



final report

Project Code: A.MIN.0106
Prepared by: Jenny Kroonstuiver
National Meat Industry Training Advisory
Council (MINTRAC)
December 2012

Date published:
PUBLISHED BY
Meat and Livestock Australia Limited
Locked Bag 991
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2059

Meat Industry Professional Development Program

Meat & Livestock Australia acknowledges the matching funds provided by the Australian Government and contributions from the Australian Meat Processor Corporation to support the research and development detailed in this publication.

This publication is published by Meat & Livestock Australia Limited ABN 39 081 678 364 (MLA). Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However MLA cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in the publication. You should make your own enquiries before making decisions concerning your interests. Reproduction in whole or in part of this publication is prohibited without prior written consent of MLA.

Abstract

The meat industry professional development program enables MINTRAC to establish suitable models of delivery and assessment, a body of competent trainers, appropriate support materials and a viable market into which this training can be sold.

MINTRAC was contracted in February 2012 to run this project, which commenced with a scan of industry professional development requirements. Priority was given to programs which prepared companies for the incoming EU requirements, such as assessing the effectiveness of stunning and the Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set.

Throughout 2012, twenty-five programs ran, with a total of 426 attendees.

Over the course of the year some modifications to the management of the program in the areas of course eligibility, costing models and branding were made at the request of the Australian Meat Processor Corporation (AMPC). The three recommendations relate to the ongoing implementation of these changes.

Executive summary

The meat industry professional development program enables MINTRAC to establish suitable models of delivery and assessment, a body of competent trainers, appropriate support materials and a viable market into which this training can be sold. The professional development programs also play a role in dramatically improving the technical skills of existing trainers. By controlling these courses MINTRAC is able to use specific technical experts to deliver all over Australia giving regional operators and trainers exposure to leaders in their fields. This ensures that the messages are consistent and the training is of high quality.

After a period of over six months where no industry-funded professional development program was offered to the meat processing industry, MINTRAC was contracted in February 2012 to run this project.

In preparation for the project, the first scan of professional development requirements was conducted in January 2012, and the feedback requests were prioritised, mindful of not overloading the industry with workshops as several other projects had reached workshop stages at the same time. Priority was given to programs which prepared companies for the incoming EU requirements, such as assessing the effectiveness of stunning and the Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set.

Throughout 2012, twenty-five programs ran with a total of 426 participants; a further nine were offered but failed to attract sufficient numbers. Courses were offered in the following areas:

- Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set
- Effectiveness of Stunning
- QA for Supervisors
- Livestock Handling
- JSA and Hazard Analysis
- New Supervisor Induction
- HACCP
- Work Skill Instruction
- Knife sharpening
- New Supervisor Induction
- Certificate IV in Laboratory Operations
- Internal Auditor Training

In September many previously identified programs were shifted to fee-for-service as AMPC did not consider them eligible to be funded under this program. At the same time, changes were also made to the costing models used for each program and the previous classifications of 'levy-payer' and 'non-levy payer' were scrapped.

Feedback from participants was collected and collated, and the full collated reports were provided in Milestone 4 of this program. Overall, comments from participants showed that the courses were professionally delivered, and that participants found them valuable and relevant to their work.

This is the first year that the professional development program has been run as a stand-alone program and not part of the MINTRAC networks. Inevitably, as the program took shape and AMPC took a far greater interest in the way the program was managed, a need for some change has been identified. The three recommendations arise from these discussions.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the list of PD programs to be funded through the AMPC/MLA program in the coming year be determined by:

- assessing individual plant requests against the criteria provided by AMPC
- offering programs recommended by AMPC and MLA
- offering programs identified by MINTRAC as meeting the criteria provided by AMPC.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that MINTRAC continue to monitor the costs of professional development workshops in the coming year and to make adjustments to the costing model as necessary.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that prior to the commencement of the next contract, MINTRAC will develop two distinctly different templates for the promotion of industry-funded and fee-for-service programs. The template for the industry-funded programs will be submitted to AMPC for approval prior to use.

