

Project background

This project aims to transition the nationally accredited course *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* to the *CHC Community Services Training Package*. The current course has 12 units of competency required for completion. The 12 units of competency contain four School Aged Care (SAC) units which are also in the *CHCXXXXX Diploma of School Aged Education and Care*. The remaining required units of competency in this course are from other training package areas such as business, community services, health and School Based Education Support (EDS).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Unit Code** | **Core Unit Title** |
| [BSBTWK201](https://training.gov.au/training/details/BSBTWK201) | Work effectively with others |
| [CHCCCS009](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCCCS009) | Facilitate responsible behaviour |
| [CHCEDS049](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCEDS049) | Supervise students outside the classroom |
| [CHCLEG001](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCLEG001) | Work legally and ethically |
| [CHCPRT025](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCPRT025) | Identify and report children and young people at risk |
| [CHCSAC006](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCSAC006) | Support children to participate in school age care |
| [CHCSAC007](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCSAC007) | Develop and implement play and leisure experiences in school age care |
| [CHCSAC008](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCSAC008) | Work collaboratively and respectfully with school age children |
| [CHCSAC009](https://training.gov.au/training/details/CHCSAC009) | Support the holistic development of children in school age care |
| [HLTAID012](https://training.gov.au/training/details/HLTAID012) | Provide First Aid in an education and care setting |
| [HLTFSE001](https://training.gov.au/training/details/HLTFSE001) | Follow basic food safety practices |
| [HLTWHS001](https://training.gov.au/training/details/HLTWHS001) | Participate in workplace health and safety |

The four RTOs delivering the course also require completion of three electives. All four of the RTOs choose these three electives from a selection of five elective units.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Unit Code** | **Elective Unit Title** |
| BSBPEF201  |  Support personal wellbeing in the workplace  |
| CHCDIV001  |  Work with diverse people  |
| CHCDIV002  | Promote Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural safety  |
| CHCMHS007  | Work effectively in trauma informed care  |
| CHCPRP003  | Reflect on and improve own professional practice  |

To ensure effective transition, a functional analysis was completed to examine the current content and structure of the accredited course, along with the needs of the workforce across the sector. This included conducting desktop research by reviewing information on industry standards, working conditions, and employer recruitment selection criteria, conducting interviews with over 20 employers from every state and territory across Australia, and undertaking two virtual workshops with OSHC workers to explore job role skills, map career pathways, and consider the impacts of foreseeable changes in the sector.

The Functional Analysis identified clear alignment between job skills required in the sector and units of competency in the nationally accredited course *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care.* Analysis of findings suggests:

* More cross sector career pathways would likely improve attraction to the qualification, given cross sector employment exists across teaching assistants, early childhood educators and workers in outside school hours care.
* The current units were well aligned with the job role requirements of the sector, with some gaps in topics, such as supporting complex behaviours and needs, trauma informed practice, inclusion and neurodiversity.
* The number of work placement hours in the Nationally accredited *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* is a barrier to course attraction and completion.
* Although the units matched the overall job role requirements, the levels of responsibility and qualification requirements varied extensively from one jurisdiction to the next.

The content and complexity of the course are more aligned with an AQF Certificate IV level qualification.

As such, the decision was made to enter consultation to explore recommendations regarding potential unit swaps, increasing cross sector pathways, reducing work placement hours (in line with current unit requirements), and transitioning the course to an AQF level 4.

Recommendations proposed

Relevant findings and proposed recommendations were presented to the Technical Committee, which was established to provide specialised advice, and the final [functional analysis report](https://humanability.com.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/Projects/OSHC/OSHC%20Functional%20Analysis%20Report.pdf) was published on the HumanAbility website. The findings and proposed recommendations from the functional analysis report, as well as a draft qualification, were presented at 15 public consultation workshops from March 27th to May 6th in every state and territory across Australia, as well as online. These workshops and an associated online survey offered opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback on the proposed recommendations outlined below.

**Recommendation 1a**: Replace *CHCCCS009 Facilitate responsible behaviour* with *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour* as a core unit.

