

May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2005

Mr Ian Dundas  
Federal Inquiry Education, Training and Extension in Agriculture  
Parliament House  
Canberra

Dear Ian

Please find attached by submission to the Federal Inquiry.

This submission is made with my extensive background in program development, budgeting and Industrial Relations in TAFE in Victoria. I have worked in rural Victoria for over 25 years and I am passionately interested in education and supporting rural communities.

I was Assistant Director of Wimmera Institute of TAFE at Horsham for eight years and in that time was responsible for the introduction for a number of innovative programs, especially for agriculture and for developing new modes of delivery.

After the merger of Ballarat University with the Wimmera Institute of TAFE I continued as Manager TAFE programs for four years.

I have taught in secondary and technical schools and I have always had an interested in developing programs that met the needs of the students.

In the last two years I have undertaken two consultancies which I believe are very relevant to this inquiry. It is with my interest in education and rural communities and wealth of experience that I make this submission.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future and I would be willing to enlarge on my submission if required.

Yours sincerely

**Peter Berrisford**  
**Consultant**

# **Submission to DAFF May 2005**

**Prepared By Peter Berrisford**

## **Some Thoughts on the State of Agricultural Training in Victoria.**

### **1. A Brief Description of the Agricultural Workforce**

There are approximately 65,200 people (2001 ABS figures) employed in Victoria in the agriculture and horticulture sectors of primary industry. Of these 15,600 are employed in horticulture. The representation of young people in employment in agriculture is well below the state average. Some 8.4% of people employed are under 24 compared with the state average of 16.4%. Older people in the agricultural workforce are significantly over represented, with some 33% of the workforce being over 55 years compared to the state average of 11.4%. Thirteen percent of farmers and farm workers are over 65 compared to two percent for Victoria as a whole.

The primary industry as a whole has a significantly lower proportion of persons with qualifications above AQF level 5 (i.e. with diplomas, advanced diplomas and degrees), some 8% compared with 22% for the Victorian workforce as a whole. In the agriculture and horticulture workforce there are some 57% of workers who have less than year 12 standard of education compared with the state average of 31%.

### **1.1 Summary of Some of the General Issues**

As a result of being involved in Rural TAFE provision since 1984 and what I have gleaned from two research projects in the past 18 months I make the following comments.

- i. The agricultural sector consists of farmers (owner/managers), the DPI, service providers (such as harvesting contractors, spraying contractors, fencing contractors etc), agronomists, private consultants, agri-businesses eg AWB, etc.
- ii. Agricultural education and training in Victoria is experiencing significant challenges. It is struggling from one review to the next with little adoption of recommendations and nothing really being done by Government to tackle the underlying issues.
- iii. The agricultural sector only receives the Australian industry average in assistance from government and therefore the resources must be used efficiently. Sectors such as dairy and cane farming are receiving large subsidies but the others do not. This statement can be supported by OECD figures.
- iv. There is a real issue with the image of and career paths in agriculture. Young people therefore are choosing careers other than agriculture.

- v. The non accredited segment of training in Agriculture accounts for at least 30% of the training that occurs. For further analysis see later sections of this submission.
- vi. The agricultural training market is changing rapidly. This reflects the rate of change in the sector. The training providers are struggling to keep up.
- vii. Delivery of programs must involve the use of modern machinery and methods.
- viii. The industry needs/wants short, sharp, relevant courses.
- ix. Relevance is a critical issue to farmers when it comes to their training and the training of young people.
- x. TAFE delivery in agriculture in Victoria has dropped by 166,000 Student Contact Hours (SCHs) between 2000 and 2003. There has been a drop in the delivery at the Cert I-IV level between 2000 and 2003 of 42%. There has been a shift to the Diploma and Advanced Diploma levels. The question needs to be asked if real training is occurring or is it just Recognition of Prior Learning/Recognition of Current Competencies at the Diploma and Advanced Diploma level. Training in Production Horticulture has increased by 147000 SCHs between 2000 and 2003.
- xi. The VET market for TAFE Agricultural delivery is too thin to achieve efficient delivery. Hence training is often not undertaken or it is poorly delivered because of the lack of resources.
- xii. The National Competition Policy as applied to VET causes significant problems for delivery in rural areas. Cooperation between providers is needed to achieve quality delivery in a thin market.
- xiii. TAFE Institutes as a general rule do not have the size of delivery in agriculture to give them the infrastructure and expertise that would enable them to be responsive to industry needs.
- xiv. Workplace training in VET (apprenticeships and traineeships) is used as a cost saver and its quality is very problematic, especially in agriculture.
- xv. At the TAFE level most providers don't deliver industry specific units only the generic ones. They leave the industry specific ones to be completed in the workplace. You can imagine the range of abilities of the so called workplace trainers i.e. the farmers? The farmers and the students of course feel in many cases they are being short changed. (This is true for many industries of course.)
- xvi. The delivery of services to the agricultural sector is very fragmented today with a large number of providers being below critical mass.
- xvii. In training, the key drivers are class size and teaching hours (delivered annually) per teacher.

