplementary kind.

Recommendation 5.

That if the socially, economically and educationally important primary and secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation are to be achieved through the implementation of the preferred conceptions of cooperative programming, then the current hierarchy of secondary credentialling levels used in the States/Territories needs to be reviewed by educational authorities and accreditation agencies. Such a review should examine the appropriateness of the hierarchy to cooperative programs - and in particular reconsider the criteria used for the classification of educational programs or subjects in terms of the hierarchy.

7.4.3 In addition to the barriers to cooperative programming presented by the hierarchy of secondary credentials noted in 7.4.2, there are inflexibilities in the means used for the determination of eligibility for 'tertiary entrance'. The practice of prescribing a specified quota of
'tertiary entrance' subjects in a student's course of senior school study is limiting the achievement of the purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation across educational systems in Australia. In Tasmania and W.A., the means for determining tertiary entrance scores have much greater flexibility - the quota of 'tertiary entrance' subjects has been reduced, and marks earned in other subjects contribute towards a student's tertiary entrance score. This greater flexibility would permit cooperative programs to contribute towards 'tertiary entrance'.

Recommendation 6.

That State/Territory educational authorities, secondary accreditation agencies and Institutions of Higher Education should recognise the barriers to achieving the primary and secondary purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation that are presented by the inflexibilities in the existing means for determining 'tertiary entrance', and cooperate in a review of these means.

7.4.4 The singular purpose of senior secondary schooling is not, and should not be perceived as the provision of an immediate route to tertiary education (either in TAFE or in Higher Education). That it is not is evidenced by the statistics on ultimate post-school destinations of young people noted and discussed in Chapters 1 and 4 of this report. That it should not be perceived as such is based on the recognition that school leavers have the right to pursue studies, work or other productive activities to meet their own interests and needs, in a way which will enable them to fulfill their role in society as an individual, and as a contributor to the benefit of that society at large. And if they choose, young people, or older people, may pursue further studies later in life as it suits their needs and circumstances.

7.4.5 Notwithstanding 7.4.4, educators in all sectors in the community have the responsibility to encourage young people to pursue their education, whilst at school, to the fullest advantage. Achievement of this purpose would be facilitated, in part, by the introduction of more flexible means for determining tertiary entrance eligibility.

7.4.6 This study has demonstrated the important relationship that exists between the practices and determinations of senior secondary accreditation agencies and the type of approaches that may be adopted to effectively achieve the purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation. It has also noted the particular balance of representation on these accreditation agencies in the States/Territories. In the case of most States/Territories, this balance is markedly directed towards the educational stakeholders in senior secondary schooling - particularly those in the Secondary and Higher Education sectors. In most States/Territories the representation on senior secondary accreditation agencies from other community groups which have a stake in senior schooling, is marginal. In the light of 7.4.4 and 7.4.5, it is considered that TAFE, industry and commerce (both employer and employee representation), parents, and students are under-represented on these agencies.
Recommendation 7.

That in the light of 7.4.4 and 7.4.5, States/Territories should review the composition of senior secondary accreditation agencies. In so doing, they should strive to achieve a more balanced representation of the range of community groups which have a stake in senior secondary schooling.

Recommendation 8.

That in keeping with 7.3.9 (which describes the preferred conception of alternative cooperation), and 7.4.3, 7.4.4, and 7.4.5 above, the reviews recommended in Recommendations 5 and 6 should also examine senior school certification arrangements with the objective of determining a single State-wide post-compulsory education certificate. This certificate would be the common award for students successfully completing either senior schooling as it currently exists, or an alternative Schools/TAFE cooperative program (of the preferred type).

Recommendation 9.

That in keeping with 7.3.13 (which describes the preferred conception of supplementary cooperation), and notwithstanding the review recommended in Recommendation 5, cooperative program initiators should, through their educational authority's appropriate channels, actively submit their proposals for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs to the secondary accreditation agencies for consideration as Level 1 accredited studies.

7.5 Strategies for Design, Delivery and Implementation.

7.5.1 This study has shown that Australian educators at both the local and central levels have developed a diverse range of design, delivery and implementation strategies for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs. Very many of these are considered to be exemplary in that they facilitate the achievement of the primary and secondary purposes of cooperation.