The branded templates will be used for:

- course advertising
- workshop agendas (where applicable)
- attendance sheets
- course evaluation forms.

Contents

	Page
1 Background	7
1.1 The role of the professional development programs in building industry capability	7
1.2 MINTRAC management of this program 2011-2012	7
2 Project objectives	8
3 Methodology	8
3.1 Scan of professional development requirements	8
3.2 Consultation with AMPC, AMIC and MLA	8
3.3 Identifying and contracting suitable facilitators	8
3.4 Development of suitable training materials	9
3.5 Costing the programs	9
3.6 Program advertising	9
3.7 Running the programs	9
3.8 Program evaluations	9
4 Results and discussion	10
4.1 Summary of identified requirements	10
4.2 Program costs	10
4.3 List of programs run	11
4.4 Feedback from participants	12
4.4.1 Effectiveness of Stunning	12
4.4.2 Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set	12
4.4.3 HACCP	12
4.4.4 Internal auditor	12
4.4.5 Job Safety Analysis	13
4.4.6 Knife sharpening	13
4.4.7 New supervisor induction	13
4.4.8 Quality Assurance for supervisors	13
4.5 Branding	13
5 Success in achieving objectives	14
5.1 Objective 1 - Extending research and development outcomes into daily practice and ongoing industry training programs	14
5.2 Objective 2 - Fostering consistent, high quality technical expertise of industry practitioners	14
5.3 Objective 3 - Facilitating early identification and addressing of critical training requirements	15

5.4	Objective 4 - Building industry capability to incorporate new knowledge and innovations into the industry training system	15
6	Impact on meat and livestock industry – Now and in five years time	15
6.1	Immediate impact on the meat and livestock industry	15
6.2	Anticipated long-term impact on the meat and livestock industry	16
7	Conclusions and recommendations	16
7.1	Conclusions.....	16
7.2	Recommendations	16
7.2.1	Nature of workshops funded through the PD program	16
7.2.2	Fee-paying categories.....	17
7.2.3	Branding.....	17

1 Background

1.1 The role of the professional development programs in building industry capability

The geographic spread of meat processing plants and the nature of their training requirements create some difficult issues for plants seeking technical training for their staff. Traditionally industries such as food processing and the dairy industry have been able to attract employees with existing technical training and experience.

However, for a number of reasons the meat industry has largely had to develop its own technical experts such as production supervisors, Animal Welfare Officers and QA managers. The delivery of accredited training to these technical experts is a pressing issue as both customers and regulators require credible evidence of training and current competency in a wide variety of areas. Examples of this type of training include HACCP, animal welfare, micro-biology, internal auditing, implementation of food safety plans, OH&S etc.

This training is often very difficult for the industry to access. The reasons for this difficulty include

- the regional location of the majority of plants
- the small number of trainees at any one of the majority of plants
- the very limited number of training providers
- the limited numbers of trainers with the technical expertise to deliver this training to the meat industry.

For each of these types of training the meat industry professional development program enables MINTRAC to establish suitable models of delivery and assessment, a body of competent trainers, appropriate support materials and a viable market into which this training can be sold. Our approach enables a viable number of trainees to be grouped in one area and creates a market which attracts training providers to take on the training. Equally this enables training capacity to be built in all states around Australia and not just in one or two centres. This also makes the industry less vulnerable to a single training provider going out of business

The professional development programs also play a role in dramatically improving the technical skills of existing trainers. By controlling these courses MINTRAC is able to use specific technical experts to deliver all over Australia giving regional operators and trainers and trainers exposure to leaders in their fields. This ensures that the messages are consistent and the training is of high quality.

As the models become established and the need for ongoing training accepted, MINTRAC is often able to leverage State funding for the ongoing provision of training, for example the animal welfare training in NSW, Victoria and SA. This has meant that a relatively modest industry investment can be multiplied by sometimes a factor of four to finance extensive training programs. Alternatively, where State funding is not readily available, we have been able to broker arrangements with RTOs to provide ongoing training on a commercial basis.