- xviii. Department of Primary Industries (DPI) devotes many millions of dollars to the provision of training services through extension to the agricultural industry. Their level of connection with industry varies greatly; from being excellent, to being virtually non-existent. The way the money is spent is not transparent and it is difficult to identify what is delivered.
- xix. The Research arm of DPI has many millions of dollars devoted to research (between 500 and 700 scientists) and the way research projects are selected needs close scrutiny. There needs to be more direct and transparent industry involvement.
- xx. Melbourne University's delivery both in TAFE and Higher Education is **supply** driven. They are not listening to the industry needs. There is a shortage of trained people for the agricultural industry but University of Melbourne and other providers cannot meet that need. Why not? There is a shortage of skilled trade level workers and a shortage of agronomists, to name two areas.
- xxi. Agri-business does not seem to be accessing TAFE training or using the National VET system.
- xxii. The apprenticeship era for grain farmers, and probably other sectors as well, is coming to an end.
- xxiii. The agricultural training market is very thin.
- xxiv. The argument used by many providers '*that is does not matter what we teach because we are teaching students to think*' does not wash. The students know what is happening in the real world and need to be excited by learning more about it. Otherwise you might as well teach agricultural students history to develop their thinking.
- xxv. Agricultural education and training (and to a lesser extent research) is disconnected from the industry.
- xxvi. When an industry is changing rapidly research needs to be very closely linked to education, training and extension. This is so delivery staff can keep up with the changes and deliver relevant programs.
- xxvii. In Victoria Agricultural Education and Training would appear to be reaching quite a dysfunctional position, both in TAFE (VET) and Higher ED sectors. Let alone in what DPI is doing.

## **2 Analysis of Agricultural Training In Victoria**

### **2.1 VET Accredited Training**

VET accredited training is training that is provided by a Registered Training Organisation (RTO) following the structure and guidelines of an accredited training package. VET qualifications form part of the AQF and the RTOs are audited on regular basis to ensure the quality of the system is maintained.

Nearly all the VET accredited training delivered in Victoria is purchased by the Office of Training and Tertiary Education (OTTE). The OTTE sits within the Victorian Department of Education and Training. It has responsibility for planning, purchasing and monitoring the services offered by TAFE Institutes, Universities with TAFE Divisions, other RTOs and Adult and Community Education Providers.

OTTE manages the allocation of funds for the state wide provision of its VET programs. It provides approximately 1,400,000 student contact hours (SCH's) of agricultural training per year for the delivery of competencies from the Rural Production Training Package (RPTP). The vast majority of accredited training is delivered through eight TAFE Institutes, three Universities with TAFE Divisions and three small but significant Private RTO's. A break down by qualification level and broad field of the hours purchased by OTTE can be viewed in a later section.

DPI delivers a small number of accredited hours and approximately 4% of FarmBis participants take part in accredited courses.

There is one small but significant registered private provider of VET accredited training that supplies its training on a fee for service basis. This is Marcus Oldham College located near Geelong. It delivers at least two courses at the Diploma level on a full time basis. Marcus Oldham conducts a range of other rural programs. It does not conduct any relevant short course programs.

Some of the purchased OTTE hours are delivered via cooperative arrangements between DPI and others. Some examples are given below.

#### **i. Edge Network**

This is the overarching badge for the extension work DPI does for the livestock industry. Rural Industries Skills Training (RIST) is an RTO and has the licence from Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA) to deliver the training associated with this program. Examples of the programs that come under this broad badge are Prograze and Beef Cheque. The accredited training provided from the RPTP is usually funded by OTTE.

#### **ii. Target 10**

This program has been running for about 10 years and is a partnership between the University of Melbourne, Dairy Australia and the DPI. The University of Melbourne provides the coordination and the short course training (mapped against competencies from the RPTP) so that OTTE funding can be used for the training. DPI provides the extension service. Approximately 36,000 SCHs on average are delivered annually.