7.5.2 A number of the strategies that have been identified are more applicable and appropriate to the effective implementation of the preferred alternative conception of cooperation; others are more applicable and appropriate to the preferred supplementary conception of cooperation.

Design Strategies

7.5.3 Two principles of curriculum design have prevailed in the States/Territories. The first is the principle of heavy reliance on existing TAFE curricula for the TAFE component of the cooperative program. Indeed in the case of most supplementary programs, the TAFE component is the program. The second principle has been that of pursuing an 'integrated' curriculum design - where the Schools and TAFE components are intended to comprise a cohesive course of studies. This principle has been more evident in the case of alternative programs. These two principles are not, however, exclusive of one another. Both these principles are considered exemplary.

7.5.4 The first principle is exemplary because it facilitates the student securing a joint (Schools and TAFE) credential, in the terms in which this is defined. The reliance on existing (accredited) TAFE courses draws on TAFE's established expertise in vocational educational provision. It
further helps to provide possible study pathways in TAFE, and enhances the student's potential in the employment market place because of the community acceptance of TAFE accredited courses. Moreover, as it relates to supplementary cooperation, it has the capacity to enhance (or extend) the depth and breadth of a student's learning at school.

**Recommendation 10.**

That because of 7.5.4, and in endeavouring to achieve the purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation, the curriculum design principle of drawing on TAFE expertise and TAFE accredited courses should be continued by State/Territory educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE).

7.5.5 In Chapter 6 two difficulties associated with the first principle noted in 7.5.3 were examined. These difficulties concerned the influence of 'spare capacity' in TAFE colleges on the selection of availability of TAFE study areas for cooperative programming, and the perpetuation of existing barriers to access in TAFE courses in cooperative programming.

**Recommendation 11.**

That in implementing Recommendation 10, educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) should strive to overcome the difficulties noted in 7.5.5. In doing so, the alternative curriculum design and delivery strategies noted in Section 7.5 should be examined.

7.5.6 The second principle noted in 7.5.3 is considered more applicable and appropriate to the alternative conception of cooperation. This principle is exemplary because it provides the guiding strategy for ensuring an effective implementation of the alternative concept of Schools/TAFE cooperation - provision of an alternative and relevant total study option which is different to either TAFE or Schools. This design principle requires the undertaking of an assessment of student needs and interests as a premise to designing the integrated program.

**Recommendation 12.**

That because of 7.5.6, and in endeavouring to implement the purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation, the curriculum design principle of 'integration', should be pursued more actively by State/Territory educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE).

7.5.7 The conclusions and recommendations in Sections 7.3 and 7.4 have noted the existence of accreditation barriers to the achievement of the purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation. These barriers are particularly evident in the case of alternative programs. They do not, however, arise from flaws in the curriculum design principle of integration. The recommended reviews of existing secondary accreditation practices (Recommendations 5, 6, 7, and 8) may lead to the overcoming of these barriers.

**Recommendation 13.**

That in implementing Recommendation 12, educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) should strive to overcome the barriers noted in 7.5.7. In doing so the alternative curriculum design and delivery strategies noted in Section 7.5 should be examined.
Program Management Strategies

7.5.8 In the States/Territories Schools/TAFE cooperative programs, of either the supplementary or alternative kind, were most often jointly administered and managed. This is considered exemplary. Moreover, the particular management and monitoring mechanisms that had been established at a central level in NSW, and at a regional level in the Elizabeth/Salisbury area of SA are considered exemplary.

7.5.9 The networked mechanism in NSW helped to promote the necessary consultation of, and participation between, parties involved in the design, delivery and implementation (including evaluation) of cooperative programs on a State-wide basis.

7.5.10 The ESTEP management process in the Elizabeth/Salisbury area of SA is considered a quite remarkable feature of the cooperative efforts that were undertaken there in 1985. The ESTEP management group involved a wide range of stakeholders (including community representatives) in the management process. The greatest strength of this particular management model, however, is considered to be its involvement of both Schools and TAFE Authority personnel, more or less equally, in the design and management of cooperative programs in its area. It is considered this involvement was both premised on, and promoted, a sense of responsibility for the Schools/TAFE cooperative initiatives in the area. It was evident there was a local community focus to the programs. In this way the programs were not viewed from the 'sectoral' perspectives (of Schools and TAFE) - the problems being addressed were not considered as problems of the Schools alone - rather they were seen as problems for the educational community.