1.2 MINTRAC management of this program 2011-2012

MINTRAC's management of the program in 2012 included:

- a twice-yearly scan of professional development requirements by means of a questionnaire distributed to meat processing companies, industry networks and training organisations
- consultation with AMPC, AMIC, MLA and regulators to identify completed programs which may require roll-out through accredited training or workshops
- identifying and contracting suitable facilitators (through a tendering process, if appropriate)
- development of suitable training materials, if required
- costing each program to determine feasibility; identifying and accessing external funding support (e.g. State Training Authority funding) wherever possible
- advertising the programs at a subsidised cost to red-meat levy payers, and at full cost to other interested participants
- accepting registrations, booking venues and facilitator travel and accommodation, copying and shipping training materials
- collating evaluations and feedback.

2 Project objectives

This project sought to:

- extend research and development outcomes into daily practice and ongoing industry training programs
- foster consistent, high quality technical expertise of industry practitioners
- facilitate early identification and addressing of critical training requirements
- build industry capability to incorporate new knowledge and innovations into the industry training system.

3 Methodology

3.1 Scan of professional development requirements

Under the contract, MINTRAC was required to conduct two scans of professional development requirements. Questionnaires were sent directly to nominated company representatives, who were asked to identify their needs and the number of potential participants.

3.2 Consultation with AMPC, AMIC and MLA

Ongoing consultation occurred with AMIC, AMPC and MLA to identify completed programs which may require roll-out through accredited training or workshops. Most of the identified requirements were already covered through other project contracts. There was general agreement that the assessment of effective stunning and the Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set were high priorities because of the incoming European Union and NSW Food Authority requirements, due to commence in January 2013.

3.3 Identifying and contracting suitable facilitators

MINTRAC sought facilitators through a tendering process unless a specific training skill set would mean only a select few are able to deliver the materials.

For example, Alison Small from CSIRO was contracted to lead the Professional development workshops in assessing the effectiveness of stunning in March/April 2012 both because of her specialist skills and because we were keen to have one technical expert deliver a consistent

message across Australia. Dr Leisha Hewitt, from Murdoch University, was also identified to deliver some of these programs.

A tendering process was used to identify Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) prepared to facilitate the programs.

3.4 Development of suitable training materials

MINTRAC, in consultation with the identified facilitators, developed the training materials for *Assess effective stunning and bleeding*. These were trialed during the first few courses, before being publicly released to RTOs.

For most other programs, materials had already been developed, or were being developed through other projects. RTOs and facilitators are required to ensure that all training materials are customized to suit the needs of the groups they are training.

3.5 Costing the programs

A costing model was developed for use with every proposed program.

Under the contract, MINTRAC committed to advertising the programs at a subsidised cost to red-meat levy payers, and at full cost to other interested participants.

3.6 Program advertising

All programs were to be advertised by:

- direct e-mail to network participants and all processing companies and RTOs in the MINTRAC database
- promotion at MINTRAC network meetings
- through the Mintracker newsletter.

3.7 Running the programs

MINTRAC's role in relation to each program advertised includes:

- accepting registrations and invoicing participants
- contracting facilitators and/or RTOs
- booking venues and facilitator travel and accommodation
- copying and shipping training materials
- developing attendance sheets
- collating evaluations.

3.8 Program evaluations

Facilitators and RTOs were required to distribute a standard evaluation form at the conclusion of each program. These forms were then returned to MINTRAC for collation.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Summary of identified requirements

The first scan of professional development requirements was conducted in January 2012, but could not be actioned until February, because MINTRAC did not receive the contract for this project until 9 February 2012.

The feedback requests were prioritised, mindful of not overloading the industry with workshops – a number of other contacts arrived at the same time and many of these had workshops as part of their requirements. As a result only the following programs were scheduled to run before July 2012:

- Effectiveness of Stunning led by Alison Small (CSIRO) – NSW, SA, WA, VIC, QLD
- Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set led by Central West Community College – Scone, NSW
- Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set led by Food Safety Operations Queensland – Churchill, Qld

By June, it had become clear that a large proportion of the requests from January had still not been actioned, so a second survey of needs was not conducted. Instead, companies were invited to update their requirements at each of the network meetings over the second half of the year.