### **iii Secondary School Delivery**

Young people at secondary school are involved in accredited training. There are approximately 1080 students involved in VETiS and 170 in School Based New Apprenticeships (SBNA) in 2003. This probably represents approximately 180,000 SCH at the Certificate II level. The delivery of agricultural education at the secondary level requires a serious review. There are too many options that have grown up in a fragmented way.

## **2.2 Structured Un-accredited Training**

There is a large amount of training activity in the structured unaccredited segment of Agricultural Training market. It has grown significantly in the past several years.

The main features of this segment are that the courses are nearly always based on elements of competencies taken from the Rural Production Training Package (RPTP) and Trainers usually possess the Certificate IV in Workplace Assessment and Training. The courses have identified learning outcomes. They are usually funded by Farmbis.

The general purpose of the courses is to enhance the ability of eligible participants to identify, acquire and apply the management skills and practices that are needed to take advantage of opportunities that arise in the environment in which they now operate. The courses concentrate on providing the broad spectrum of skills and knowledge to understand and manage their business and natural resources to remain competitive, profitable and sustainable.

Demand usually means that the programs that are delivered are non-accredited. They are often designed by the participants and are usually short courses that are very relevant to the participants needs.

There is no quality system available to enable the verification of assessment associated with delivering the elements of competencies.

The VET accredited system is based on the delivery of competencies and hence the structured un-accredited segment does not lead to a qualification or part of a qualification.

The reality therefore is that FarmBis sponsored programs do not lead participants down the qualifications path except, when they actually undertake a VET accredited course.

The structure of the FarmBis program has taken into account the two important issues associated with farmers and farm workers. These being, their lower than average education level and the fact that the average age of farmers and farm workers is in the high 50's.

The provision of structured un-accredited training to the rural sector involves a wide range of organisations including TAFE Institutes, Universities, Private RTOs and a multitude of consultants and unregistered private providers.

In Victoria at the end of 2004 there were 200 FarmBis registered providers. Over its life to date there have been over 300 different providers registered at various times.

Since July 1, 2001 there have been nearly 32,000 participants. There were 172 VET Accredited programs with approximately 1400 participants. Between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004 there were nearly 12,000 participants. There have been over 900 individual courses registered with FarmBis – Victoria since it was established.

FarmBis as a source of funding has become increasingly popular and is a well recognised badge for agricultural professional development and training. In recent years the FarmBis program has done a lot to encourage farmers and farm workers to undertake structured training.

## **2.3 In-formal Training**

There are a large number of providers of this type of training, ranging from government departments, farmer groups, farm suppliers eg Machinery, Fertiliser and Chemical Companies.

### **2.3.1 DPI Involvement**

Catchment and Agricultural Services (the relevant DPI Division) has a range of approaches to agricultural education and training (extension programs). These include:

- Group Facilitation eg workshops and seminars
- Information access – articles, media releases, booklets etc
- Program Learning
- One to One Extension
- Research seminars
- Field days
- Farmer Directed groups.

DPI extension activities are promoted through a range of programs usually in partnership with other organisations. Often DPI staff are involved in presenting training programs, both accredited and unaccredited and up to 65% of DPI presenters have completed the Certificate IV in Work place Assessment and Training.

### **2.3.2 Farmer Systems Groups**

Farming Systems Groups provide a range of activities in in-formal farmer education. They usually carry out a research program concentrating on knowledge transfer at field days.

#### **i. Birchip Cropping Group (BCG)**

BCG is a farmer driven agricultural organisation operating as a not for profit incorporated association. It conducts applied research and extension on all the major crops grown in the region. The group aims to investigate the critical success factors that ensure sustainability and profitable production systems.

The group's information is freely distributed and promoted and a manual of trial results is distributed to 6000 farmers in four states. BCG conducts five field days and six events each year, all of which are well attended.

#### **ii. Southern Farming Systems**

Southern Farming Systems commenced operating in 1995 and is a non profit farmer owned and operated group. It carries out applied research to increase the profitability of southern farming operations. It has approximately 900 members and is supported by a range of business organisations and government. It has six research sites.