7.5.11 This study also identified what was referred to as a "contract approach" to the design and management of cooperative programs. This approach was observed in relation to the Business Studies supplementary cooperative program offered in SA. The approach is examined in the relevant case study commentary and in Chapter 6. It has three stages - agreement in principle; developmental; and monitoring. It is a commendable approach to cooperation because it promotes the involvement of both Schools and TAFE, and importantly the accreditation agencies concerned. It also provides the capacity to overcome barriers to cooperation stemming from the concern of TAFE for the maintenance of its course standards where TAFE accredited courses are delivered in Schools by School teachers (and vice versa).

Recommendation 14.

That where appropriate, State/Territory educational authorities (both Schools and TAFE) encourage and promote the cooperative program management models and processes exemplified in 7.5.9, 7.5.10, and 7.5.11.

Recommendation 15.

That as appropriate, the Commonwealth Educational Authorities should seek to encourage and promote the adoption of Schools/TAFE cooperative program management models and processes exemplified in 7.5.9, 7.5.10, and 7.5.11 in the States/Territories.
Program Delivery Strategies

7.5.12 The very great majority of supplementary cooperative programs identified in this study were delivered by TAFE teachers in TAFE colleges. This practice is in keeping with the conclusions noted in 7.5.3, 7.5.4, and 7.5.5. The practice is clearly optimum because it relies on those with the greatest expertise and specific resources to deliver vocational education at its highest quality. It also provides school students with an opportunity to experience the different TAFE learning environment and explore other possible TAFE options.

Recommendation 16.

That State/Territory educational authorities should continue to employ the optimum practice of expert TAFE teachers delivering the vocational components of Schools/TAFE cooperative programs in TAFE colleges.

7.5.13 This study has also identified instances of other cooperative program delivery strategies which were employed, in large part, where TAFE teacher delivery in a TAFE college was not feasible. Two of these in particular are considered to be exemplary. These are cross-sectoral delivery, and schools clustering. These and other delivery strategies are examined in detail in Chapter 6. That these alternative delivery strategies were initiated is a credit to the creativity and commitment to cooperation of those responsible.

7.5.14 The circumstances in which cross-sectoral alternatives were generally employed were:

(a) where the schools requiring supplementation were in isolated regions, at some distance from the nearest TAFE college,

(b) where the local TAFE college was unable to meet the demand in its local community for vocational courses which had a higher enrolment priority than the Schools/TAFE program,

(c) where the schools concerned had the requisite level of teaching expertise and curriculum resources to offer the program to the standards required for TAFE accreditation.

7.5.15 TAFE delivery of the vocational component of cooperative programs is not considered a necessary condition to the introduction of such programs. In some circumstances, cross-sectoral delivery strategies (including the notion of 'institutional accreditation' described in Chapter 6 - where individual schools are endorsed as providers of specific TAFE subjects or units) are useful and appropriate. In considering alternatives to TAFE delivery, however, appropriate means for securing the maintenance of curriculum standards need also to be used. Under these circumstances, moreover, cross-sectoral delivery of cooperative programs is a possible means for overcoming the current high levels of demand for TAFE courses in specific study areas.
Recommendation 17.

That notwithstanding Recommendation 16, and under the circumstances noted in 7.5.15, State/Territory educational authorities should consider the alternative cross-sectoral delivery practices described in Chapter 6 as delivery strategies for Schools/TAFE cooperative programs.

7.5.16 The practice of 'schools clustering', where two or more geographically close schools collaborate to be serviced by a TAFE college for the TAFE component of the Schools/TAFE cooperative program, is widespread in the States/Territories. Both 'formal' and 'informal' cluster arrangements have been identified. A 'hub cluster' structure, identified in SA, has also been identified. These delivery arrangements afford the opportunity for administrative efficiencies, and for educational gains due to economies of scale. They are considered to be exemplary.

Recommendation 18.

That States/Territories should continue to employ and further develop the various clustering strategies noted in 7.5.16, and described in Chapter 6, as means for facilitating the economic achievement of the purposes of Schools/TAFE cooperation.