Up until September 2012, MINTRAC continued collecting and collating requests from plants and then costing and advertising programs that had been requested. This method of planning was part of the contractual requirements, and had been fully reported to AMPC and MLA in all milestone reports, along with the list of requested courses and those that MINTRAC was planning to offer.

Early in September 2012, after MINTRAC had advertised a JSA workshop, AMPC advised us that they did not feel that this type of workshop should be funded through the PD program. After further discussion with AMPC, we moved the majority of the remaining requested programs into fee-for-service offerings. From this point on, courses offered under the AMPC/MLA funded programs were restricted to those which related to 'new' science, newly-released training programs, and dissemination of research or new technology.

As a result of this change, the previous practice of determining funded professional development programs based primarily on company requests is no longer applicable.

4.2 Program costs

MINTRAC charges a participant fee for all workshops, and the income from these fees is retained in the project cost centre and re-invested into offering additional workshops. We believe that it is essential that fees be charged to ensure company commitment to the program and to reduce the incidence of 'no shows'. The standard fee is around \$200 for a one-day course, and \$400 for a two-day course, although this can vary slightly from course to course.

Historically, and based on a request from AMPC when compulsory levies were introduced, the categories of 'levy-payer' and 'non-levy payer' were used to determine fee levels.

The addition of 'non-levy paying' workshop participants was often the means by which we gained sufficient people to justify running the course, particularly in regional areas. They paid the full fee, while levy-paying companies paid half fees with the project funds used to make up the shortfall.

During September 2012, AMPC queried the 'levy-payer' and 'non-levy payer' classifications MINTRAC had been using to determine fees for PD workshops, and advised us that this distinction was not to be used.

In addition, AMPC advised us that project funds could not be used to cover RTO delivery fees.

As a result we introduced a new costing model for workshops, based on the AMPC advice, and this was implemented immediately. We also stopped inviting non-industry people to participate in the industry-funded workshops.

4.3 List of programs run

The following programs were run during 2012:

2012	Scheduled Workshops	Attendee numbers
17 February & 5 April	Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set – Nippon Meat Packers, Oakey, QLD	10
20 March	Effectiveness of Stunning – SA	11
22 March	Effectiveness of Stunning – WA	13
26 March	Effectiveness of Stunning – NSW	15
14–15 April	Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set – Scone, NSW	10
16–17 April	Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set – Scone, NSW	9
16 April	Effectiveness of Stunning – QLD	12
23 April	QA for Supervisors – CRF, Colac, VIC	12
27 April	Effectiveness of Stunning – VIC	22
18 May	Effectiveness of Stunning – Gundagai, NSW	12
28–29 May	Effectiveness of Stunning – QLD	13
30–31 May	Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set – Churchill Abattoir, QLD	14
5–6 June	Livestock Handling – Tocal, NSW	7
12 June	JSA and Hazard Analysis – Bindaree Beef, Inverell, NSW	13
14–15 June	New Supervisor Induction – Brisbane QLD	9
14–15 June	Animal Welfare Officer Skills Set – Teys Wagga, NSW	8
16–17 June		4
4 July	Effectiveness of Stunning – Warrnambool, VIC	7
17–18 July	Livestock Handling – Yanco, NSW	8
24–25 July	HACCP – Melbourne, VIC	7
21–23 August	Work Skill Instruction – Teys, Wagga Wagga, NSW	4
27–30 August	Knife sharpening – Gundagai Meat Processors, Gundagai, NSW	c160
13–14 September	New Supervisor Induction – Brooklyn, VIC (rescheduled from June 2012)	13
14 September	JSA & Hazard analysis – Wingham Beef	13
Commenced 1 July	Certificate IV in Laboratory Operations	9
23–24 October	Internal Auditor Training - Bunbury	7

20-21 November	Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set – JBS (Brooklyn) Vic	11
----------------	---	----