### 3 An Estimate of the Size of Agriculture and Horticulture Training Delivery in 2003

#### 3.1 OTTE Purchased Student Contact Hours (SCHs)

<b>Agriculture</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000
AQF 1&2	179	181	168	232	160
AQF 3&4	618	716	505	495	360
AQF>5	226	222	307	339	387
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1023</b>	<b>1119</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1066</b>	<b>907</b>
Not Accredited	55	6	7	2	81
Non Award	176	81	62	60	52
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1254</b>	<b>1206</b>	<b>1049</b>	<b>1128</b>	<b>1040</b>

<b>Production Horticulture</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000	SCHs X 1000
AQF 1&2	9	50	25	56	67
AQF 3&4	16	73	96	109	96
AQF>5	6	65	120	132	173
Not Acc				3	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>335</b>

Within the field of Agriculture there has been 17% decline in delivery between the years 1999 and 2003. There has been a decline in training at Certificate I-IV levels between 2000 and 2003 of 42%. In Production Horticulture there has been an increase of 78% in the total training provided between the years 2000 and 2003.

Between 2000 and 2003 delivery of training in agriculture has declined by 166,000 SCHs and delivery of training to the Production Horticulture sector has increased by 147,000 SCHs. Within the Primary Industry field there have been increases in training in Amenity Horticulture (5%), Animal Care (4%), and Conservation (10%), since 1999. Fish Harvesting training has increased 30% (from a small base) since 2000.



### 3.2 Estimated Total Agriculture and Horticulture delivery in 2003

The following represents a summary of the training provided to the Agricultural and Horticulture sectors. The figures, in most cases, are estimates only.

	<b>Accredited</b>	<b>Non accredited</b>
	X 1000 SCHs	x 1000 SCHs
OTTE Training	1242	133
VETiS and SBNA	180	
FarmBis		300
DPI Extension		120
DPI Research Program		60
Farmer Systems Groups		20
Marcus Oldham	27	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1449</b>	<b>633</b>

From the above figures it can be seen that approximately 30% of the total training provided to the Agriculture Sector is unaccredited and does not link directly to formal qualifications.

## 4 The Rural Production Training Package

Research shows that as a general rule the length of the units of competency in the Rural Training Package are far too long to enable any easy packaging of them into the short sharp courses the industry is looking for.

There are no nesting arrangements in the qualifications of the RPTP. Nesting arrangements have several advantages not the least of which is the encouragement of pathways. There are no prerequisites for any of the competencies and this is also an issue when trying to develop pathways for student.

The qualifications contained in the RPTP are all substantial in length and there is no possibility to design short sharp relevant courses as subsets of the listed qualifications. This inflexibility should be able to be rectified at the State level. After time innovations can then be adopted nationally.

The involvement of the Victorian Qualifications Authority in the accreditation of qualifications that are identified as having an industry need must continue. This approach enables a quick response to need rather than having to wait for things to happen at National level. The National policy of not allowing new or further qualifications that are based solely on the competencies of a training package to be developed must change.

### 4.1 The Range in Nominal Hours in the RPTP Qualifications

There is a ridiculously wide range in the length of similar qualifications that can be obtained under the RPTP. This leads to confusion and a general down grading of the qualifications in the eyes of students and the industry.

Each state training system is responsible for determining the nominal hours that will be allocated to each competency. These are spelt out in what is called the purchasing guide. As result of the hours allocated to each competency the various certificates and diplomas that are approved under the RPTP have a range of lengths depending on the competencies that are chosen by the student.

These are listed below.

	<b>Minimum Hours</b>	<b>Maximum Hours</b>
<b>Certificate I</b>	60	280
<b>Certificate II</b>	286	1190
<b>Certificate III</b>	415	1720
<b>Certificate IV</b>	457	1800
<b>Diploma</b>	710	1760
<b>Advanced Diploma</b>	1245	1960

That is one student could receive a diploma for 710 hours of training (nominal) and another receive a diploma after 1760 hours of training.

#### 4.2 Range of Nominal Hours for Each Competency

All the competencies in the RPTP are allocated a level depending on their difficulty and the levels range from 1 to 6. The range of nominal hours allocated to each competency via the purchasing guide the various levels are listed below.

	<b>Minimum Hours</b>	<b>Maximum Hours</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	15	160
<b>Level 2</b>	10	150
<b>Level 3</b>	10	160
<b>Level 4</b>	40	200
<b>Level 5</b>	80	180
<b>Level 6</b>	200	260

The fact that a competency could be so complex that it is 260 hours long defies belief. I would recommend that as a general rule that 40 hours be the limit for any competency.