Justification:

* The current unit of competency:
* includes terminology which is irrelevant and inappropriate in an OSHC context such as ‘imprisonment’ and ‘constraint’
* is not specific to working with school-aged children
* focuses on behaviours of concern and conflict resolution but does not include positive behaviour support techniques, trauma-informed practice, inclusion support, or neurodiversity

**Recommendation 1b:** Replace *CHCLEG001 Work legally and ethically with CHCEDS033 Meet legal and ethical obligations in an education support environment* as a core unit.

Justification:

* The current unit of competency
* is general in nature across the whole of community services
* is not specific to working with school-aged children

These suggested replacement units were recommended due to their closer alignment with the education support sector and the age groups cared for in OSHC. There were no Outside School Hours Care units available that met the skills and knowledge required for the sector or addressed the terminology issues identified in existing units.

**Recommendation 2a:** Include three required electives in the qualification.

Justification:

* RTOs with *10983 Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* on scope currently administer the course with 12 core units and 3 elective units, and assert 3 is adequate. Analysis of the combination of required and elective units indicated good coverage of the skills and knowledge required by the sector, apart from some gaps identified above in a required unit of competency.

**Recommendation 2b:** Include three required electives in the qualification, chosen from the five listed electives that are currently offered by RTOs with *10983NAT* on scope.

Justification:

* The three electives have all been chosen in varying combinations from 5 units, which RTOs indicated were well aligned. Analysis conducted during the functional analysis research and mapping also suggested the current selection of units provided good coverage to the skills and knowledge required by industry.

**Recommendation 2c:** Include three required electives in the qualification, chosen from the wider *CHC Community Services Training Package*.

Justification:

* Widening elective choices promotes flexibility for RTOs and their local communities. While the five electives currently delivered align well to industry needs some issues were identified. For example, RTOs suggested that *CHCMHS007 Work effectively in trauma informed care* was difficult to assess in an OSHC context. They also suggested that the relevance and appropriateness of *CHCDIV002 Promote Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural safety* varied in different communities. There was also suggestion that access to a learning framework unit or units in development for younger children could also be beneficial in some contexts.

**Recommendation 3:** Require at least 160 workplace hours in the qualification.

Justification:

* The requirements for two units CHCSAC006 Support children to participate in school age care and CHCSAC009 Support the holistic development of children in school age care state that students must:
*perform the activities outlined in the performance criteria of this unit during a period of at least 160 hours of work with school age children in a regulated children’s education and care service.*

**Recommendation 4a:** Add instructions/guidelines for RTOs into the CHC Companion Volume to assist with the implementation *of CHCEDSXXX* units that contain wording such as ‘teacher’, ‘the role of an education support worker’, and ‘students in a school’.

Justification:

* Terminology used in *CHCEDS049 Supervise students outside the classroom* as well as the proposed replacement units *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour* and *CHCEDS033 Meet legal and ethical obligations in an education* support environment need to be addressed to ensure compliance is met for RTOs who will deliver the qualification.

**Recommendation 4b:** Add industry information into the *CHC Companion Volume* on skills required at different career levels.

Justification:

* Industry mapping of skills supports RTOs in the development of training and assessment strategies, clustering and sequencing of units.

**Recommendation 5:** List the qualification as a *Certificate IV* in *Outside School Hours Care*.

Justification:

A review of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) level criteria suggests that the complexity of skills, knowledge, and autonomy required in this qualification may be more appropriately classified at Level 4 rather than Level 3.

Consultation

Public consultation workshops were attended by a total of 117 stakeholders from associations, community education providers, employers (large/medium/small), government agencies, group training organisations, higher education, peak bodies, RTOs (enterprise/public/private), state/territory training authorities, and suppliers.

Workshops were held in Hervey Bay, Brisbane, Cairns, Canberra, Devonport, Hobart, Wollongong, Darwin, Melbourne, Berri, Adelaide, and Perth. Three online sessions were offered and two were successfully conducted. The second of the three sessions was cancelled due to technical issues, with a replacement session offered to those registered, but there was no response.

Attendees were presented with an overview of the Functional Analysis process and relevant findings. The draft qualification, recommendations and justifications were outlined, and participants were then invited to complete an online survey to provide their feedback. The online survey was made available on the HumanAbility website and attendees were encouraged to share information from the workshops and the online survey with their colleagues and other relevant stakeholders.