4.4 Feedback from participants

Feedback from participants was collected and collated, and the full collated reports were provided in Milestone 4 of this program. Below is a general summary of the feedback received for each group of programs:

4.4.1 Effectiveness of Stunning

- all except two participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- respondents felt they had gained a better understanding of stunning, in particular the science underpinning the stunning process
- comments on 'best aspects' covered the on-site demonstration and the facilitator's knowledge
- comments on 'least helpful' were minor and related to long sitting periods, running out of lollies etc
- recommendations for improvement included more 'hands on' activity
- there were two respondents who felt the course was way above their heads and not very relevant.

4.4.2 Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set

- all but 1 participant either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- all felt they had gained a better understanding of animal welfare
- comments on 'best aspects' covered trainer knowledge, interaction with others, learning gained
- comments on 'least helpful' related to hard chairs, later arrivals etc
- few recommendations for improvement were made
- 'other comments' complimented the trainers on their expertise and knowledge

4.4.3 HACCP

- all participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- all felt their HACCP knowledge had been updated
- comments on 'best aspects' covered trainer excellence; video clips, case studies
- comments on 'least helpful' related course notes which did not follow presentations (1 comment)
- recommendations for improvement related to time, more case studies and course notes, more up-front information.

4.4.4 Internal auditor

- all participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- all felt they had gained an understanding of the basic principles of internal auditing
- comments on 'best aspects' covered trainer knowledge, high standard of content; plain English
- comments on 'least helpful' related to length of workshop; lack of OH&S content

- recommendations for improvement included suggestions for use of case studies; longer time
- 'other comments' praised the course

4.4.5 Job Safety Analysis

- all but 1 participant either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- respondents felt they had gained an understanding of the legal aspects and a greater awareness of risk assessments
- comments on 'best aspects' covered interactivity, discussions and practical scenarios
- comments on 'least helpful' related to workplace culture (1 comment only)
- there were minimal recommendations for improvement
- 'other comments' praised the course

4.4.6 Knife sharpening

Only nine responses were received, and this is not representative of the 163 participants.

4.4.7 New supervisor induction

- all but 1 participant either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- respondents felt they had gained a better understanding of themselves and how to handle others
- comments on 'best aspects' covered workshop style and communication tools
- comments on 'least helpful' related to noisy participants (1 comment)
- there were no recommendations for improvement
- 'other comments' praised the course and one suggested it should be compulsory for all supervisors.

4.4.8 Quality Assurance for supervisors

- all participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop had been beneficial for its purpose
- respondents felt they had gained a better understanding of HACCP systems, ECPs and SOPs
- comments on 'best aspects' covered workshop style and interactivity with other participants
- comments on 'least helpful' related to the algebra and the lack of relevance of some species
- recommendations for improvement included more 'hands on' activity
- there was only one 'other comment' which related to the timing of the workshops in relation to production demands.

4.5 Branding

Over the course of the year, AMPC made several requests to MINTRAC to ensure that workshops funded under this project were adequately branded as being sponsored by AMPC. Initially it was stated that a template would be developed, under mutual agreement between AMPC and MINTRAC; however this did not eventuate.

As an interim measure, MINTRAC began placing the AMPC logo onto course advertising, although initially this was inconsistent due to internal confusion among MINTRAC staff. We now believe that the system is firmly in place.

5 Success in achieving objectives

5.1 Objective 1 - Extending research and development outcomes into daily practice and ongoing industry training programs

While programs such as the *Effectiveness of Stunning*, the *Certificate IV in Laboratory Operations* and the *Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set* are explicitly structured to provide participants with the most up-to-date research and scientific knowledge, all programs contribute towards this goal.

Programs such as *HACCP* and *QA for Supervisors* inevitably cover recent developments in microbiological testing requirements and processing, new technologies and recent scientific developments.

Programs such as *New Supervisor Induction* and *Work Skill Instruction* introduce personnel to new communication practices and technologies, as well as methods of self-directed research in order to remain up-to-date with new developments.

