



Name: Heavy Vehicle Industry Australia (HVIA)

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 current Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) and credit transfer system in Australia is ineffective, inconsistent, and ultimately fails to serve the needs of industry, students, and training providers. In practice, it does not support the seamless recognition of prior experience or movement between qualifications. Rather than enabling flexibility and efficiency, the system creates barriers, delays, and inequities.

Clarity and Ease of Application

There is no consistent or user-friendly process for RPL or credit transfer. The application process is complex, opaque, and heavily burdensome for both the applicant and the training provider. In fact, some RTOs operate business models built around offering RPL simply because they understand how to navigate the complexity—demonstrating just how inaccessible the process is for ordinary workers and employers.

Transparency of the Process

Transparency is minimal. Outcomes depend largely on the applicant's persistence and ability to interpret requirements, or on the degree of involvement by an employer. Once an employer initiates the process, an additional layer of responsibility and expectation is placed on them—creating confusion over ownership and accountability. This also raises the risk of inequitable treatment between applicants with and without employer support.

Availability of Up-front Information

Information about credit or RPL eligibility is often tied to commercial intent. Many RPL providers use the process as a revenue stream, providing limited guidance upfront and charging fees to "review" experience that may ultimately be deemed insufficient. The tendency is to assess only what is on paper—minimising genuine engagement with a learner's skills and industry experience.

Promotion of RPL as an Option

RPL is not widely or meaningfully promoted as a viable option. Nor should it be, in its current form. Given the administrative burden, cost, and lack of transparency, RPL is not a pathway we would recommend to workers seeking to upskill or reskill. The system is too inconsistent and too difficult to navigate to be of real value.

Impact of the Funding Model

The funding model further undermines the process. RTOs receive little or no funding for conducting RPL, so they prioritise full course enrolments or second apprenticeships—even when a learner may already be competent in many of the required units. As a result, experienced workers are forced to repeat training unnecessarily, wasting time and taxpayer money. This is now the default industry practice, not because it's efficient or

effective, but because it's easier to fund and administratively manage.

Competency Assessment Issues

The current system reduces competency assessment to a "tick-box" exercise—where demonstrating a task three times, with supporting photographs and job cards, is often considered sufficient. This does not reliably prove capability but rather demonstrates a provider's ability to manipulate the system. There is little to no room for contextual judgement, practical demonstrations, or industry-led evaluation.

Need for Systemic Reform

A complete overhaul is required. The system must be reframed around trust in industry experience, national consistency, and ease of use. Specifically:

- Develop a nationally standardised RPL framework, coordinated by Jobs and Skills Councils, with common evidence requirements and shared assessment criteria.
- Establish centralised digital tracking of credentials and credits, such as a national digital skills passport, to assist workers in carrying recognised experience across qualifications and providers.
- Create industry-endorsed skills verification mechanisms, allowing for practical, experience-based assessment outside the rigid confines of RTO-specific paperwork.
- Align funding mechanisms to properly support RPL assessments, making them financially sustainable and attractive to providers.

Until these structural issues are addressed, the RPL and credit transfer system will continue to be underutilised and ineffective. In its current form, it undermines the goal of a flexible, responsive vocational education and training sector. Reform must be led by industry and guided by practical experience, not just administrative convenience.

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

The participant did not respond to this question.

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?

Work-related training is essential across our industry—however, the current VET system does not meet the real training needs of employers or the workforce. Participation in formal training is often driven more by compliance or funding eligibility than by actual skills needs. As a result, a large proportion of high-value, job-relevant

training occurs outside the RTO system, particularly within OEMs (original equipment manufacturers) and other large employers.

OEMs and other major employers invest significant time and resources in training their workforce in-house. This includes highly specialised product, systems, safety, and service training that is simply not available—and not possible to replicate—within the current RTO framework. The training delivered internally by OEMs is contextual, relevant, immediate, and aligned to current technologies.

This reality reflects the widely accepted 70:20:10 model of adult learning:

- 70% of learning occurs on the job,
- 20% through workplace interaction, and
- only 10% via formal education.

The formal training system captures just a fraction of how people actually gain competency and capability.