## 5 Melbourne University

Melbourne University in many respects does not understand the philosophy behind TAFE. Although it is Victoria's biggest provider of Agricultural TAFE training it is basically still a very small provider of TAFE over all. They don't have the infrastructure to cope with TAFE systems or keep up with its agenda. Whether its quality, reporting etc. The lack of resources of the Faculty of LFR has to devote to keeping up with the TAFE agenda and its quality systems is small compared to even the smallest TAFE Institute.

The cultures of Higher Education and TAFE do not fit well together even when they are in an organisation on equal financial terms. TAFE in the University of Melbourne is hardly a pimple on its Higher Education body. One can easily imagine there is an underlying wish on the part of many to get rid of the TAFE delivery.

They have been under delivering in the TAFE area on and off for years.

The University of Melbourne is struggling to deliver quality education and training within budget.

There have been many enquiries into Agricultural Higher Education but nothing seems to change. They have major problems with:

The content of their courses at undergraduate level do not suit people who are going back onto farms because there are not any up to date practical units in the program. Both farmers and agri-business are crying out for agronomists but they don't seem to have any focus on the training of agronomists.

Melbourne Uni has the degree course delivered from two locations with comparatively low numbers at each.

There is very little connection between the agricultural faculty at Melbourne University and the agricultural industry.

There are very few pathways between TAFE and HE. Articulation basically doesn't exist in agriculture.

In rationalising their delivery in order to achieve efficiencies (as a result of their budget problems throughout the Faculty of Ag) at their TAFE campuses Melbourne University wants to pick the eyes out of what they delivery. They want to keep full time courses going but not pick up on any part time delivery; leaving this difficult under funded aspect of training to the TAFE Institute.

## **6 Some Suggestions for Reform**

### **6.1 Industry accreditation**

Establish an industry accreditation system for Higher Education Agricultural courses to ensure the quality and relevance of these programs. The proposal is that there is put in place a system that ensures the University is accountability to the industry as a whole in a similar way that other occupations review their degree programs. I cannot think of a better way to answer industry criticism.

The system might be best handled at the national level perhaps by the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science and Technology with input from the National Farmers Federation and representatives of national companies, State Departments of Primary Industries etc.

### **6.2 Relocation of the Agricultural Degree Program to Shepparton**

This proposal was a recommendation of the Ras Lawson review 2002 and it still has relevance.

The agricultural degree courses of the University of Melbourne should all be located at Shepparton, (not on the Dookie Campus) with the ability for students to undertake specialist units at relevant locations eg grains in Horsham. This would greatly assist with the University develop links with industry and make their courses more relevant. The proposition would have to be thought through to overcome some short falls such as, how do you do a double degree. The idea would need to be tested with other industry groups. It would though provide the University of Melbourne with some serious rationalisation and cost savings.

### **6.3 Length and Content of the Degree Program**

The degree program should be increased to four years. In the additional year all students would undertake two 16 week placements. One of the placements should be at a research organisation and the other in some form of agricultural employment (that was not research). During the research block students would undertake a research project and during the work placement they would undertake a business/production planning unit.

There should be some additional elective units introduced to the course. These should be delivered in 4 week blocks (of say 120 hours in length) at various specialist locations. For example a grains unit or two could be delivered in Horsham using the specialist personnel that are at the Grains Innovation Park.

Careful consideration needs to be given to the issue of students being able to specialise to a serious depth. For example agronomy needs to be available as a specialist area.

## **7 The Proposal for a Centre of Excellence for the Grains Industry**

The concept of a Centre of Excellence was proposed by myself in a report to Grains Industry Training Network (GITN) in late 2003. It was supported at the recently held Grains Industry Search Conference and the proposal outlined here is an attempt to develop it to a practical possibility. This short paper has not been prepared in consultation with GITN or any provider and has been prepared in the environment of the possible closure of Longerenong Campus of Melbourne University. It represents my views only.

As well as trying to meet industry's needs I have attempted to address what I consider to be the objectives of the University of Melbourne. These being: -

- Keeping faith with the community and maintaining a presence in the Wimmera
- Increasing its involvement with research in the agricultural sector
- Solving its budget problems at Longerenong
- Being associated with the state government in a major initiative
- Being associated with a centre that has the potential to become the National Centre for Grains
- Shifting the management of a difficult section of the University to local people who have an interest in ensuring its success
- Meeting its moral responsibility to do the best for the grains industry (given UM is the largest provider of Agricultural Education and Training in Victoria).

I have also considered a range of other factors:

- The thinness of the training market
- The lack of connection between extension and training
- The lack of connection between research and education and training
- The need for industry input into research and education and training.
- The ability to get some economies of scale.