Internal auditor programs provide plant personnel with the tools to undertake audits in areas related to areas of changing technology, research and exposure, such as environment, animal welfare and microbiological testing.

Programs such as *Job Safety Analysis* and *New Supervisor Induction* cover new legislation and legal requirements and responsibilities, particularly when working with new technologies.

Knife sharpening programs introduce participants to new techniques and technology, with a strong focus on personal safety and the minimisation of injury.

5.2 Objective 2 - Fostering consistent, high quality technical expertise of industry practitioners

One of the outstanding features of the meat industry professional development programs is the fact the trainers are encouraged to participate in the programs offered. In programs such as the *Effectiveness of stunning* courses, RTOs who attended were exposed to the consistent, highly scientific messages of the two facilitators and were thus equipped to adopt the same approach in their own training programs.

This train-the-trainer approach ensures that trainers are regularly updated, that the message stays consistent across Australia, and that industry can have confidence in the accuracy and value of the training being offered through the accredited training system.

In addition, participation by company personnel with direct responsibility for and in the areas of training contributes to the overall expertise across the industry. A scan of the evaluation feedback shows there are frequent references to the direct benefit participants see for their own jobs, and their keenness to try out the learning gained from the workshops.

5.3 Objective 3 - Facilitating early identification and addressing of critical training requirements

Even though MINTRAC began alerting companies to the implications of the January 2013 EU requirements as early as 2010, it was not until this year that middle/senior level management of processing companies began to appreciate the detail of what was required. The Professional Development program has enabled companies to be prepared well ahead of January 1.

The fact that professional development requirements are also identified and discussed in detail at all network meetings also contributes to the early identification of upcoming requirements. Over the period from July to December 2012, the following needs were identified at Training Network and MI&QA network meetings:

- livestock handling
- E-learning – training record systems; employee induction; contractors etc
- Meat Safety
- Dog handling
- Knife sharpening
- Cert IV Leadership
- AQIS ATMs and OPVs on how to assess AWOs
- Dispositions and currency training
- HACCP refreshers
- Leadership
- Lean manufacturing –
- AWOSS
- MHA
- Internal auditing
- NLIS
- MSA
- Chiller assessment
- Declared allergens; additives;
- Cert IV OH&S

5.4 Objective 4 - Building industry capability to incorporate new knowledge and innovations into the industry training system

This is a long-standing objective of this program and over the years the courses offered through the professional development program have substantially contributed to the incorporation of new knowledge and innovations into the industry training system. Because the programs offered are almost all face-to-face workshops, this occurs both formally through the structured training programs, and informally through the discussions and interactions between the participants. A review of the evaluations frequently sees reference to the benefits gained from being exposed to new science and the desire to implement this knowledge back in the workplace.

6 Impact on meat and livestock industry – Now and in five years time

6.1 Immediate impact on the meat and livestock industry

The professional development program this year has primarily addressed the industry need to be prepared for the 2013 EU requirements, and for industry to ensure that its attention to animal welfare was both consistent and of a very high standard. This program this year alone has

produced over fifty fully qualified Animal Welfare Officers, and over 100 people qualified to assess the effectiveness of stunning.

Because the programs offered have largely been identified by the processing plants themselves, they have been addressing clearly identified needs and therefore have significant impact.

6.2 Anticipated long-term impact on the meat and livestock industry

One of the key benefits of the professional development program has been its capacity to provide a high-quality and timely response to identified requirements. Over the longer term, the program has ensured that the industry is confident that there is a means of rapidly addressing such needs without having to either rely on their own resources or attempt to urgently source public training funds.

However, these programs actually demonstrate that there is a commitment to training, particularly accredited training, and the fact that there is a willingness to contribute industry funds in the short term is often the impetus needed to gain public funding over the longer term. Increasingly we are now seeing a willingness by the state and federal government to fund Skill Set training such as the *Animal Welfare Officer Skill Set*, for the very reason that there is such strong industry commitment to and support for the program.