Overall, there were 75 individuals who completed the online survey, of which 52 self-identified as being from public, private or enterprise training providers. The remainder of the respondents indicated they were employers or representatives of state or federal government agency or department, relevant peak body or association, supplier, or community education provider. For each recommendation, the online survey asked whether respondents supported it and allowed an option for additional feedback on the option and for the qualification in general.

Survey outcomes, analysis, and resulting changes to the qualification are outlined in the next sections, along with supporting feedback.

Replacement of two core units

**Recommendation 1a**: Replace *CHCCCS009 Facilitate responsible behaviour* with *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour* as a core unit.

**Recommendation 1b**: Replace *CHCLEG001 Work legally and ethically* with *CHCEDS033 Meet legal and ethical obligations in an education support environment* as a core unit.

When asked about the proposed replacement of two core units, 93% of the 75 survey respondents supported replacing *CHCCCS009 Facilitate responsible behaviour* with *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour* as a core unit, and 87% of the 75 survey respondents supported replacing *CHCLEG001 Work legally and ethically* with *CHCEDS033 Meet legal and ethical obligations in an education support environment* as a core unit. Stakeholders provided strong supportive feedback that these two replacement units contained essential skills and knowledge for OSHC workers, such as trauma-informed care and an education-focused approach to behaviour management.

Some surveyed stakeholders commented that these replacement units, although originally designed for education support workers, appropriately reflect the context, content, and language of the OSHC environment. Some respondents recommended addressing the wording ‘teacher’ and ‘students in a school’ as found in *CHCEDS049 Supervise students outside the classroom* and the two recommended replacement units, and indicated their support for recommendation 4a that addresses this issue.

**Recommendation 4a**: Add instructions/guidelines for RTOs into the *CHC Companion Volume* to assist with the implementation of *CHCEDSXXX* units that contain wording such as ‘teacher’, ‘the role of an education support worker’, and ‘students in a school’.

In the surveys, stakeholders expressed their support of these replacement units: “*These (units) align to the qualifications better than the previous ones.*”

“*I support the replacement of CHCCCS009 with CHCEDS061, as it provides a more education-focused approach to behaviour management, aligning with the role of education support workers.*”

Seven of the 75 surveyed stakeholders expressed concerns that these units were not appropriate as education support environments are not under the list of ACECQA regulated services and wouldn’t meet the requirements of an OSHC environment. Some proposed an alternative, suggesting OSHC specific units be developed, as although the education support units were more aligned with OSHC than the current units, there are significant differences in the roles, regulations, environments, language, and many other aspects between education support and OSHC. Although the number of stakeholders that expressed these concerns was low, this issue is significant as it highlights the lack of relevant units available to support the OSHC workforce and consideration of the development of new units may be required. Some stakeholders believed “*None of these are fit for purpose, create sector focused UOCs.*”

“*I believe we would have much better outcomes nationally if this qualification were reviewed and updated as part of a broader, in-depth review of the ECEC qualifications. ECEC and OSHC both sit under the 'Children's Education and Care' umbrella from a legislative perspective, so identifying commonalities in knowledge and skill would be much easier. In addition, clear AQF pathways, or 'streams' at the same AQF level could be considered. I think that in order to have a robust, well utilised fit for purpose (nationally) qualification, it needs to be considered in the context of a broader review.*”

“*While CHCEDS061 is school-focused, CHCCCS009 provides a broader and more flexible foundation in behaviour guidance that applies across various care settings, including OSHC, early childhood, and community services. It supports the autonomy required of OSHC educators, who often work without direct supervision from teaching staff. CHCCCS009 also reinforces sector-wide behaviour guidance principles rather than school-specific approaches, making it more transferable and aligned with the diverse contexts OSHC educators may work in. Replacing it could limit the qualification’s versatility and fail to reflect the distinct professional identity of OSHC educators.*”

“*The proposed units appear to align more closely with school-based education support roles and do not fully reflect the distinct regulatory, pedagogical, and operational requirements of OSHC services. These differences are significant and cannot be overlooked. Without the flexibility to adapt unit content and assessment to suit the unique realities of OSHC environments, there is a real risk that the qualification will fail to prepare educators adequately for the sector. This could ultimately undermine the quality of training provided and erode the confidence and capability of educators entering the OSHC workforce.*”

Increased alignment with education support was noticed by some surveyed stakeholders who commented on the inclusion of additional units from school-based education support qualifications, acknowledging improved career and study pathways. A small number of other units from ECEC and the wider *CHC Community Services Training Package* were suggested as other possible replacements or additions, but this was not supported by more than 1-2 stakeholders.