### **7.1 The Centre should be:**

- Run by a Board appointed by the University of Melbourne Council from recommendations put to it in the first instance through community consultation and there after by the Board itself. The non employee members of the Board would be paid an annual sitting fee (total to be 0.5% of the total budget).
- The Board should consist of six expert farmers (with experience in management or at board level), an accountant, a lawyer, a researcher, an education and training expert and the CEO.
- The Board will have a legal agreement with the University of Melbourne outlining its role and responsibilities.
- The centre would have annual performance agreement with OTTE to deliver training.
- The centre would have an annual performance with the DPI to deliver extension services and research outcomes.

- The Board would report annually to the University of Melbourne Council.
- The University of Melbourne Council will reserve the right to intervene in the centres affair. If required, it would do so via a motion at council that would suspend the Board and put in an administrator.
- The Board would have full control over all management matters including:
  - ❖ Appointment of the CEO
  - ❖ Appointment of staff (delegated to the CEO)
  - ❖ Financial affairs
  - ❖ Facilities
  - ❖ Research program
  - ❖ Training and extension efforts
- The centre will present to the University of Melbourne Council in November each year a balanced budget for the following year.
- The centre will present an annual report by the first of April each year, containing a full statement of accounts.
- The centre will carry forward all surpluses and deficits into its next year's accounts.
- The centre will pay a fee of 5% of its annual budget to the University of Melbourne to compensate for its input and monitoring etc
- The Centre would draw on the IT resources of the University of Melbourne to ensure it had access to support that was delivered by an efficient department with economies of scale
- The centre's accounting and personnel systems would be compatible with and integrated with those of the University of Melbourne.
- The staff will be employed by the University of Melbourne

## **7.2 The Centre will bring together:**

The Student Contact Hours of the Longerenong campus of the University of Melbourne with budget of the order of \$...??

The research staff involved in the grains industry from Department of Primary Industries (Grains Innovation Park and others) with budget of the order of \$...??

The extension staff from Department of Primary Industries that are involved in grains both directly and in some cases indirectly. (These will be located across Victoria). The budget will be of the order of \$...??

### 7.3 The Centre will consist of two divisions

- The Research Division
- The Training and Extension Division

Supported by a small Corporate Services Department

### 6.4 Structure

#### Board

#### CEO

#### Director of Research

Staff  
Scientists 80  
Support Staff 40

Budget \$14M

A fully developed pure and

- ◆ applied research program using
- ◆ the facilities at GIP and the land at Longerenong, Horsham and
- ◆ other locations.
- ◆ one to one extension linked to training
- ◆ field days
- ◆ workshops
- ◆ research updates

#### Director of Training & Extension

Staff 60

Budget \$6M

Delivering

- full time programs
- short accredited skills specific courses
- short unaccredited courses



## **Manager of Corporate Services**

### **Functions:**

- Marketing
- Accounts
- Personnel
- Facilities
- Knowledge Transfer (eg library)

Staff 15

Budget \$5M

### **6.5 Income**

- State DPI
- State OTTE
- Commercial Income Target \$10M

### **6.6 Location of Staff**

Research staff will in the main be located at:  
Innovation Park Horsham

Training and extension staff will be located at:

- Innovation Park Horsham
- Longerenong Campus
- Geelong
- Rutherglen
- Bendigo
- Swan Hill
- Walpeup
- Birchip

Corporate Services would be located at Longerenong Campus

### **6.7 Employment of Staff**

All staff would be employed by the UM as:

- Ongoing
- Limited tenure
- Casual

## **7 Recommendations**

- 7.1 The National competition policy should be waived for the delivery of all VET programs to locations more than 20kms from population centres of 20000 people or more.
- 7.2 The length of the units of competency in the Rural Training Package be limited to 40 nominal hours each.
- 7.3 That government work with industry to develop and publicise the pathways and career opportunities for agriculture.
- 7.4 That nesting arrangements are introduced into qualifications of the RPTP
- 7.5 That consistency is obtained for the length of qualifications contained in the RPTP
- 7.6 That the establishment of the Grains Industry Centre of Excellence in Victoria becomes a priority.
- 7.7 That short sharp relevant accredited courses are supported in their development
- 7.8 That Melbourne University be encouraged to look seriously at the structure and delivery of its degree program in agriculture.
- 7.9 That a national agricultural degree accreditation program be put in place.