Why Businesses Avoid Formal Training Pathways

There are several reasons why employers and individuals do not engage extensively with the formal training system:

- Low quality and relevance of some RTO offerings – many qualifications and training packages are outdated or lack the technical depth required by modern industry. Employers often find that RTO-trained workers still require significant retraining or additional instruction once on the job.
- Inflexibility and administrative burden – RTOs operate under rigid frameworks that do not reflect the fast-paced, evolving nature of many industries. The administrative load required to coordinate training (including compliance, audits, enrolments, and evidence collection) acts as a barrier for many businesses, especially SMEs.
- Lack of responsiveness – the training system is slow to adapt. Businesses require agile training solutions that can be implemented rapidly, not bound by semester-based or calendar-year models.
- Funding distortions – businesses are often incentivised to pursue full qualifications or apprenticeships due to how funding is structured, even when short, targeted training would be more appropriate. This can lead to inefficiencies, repeat training, and disengagement.
- Perceived lack of return on investment – when formal training does not result in a measurable improvement in job performance or productivity, businesses are reluctant to invest further.

Why Businesses Do Invest in Training – But Not Always Through RTOs

Businesses are committed to developing their people—but they do so on their own terms, through internal programs, OEM-led training, mentoring, and structured on-the-job learning. These forms of training are directly aligned with operational goals, safety requirements, and the technologies used on site. They are also more cost-effective and more trusted than external options.

What Needs to Change

To support greater participation in relevant, work-related training:

- The VET system must partner with industry, not operate in parallel to it.
- Qualifications and micro-credentials must be co-designed with OEMs and industry leaders to ensure relevance.
- Flexible, industry-led training solutions must be formally recognised and funded—

especially where they reflect high standards of instruction and content.

- A national approach to recognising informal and on-the-job training should be implemented, allowing workers to gain recognition for the real skills they acquire outside the classroom.

Without reform, industry will continue to bypass the formal training system, investing in its own high-quality, fit-for-purpose training programs that sit outside of recognised qualifications. This represents a missed opportunity to align national workforce policy with the way learning actually occurs in Australian workplaces

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

The participant did not respond to this question.

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

The single most important action government can take is to formally recognise and support the extensive training already delivered by industry, particularly by OEMs and other employers operating in highly technical sectors. These employers are not relying solely on the RTO system. They are delivering the bulk of meaningful, job-relevant training themselves.

In practice, industry provides the majority of work-related training—not as an optional extra, but as a core operational necessity. The skills required to operate, maintain, and safely service complex equipment or systems far exceed what is delivered through standard vocational education programs. Government policy must move beyond the assumption that formal qualifications are the only meaningful training pathway.

Recognise the Real Training Burden on Employers

If an employer takes on an apprentice, up to 90% of the training burden is carried by the employer, not the RTO. This includes:

- onboarding,
- site-specific safety instruction,
- OEM equipment training,
- mentoring and supervision,
- technical skills development, and
- compliance with regulatory and operational standards.

Yet, under current arrangements, that same employer must also pay for or subsidise formal external training, which often delivers only a fraction of the value. This is neither equitable nor sustainable.

What Government Should Do:

1. Formally recognise industry-delivered training as a legitimate and valuable part of the national training effort.

- o This includes on-the-job training, OEM programs, internal technical instruction, and site-based competency frameworks.

- o Recognition should carry weight for both funding and credentialing purposes.

2. Reform funding models so that employers who are already providing the majority of

training are not financially penalised.

- o Where a business is taking responsibility for training an apprentice or worker, the cost of external RTO delivery should not fall to the employer or employee. Public funding should cover the gap—not duplicate the effort.

3. Streamline partnerships between industry and the formal training sector, enabling co-designed programs, shared delivery models, and flexible training options that reflect the pace and complexity of modern workplaces.

4. Establish a national framework to capture and credential informal and workplace-based training.

- o This could take the form of a digital skills passport or industry-endorsed certification pathways.

- o Recognition should not be limited to what can be documented in an RTO's unit of competency.

Stop Over-Relying on the RTO Model

The assumption that all meaningful training must flow through an RTO is outdated and counterproductive. It ignores the fact that in many high-skill industries, employers are already delivering far more relevant and timely training than can be found through external providers.

Instead of asking how employers can better engage with the training system, government should ask:

How can the training system be restructured to engage with employers who are already leading the way?

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.

In the heavy vehicle and manufacturing sectors, occupational entry regulations—particularly those related to repair, servicing, and technical maintenance—are fragmented, inconsistent, and poorly aligned with the needs of industry. The absence of a nationally consistent regulatory and licensing framework has created a confusing, overly complex, and at times contradictory landscape that directly affects service availability, workforce mobility, safety outcomes, and investment in skills development.

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.

Industry association or professional-body representative

Which state or territory are you predominantly based in?

National