



Name: The Front Project

Submission date: 6/06/2025

Improve school student outcomes with the best available tools and resources

What (if anything) needs to be done to improve the use of edtech tools (including GenAI) in schools?

The participant did not respond to this question.

What more (if anything) needs to be done to improve awareness and access to high quality lesson planning and curriculum materials in schools?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Is there anything more you would like to say about edtech, GenAI or lesson planning and curriculum materials?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Which of the following best describes you?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Are you currently using any edtech tools (including learning games and GenAI) to support teaching and learning in the classroom?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If yes, what has been your experience with using these tools?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Are there things you would like to do with GenAI or edtech tools that you can't do currently? What's stopping you from doing these things?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If no, can you tell us why you are not using any edtech tools?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Do you access lesson planning and curriculum materials online?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If yes, what has been your experience with using these tools?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If no, can you tell us why you are not using online lesson planning and curriculum materials?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Support the workforce through a flexible post-secondary education and training sector

Credit transfer and recognition of prior learning

In your experience, how well does the credit transfer and recognition of prior learning system operate in Australia? Does it adequately support students to move between courses or have their work experience recognised as part of a qualification? Are there ways it could be improved?

The credit transfer and recognition of prior learning (RPL) system in Australia is patchy, inconsistent, and often difficult to navigate, particularly in high-pressure sectors like early childhood education and care (ECEC). While the intent of these systems is to support flexible, lifelong learning, they often fall short in practice — due to fragmented processes, unclear standards, and a lack of trust or recognition across providers and employers.

The ECEC sector provides a compelling case study for how these systems could be improved. As governments roll out reforms like the 3 Day Guarantee and expanded preschool hours, there is growing pressure to rapidly train and retain a diverse, skilled workforce. However, traditional training pathways (like full Cert III or Diploma programs) are often too rigid or time-intensive to meet the current demand — especially for mature-age workers, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, or those already employed in the sector with significant practical experience.

This is where microcredentials could play a valuable role — if implemented well.

Which of the following best describes you? Please select all that apply.

Early Childhood Education and Care peak body

In the past 3 years, have you applied for credit recognition or recognition of prior learning (RPL)?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If yes, what was your experience in applying for credit recognition or RPL like?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If no, can you elaborate on why you didn't apply?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Work related training

What are the main reasons individuals and/or businesses do or do not participate in work-related training?

Individuals participate in work-related training for a mix of practical and aspirational reasons — including opportunities for career progression, personal commitment to quality, and employer support. In sectors like early childhood education and care (ECEC), training is often pursued to meet regulatory requirements or to develop specialist skills in areas such as inclusion or trauma-informed practice. However,

barriers like cost, time, inflexible delivery models, and low confidence can prevent many — particularly those in low-paid or insecure roles — from accessing further learning. If training is not clearly linked to career advancement or if workers are overwhelmed by workload and burnout, participation rates remain low despite high motivation.

For businesses, investment in training is shaped by compliance needs, quality goals, and access to funding. Yet many services, especially in ECEC, face significant constraints — including tight budgets, staff shortages, and uncertainty about which training options are credible or worthwhile. Some employers also worry that investing in staff development will lead to turnover rather than retention. To address these issues, Australia needs more flexible, stackable training models (such as microcredentials), greater alignment with career pathways, and targeted support to reduce financial and logistical barriers. Training must be seen not just as a cost, but as a strategic investment in workforce stability, service quality, and long-term sector resilience.

What role, if any, should businesses be playing to address any barriers and better support the offer of work-related training to employees?

Businesses have a vital role to play in supporting access to work-related training — but they cannot and should not be expected to do it alone. At a minimum, employers should create a culture where ongoing learning is encouraged, valued, and built into daily practice. This includes offering flexibility for staff to attend training during work hours, covering or subsidising costs where possible, and recognising training outcomes through promotions, pay increments, or leadership opportunities. When employees can see that their learning is supported and rewarded, participation and retention improve.

However, many businesses — particularly in sectors like early childhood education and care — face significant structural constraints, including tight margins, staff shortages, and limited capacity for planning or investment. That's why governments and training providers must also play a role: by co-designing funding models, developing high-quality, modular training options, and ensuring that training aligns with real career progression. Businesses can act as partners, shaping what meaningful, practical, and accessible training looks like — but they need the right policy and funding environment to make that possible. Supporting employee learning should be seen as a shared responsibility, not an added burden.

What, if anything, could government do to address barriers and better support the offer of work-related training to employees?

Governments have a critical role in addressing the systemic barriers that prevent individuals and businesses from engaging in work-related training. First and foremost, governments can improve access by funding low- or no-cost training, especially for priority sectors like ECEC where workers are often low-paid and time-poor. They can also invest in flexible, modular, and stackable learning pathways — such as accredited microcredentials — that allow people to learn while working or caring, and progressively build towards full qualifications. Embedding these pathways into national frameworks would give learners confidence their effort leads to real recognition and career progression.

In addition, governments can support businesses to offer training by funding backfill for staff release, providing targeted workforce development grants, and streamlining regulatory recognition of training outcomes. National leadership is also needed to align

qualifications, RPL (recognition of prior learning), and microcredentials in a way that is consistent, portable, and transparent across states and territories. Finally, governments should actively engage with employers, workers, and education providers to co-design solutions that meet real-world needs — particularly in sectors experiencing growth, reform, or workforce shortages. Training should not be a privilege or a burden — it should be a supported, structured part of a thriving workforce system.

Which of the following best describes you? Please select all that apply.

I am an employee/individual

For business owners, managers and sole traders, how many employees do you have?

The participant did not respond to this question.

For employees/individuals, have you participated in any work-related training in the last 12 months that did not relate to general compliance (such as WHS)?

No

If yes, can you elaborate on the reasons for the training and any benefits you received from doing it?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If no, can you elaborate on any challenges or barriers you faced in attempting to undertake work-related training?

The participant did not respond to this question.

For business owners, managers or sole traders, have you provided or supported your employees to participate in work-related training in the past 12 months?

The participant did not respond to this question.

If yes, can you elaborate on the reasons for the training and any benefits you or your employees received from doing it?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Can you describe whether you accessed any government assistance, what type, and the amount received? If you didn't access any financial assistance, please tell us the reasons why.

The participant did not respond to this question.

If no, can you elaborate on any challenges or barriers you faced in attempting to provide or support your employees to undertake work-related training, such as the time or cost, availability of relevant or high-quality courses, and level of interest from your employees?

The participant did not respond to this question.

Balance service availability and quality through fit-for-purpose occupational entry regulations

What are the effects of occupational entry regulations? Please describe your experience and name the specific occupations you are referring to.

The participant did not respond to this question.

Do you believe current occupational entry regulations are proportionate to the level of risk associated with different professions? Why or why not? If not, do you have any suggested improvements to regulations to better reflect risks? Please name the specific occupations you are referring to.

The participant did not respond to this question.

Which of the following best describes your connection to occupational entry regulations? Please select all that apply.

The participant did not respond to this question.

Which state or territory are you predominantly based in?

The participant did not respond to this question.