Specific issues of concern include the need for more review time for new sector-specific units to be developed and written. Some stakeholders maintained that a Certificate III level would be more beneficial as an entry-level qualification citing concerns such as student attraction. Stakeholders also recommended comprehensive view of the Outside School Hours Care qualifications along with a review of the early childhood qualifications to ensure alignment.

**Recommended actions**:

1. *Write a new unit to replace the recommended CHCEDS033 Meet legal and ethical obligations in an education support environment* that is more aligned to the OSHC workforce and context than the current *CHCLEG001 Work legally and ethically*
2. Write a new unit to replace the recommended *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour* unit in the course so it aligns with the OSHC sector and covers industry required content not currently in *CHCCCS009 Facilitate responsible behaviour.*

AND

1. *Progress an Activity Submission for a full review of the OSHC qualifications in the November round.*

Electives

**Recommendation 2a**: Include three required electives in the qualification.

**Recommendation 2b**: Include three required electives in the qualification, chosen from the five listed electives that are currently offered by RTOs with *10983NAT* on scope.

**Recommendation 2c**: Include three required electives in the qualification, chosen from the wider *CHC Community Services Training Package*.

Currently, *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* has 12 core units. RTOs currently delivering this qualification have also chosen to include three electives. Across the four RTOs currently delivering, the three electives have all been chosen in varying combinations from 5 units. During the functional analysis, RTOs indicated that three electives were an appropriate number for the qualification, and the five electives currently being administered by the RTOs with *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* on scope were well aligned with the job skills required for the sector. As a result, following advice from the Technical Committee and the knowledge that opportunities to increase pathways were important, stakeholders were asked about the number of electives and options for elective choices.

Stakeholders strongly favoured the inclusion of three required electives in the qualification, with 88% of respondents in support of this recommendation. When asked about which units should be included as electives, 81% of respondents supported the five listed electives that are currently offered by RTOs with *10983NAT* *Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* on scope, and 96% of respondents support three electives chosen from the wider *CHC Community Services Training Package*.

There were additional units recommended, mainly from across the wider *CHC Community Services Training Package,* to be included as electives; none were suggested by more than 1-2 respondents. However, this may have been impacted by participants’ knowledge of the broader training package. As such, the suggested units should be considered by the technical committee for inclusion in the recommended elective list:

* *CHCECE054 Encourage understanding of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples' cultures* (to replace *CHCDIV002 Promote Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural safety* on the recommended electives list)
* *CHCECE037 Support children to connect with the natural environment*

High number of stakeholders support these options to include electives (as indicated above); many commented that providing a greater choice of elective units in the qualification improves study and career pathways, builds workforce capacity, and supports greater diversity of learners. They also agree that allowing electives to be chosen enabling RTOs and potentially even students more choice and flexibility, and greater capacity to adapt the qualification to individual student, community, and industry needs.

One stakeholder reinforced this position, expressing “*Providing a wider scope of elective choices from ECEC, Education Support and Community Services qualifications offers an attractive transition of qualified persons from these sectors into OSHC. With these persons comes a greater diversity of employees and builds workforce capacity for OSHC. This would be seen as advantageous to OSHC accessing a wider 'pool' of qualified employees.*”

Another stakeholder agreed, stating “*The opening of the electives to wider CHC units aligns with place-based training solutions, some regional areas may have specific needs and would also address some differing State/Territory requirements.*”

During the functional analysis, RTOs with the qualification on scope indicated that the current five listed electives align with the skills and knowledge required in OSHC and should not be removed. The five electives currently offered by the RTOs with the qualification on scope include:

* BSBPEF201 Support personal wellbeing in the workplace
* CHCDIV001 Work with diverse people
* CHCDIV002 Promote Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural safety
* CHCMHS007 Work effectively in trauma informed care
* CHCPRP003 Reflect on and improve own professional practice

This feedback was considered, along with the almost unanimous support for allowing electives to be chosen from the wider *CHC Community Services Training Package*.