7 Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

The MINTRAC Professional Development program continues to provide a valuable industry service. The fact that it was unavailable for six months of the last financial year was a matter of considerable concern to meat processing companies. As MINTRAC attempted to run key programs unsubsidised, or delayed offering them until such time that state funding might become available, there was a great deal of industry frustration about the lack of availability or high costs.

This is the first year that the professional development program has been run as a stand-alone program and not part of the networks. Inevitably, as the program took shape and AMPC took a far greater interest in the way the program was managed, a need for some changes has been identified. The following recommendations arise from these discussions.

7.2 Recommendations

7.2.1 Nature of workshops funded through the PD program

Up until September 2012, MINTRAC had been collecting and collating requests from plants for PD programs twice yearly, and then costing and advertising programs that had been requested. This method of planning was part of the contractual requirements, and had been fully reported to AMPC and MLA in all milestone reports, along with the list of requested courses and those that MINTRAC was planning to offer.

Early in September 2012, after MINTRAC had advertised a JSA workshop, AMPC advised us that they did not feel that this type of workshop should be funded through the PD program.

After further discussion with AMPC, we moved the majority of the remaining requested programs in to fee-for-service offerings. From this point on, courses offered under the AMPC/MLA funded

programs were restricted to those which related to 'new' science, newly-released training programs, and dissemination of research or new technology.

As a result of this change, the previous practice of determining professional development programs based primarily on company requests is no longer applicable.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the list of PD programs to be funded through the AMPC/MLA program in the coming year be determined by:

- assessing individual plant requests against the criteria provided by AMPC
- offering programs recommended by AMPC and MLA
- offering programs identified by MINTRAC as meeting the criteria provided by AMPC.

7.2.2 Fee-paying categories

MINTRAC charges a participant fee for all workshops, and the income from these fees is retained in the project cost centre and invested back into offering additional workshops. We believe that it is essential that fees be charged to ensure company commitment to the program and to reduce the incidence of 'no shows'.

Historically, and based on a request from AMPC when compulsory levies were introduced, the categories of 'levy-payer' and 'non-levy payer' were used.

The addition of 'non-levy paying' workshop participants was often the means by which we gained sufficient people to justify running the course, particularly in regional areas. They paid the full fee, while levy-paying companies paid half-fees with the project funds used to make up the shortfall.

During September 2012, AMPC queried the 'levy-payer' and 'non-levy payer' classifications MINTRAC had been using to determine fees for PD workshops, and advised us that this distinction was not to be used.

In addition, AMPC advised us that project funds could not be used to cover RTO delivery fees. As a result we introduced a new costing model for workshops, based on the AMPC advice, and this was implemented immediately. We also stopped inviting non-industry people to participate in the workshops.

As yet, the new model is relatively untested. It is possible that further adjustments will need to be made to the fees charged, minimum numbers set, and the level of AMPC/MLA subsidy applied to workshops.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that MINTRAC continue to monitor the costs of professional development workshops in the coming year and to make adjustments as necessary.

7.2.3 Branding

Over the course of the year, AMPC made several requests to MINTRAC to ensure that workshops funded under this project were adequately branded as being sponsored by AMPC. Initially it was stated that a template would be developed, under mutual agreement between AMPC and MINTRAC; however this did not eventuate.

As an interim measure, MINTRAC began placing the AMPC logo onto course advertising, although initially this was inconsistent due to internal confusion among MINTRAC staff. We now believe that the system is firmly in place.

However, it is believed that a promotional format which is distinctly for industry-funded programs still needs to be developed. This is particularly important for MINTRAC, as many of the programs which were formerly covered by this project are now fee-for-service, and will therefore be much more expensive to run, and the distinction needs to be very clear in MINTRAC's own advertising.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that prior to the commencement of the next contract, MINTRAC will develop two distinctly different templates for the promotion of industry-funded and fee-for-service programs. The template for the industry-funded programs will be submitted to AMPC for approval prior to use.

The branded templates will be used for:

- course advertising
- workshop agendas (where applicable)
- attendance sheets
- course evaluation forms.