**Recommended actions**:

1. Packaging rules of the qualification when it is transitioned into the *CHC Community Services Training Package*:
2. To require 12 core and 3 elective units
3. To state electives may be chosen from the wider CHC Community Services Training Package
4. To list the five listed electives that are currently offered by RTOs with 10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care on scope as recommended electives:
* BSBPEF201 Support personal wellbeing in the workplace
* CHCDIV001 Work with diverse people
* CHCDIV002 Promote Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural safety
* CHCMHS007 Work effectively in trauma informed care
* CHCPRP003 Reflect on and improve own professional practice
1. Present the additional electives suggested during consultation for the technical committee to provide advice on adding these to the recommended list in the qualification.
2. *CHCECE054 Encourage understanding of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples' cultures* (to replace *CHCDIV002 Promote Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural safety* on the recommended electives list)
3. *CHCECE037 Support children to connect* with the natural environment

Workplace hours

**Recommendation 3a**: Require at least 160 workplace hours in the qualification.

The *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* currently includes 320 workplace hours, which is above and beyond the compliance requirements of the mandatory workplace hours for the units of competency contained in the CHC Training Package. Two core units (*CHCSAC006 Support children to participate in school age care and CHCSAC009 Support the holistic development of children in school age care)* require assessment of the elements and performance criteria *during a period of at least 160 hours of work with school age children in a regulated children’s education and care service*.

During consultation workshops and in survey responses, RTO representatives indicated that this is a significant barrier for both students and the RTO. Survey feedback was consistent with their reasons – 320 hours is too many hours for a Certificate III, too hard to complete in an OSHC environment due to short and split shifts and takes too long for students to complete which often leads to disengagement. Stakeholder consultation confirmed that 160 hours would be more achievable for learners and is more closely aligned with workplace requirements in other relevant Certificate III or IV level qualifications.

Stakeholders strongly agreed this is a “*Great recommendation. 320 hours is too high to ask for a Certificate III when Diplomas have less required hours. From a business perspective, it is more difficult for people to do 320 hours of placement when we run shorter shifts and would take longer to accumulate the hours.*” “*As a Cert III Qual, it links well with the minimum requirement of 160 hours for the Cert III in ECEC. This also links to what is stated in the two Units CHCSA006 and CHCSAC009.*”

While 88% of respondents supported the requirement of at least 160 workplace hours in the qualification, several stakeholders, including RTOs currently delivering the qualification, stated that 160 hours is still too high. Some stakeholders stated that 160 hours is too many when there are only two units in the qualification that require work placement hours (not including any proposed replacement units), and 100-120 hours was recommended by some. Stakeholders from remote regions of Australia cautioned that students in some remote areas may still struggle to complete 160 hours.

Some stakeholders from remote areas cautioned that “*Remote areas will struggle to complete these hours which will diminish the chance of students gaining qualifications*” and “*Work placement hours serve as a barrier particularly in remote NT locations without regulated services.*” However, this feedback was not from RTOs with *10983NAT Certificate III in Outside School Hours Care* on scope in remote areas. Stakeholders from RTOs that do offer the course in remote areas did support 160 hours, stating “This would be in line with OSHC [requirements]”. Further feedback confirmed that 160 hours is achievable by students in rural and remote regions studying *CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care: “I work with Trainees and Apprentices in rural and remote regions. The employers I work with want the students to complete the Certificate III in ECEC as it gives them more scope for working”.*

There were also some concerns regarding the wording ‘at least’, which could allow RTOs or students to challenge the need to undertake any additional hours. A small number of stakeholders advised that it could be difficult to assess individual units that share the 160 hours, and some were concerned that there could be issues with auditors’ interpretation of ‘minimum’ hours.

**Recommended actions**:

1. Require at least 160 workplace hours in the qualification, assessed across two core units

Companion Volume inclusions

**Recommendation 4a**: Add instructions/guidelines for RTOs into the *CHC Companion Volume* to assist with implementation of *CHCEDSXXX* units that contain wording such as ‘teacher’, ‘the role of an education support worker’, and ‘students in a school’.

**Recommendation 4b**: Add industry information into the *CHC Companion Volume* on skills required at different career levels.

Stakeholders strongly supported the recommended inclusions to the *CHC Companion Volume*, with 95% in support of including industry information on skills required at different career levels. Additionally, 92% supported adding instructions or guidelines to assist with the implementation of *CHCEDSXXX* units that contain wording such as ‘teacher’, ‘education support worker’, and ‘students in a school’. This wording reflects education support environments and is used in the two *CHCEDSXXX* units proposed in recommendations 1a and 1b. However, this wording is already present in the core unit *CHCEDS049 Supervise children outside the classroom* and should be addressed regardless of whether recommendation 1a and/or 1b is adopted:

“*Assessment must ensure access to students in a school*” and “*the unit applies to education support workers*”.

There were no major concerns regarding the wording of ‘students in a school’ as the OSHC environment is so close in most cases to the education support environment. Not only are OSHC services often located in schools or on, adjacent to, or nearby school grounds, but the children attending OSHC services are inherently ‘students’ attending outside of school hours care. In addition, OSHC educators are increasingly working across both OSHC services and in education support worker roles during school hours, so they would work with children while they are ‘students’ at school and ‘children’ before and after school.

Stakeholders did not raise any significant concerns regarding the use of the word ‘teacher’. This wording does not indicate a qualified teacher but refers to the lead or supervising educator in an OSHC service or education support environment. For example, ‘teacher’ is used in the performance criteria of *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour* to identify who the responsible person in the workplace is. This does not refer to a specific role of or level of qualification held by an educator, but rather the person to whom issues of behaviour should be reported: “3.2 Identify areas of concern and discuss with teacher.” In an education support environment, the ‘teacher’ may be a qualified teacher or senior teaching assistant, or in an OSHC service, this may be the lead educator or room leader.

One stakeholder shared, “*Within the replacement units comes job role terminology that differs from OSHC, e.g., 'teacher', 'primary school environment'. Including alternative meanings to the Companion Guide will assist in advising RTOs and OSHC services how these imported units remain valid to the OSHC job roles and environments.*”

Stakeholders agreed that these types of instructions or guidelines would make it easier for students to identify who their supervisor is in the workplace. Several stakeholders also recommended that sector relevant definitions and acronyms be included in the *CHC Companion Volume* to support this clarification.

One issue raised by a few stakeholders is that the *CHC Companion Volume* is not endorsed or accepted by ASQA, so it may not support RTOs in an audit. As explained by an RTO stakeholder “*The companion volume cannot be considered endorsed and does not support us in an audit.*”

Although the number of stakeholders not in support of replacing the two EDS units with context in the companion volume was low, their concerns are worth noting.

Rather than replacing units, writing new units aligned to OSHC and to replace *CHCEDS049 Supervise children outside the classroom* would reduce reliance on contextual information in the companion volume and aligns with earlier discussions around ensuring the qualification is fit for purpose.

Almost all stakeholders support the inclusion of industry information in the *CHC Community Services Companion Volume* outlining the skills required at different career levels. They noted this would be very helpful for RTOs in developing course structures, mapping career pathways for prospective and current students, and delivering the qualification effectively. Some said this information may vary from state to state. One RTO stakeholder shared that “*Both are great resources for RTOs to use and refer to when creating their course structure and advertise career pathways to potential students. Supports to provide a more holistic view of the course they aim to deliver - securing employment. Future education pathways should also be included.*”

Additional feedback was received, including recommendations for further information that could be beneficial to include in the *CHC Companion Volume*:

“*1. Clear OSHC Contextualisation Guidance*

*Examples of how units can be contextualised for OSHC settings (e.g. duty of care in after-school programs vs. classroom)*

*Differentiation between school-based education support and education and care services*

*Sample workplace scenarios specific to OSHC (e.g. managing mixed-age groups, split shifts, transitions)*

*2. Mapping to Sector-Specific Frameworks*

*Explicit alignment to My Time Our Place (MTOP)*

*Explanation of how the National Quality Standard (NQS) and Education and Care Services National Regulations apply to OSHC*

*References to child-safe standards and legislative obligations in each state/territory*

*3. Assessment Advice for Diverse Services*

*Guidance for services with single staff, no on-site supervisor, or limited capacity for direct observation*

*Options for collecting third-party evidence, video-based observation, or simulated tasks where appropriate*

*Inclusion of holistic assessment strategies to reduce over-assessment*

*4. Workplace Suitability Guidelines*

*Clear descriptors of what constitutes a suitable OSHC work placement (e.g. must operate under the NQF, with a qualified supervisor)*

*Advice for traineeships and non-traditional OSHC models (e.g. vacation care-only settings)*

*5. Foundation Skills and LLN Support*

*Strategies to support learners with language, literacy, and numeracy needs, without compromising competency*

*Tips for differentiated delivery and use of visual, oral, and practical learning methods”*

**Recommended actions**:

1. Write a new unit within the OSHC context to replace *CHCEDS061 Support responsible student behaviour*
2. Write new units to replace *CHCCCS009 Facilitate responsible behaviour* and *CHCLEG001 Work legally and ethically* that are more aligned to the OSHC context and include required content not covered in the existing units
3. Include industry information on skills required at different career levels in the *CHC Companion Volume*
4. Include additional information on OSHC specific contexts

Qualification AQF level

**Recommendation 5**: List the qualification as a *Certificate IV* in *Outside School Hours Care*.

Recommendation 5 regarding the AQF level of the qualification generated significant discussion during the consultation workshops and participants were advised to record all their feedback in the survey responses. Although 65% of respondents indicated that they support listing the qualification as a *Certificate IV in Outside School Hours Care*, this does not represent a clear consensus. Many stakeholders who supported designating the qualification at a AQF 4 level included comments in their feedback that:

* did not indicate full support,
* lacked clarity on the options,
* included stipulations or recommended changes for the qualification to accurately reflect this level.

Similarly, many stakeholders who answered ‘no’ to this question were also accompanied with comments that indicated the respondent was undecided or also included stipulations or suggestions for the qualification to remain at the AQF 3 level.

Note: Although issues related to funding are not factors of consideration when deciding AQF level, it’s clear from the survey feedback that funding implications had a significant influence on stakeholder response to the question of AQF level.

Many stakeholders stated that listing the qualification as the AQF 4 level would significantly jeopardise the current funding in several states and territories, impacting students currently completing the qualification and potentially greatly lowering the number of future applicants. Some stakeholders simply said that they supported the qualification being listed at the AQF 4 level, but would want advocacy for funding to support its implementation with RTOs and schools.

Many stakeholders believe “*It’s a dilemma because educators should be valued for their skills and paid accordingly. However, making the qualification a Certificate IV could impact HLSP funding for those wanting to pursue a Diploma or even some university qualifications covered under HLSP. Some people take a qualification when they have the time and funding available, but if they feel it could jeopardise their chances of receiving Diploma funding later, they may hesitate to enrol. This could also result in a shortage of more qualified professionals due to the lack of available funding.*”

“*I would support a Cert III providing there is available funding to support students studying the course. My concern is that if there is no funding students will opt to go with a Cert III in Early Childhood instead and then we are not training the workforce for OSHC. I realise we shouldn't consider funding over qual levels but think that we need to advocate for funding.*”

“*Very concerned about the impact for South Australia on the OSHC sector. Cert III in Out of School Hours Care is a very well-known and embedded qualification used in SA OSHC services. New students may be intimidated undertaking a Cert IV in comparison to other child care and community-based courses at Cert III level. Cert III could be adjusted accordingly rather than reclassifying to Cert IV. Cert III is currently listed as a fee free course and is likely to continue to be funded due to staffing shortages. Unknown impact on salaries and costs for OSHC services.*”

The issue of traineeships in schools was raised alongside the topic of funding, with some stakeholders expressing concerns that the qualification may not be offered by schools if it is listed at a Certificate IV level, which would impact future workforce capacity. Schools being unwilling to offer a Certificate IV level qualification was also raised as a concern regarding it being ‘harder to fill’ from an RTO perspective. In relation to the risk of further affecting workforce capacity needs, stakeholders, particularly from RTOs, expressed significant concerns that raising the AQF level could lead to an additional shortage of workers due to decreased enrolment. An opposing view emerged in some survey responses, with certain stakeholders suggesting that elevating the AQF level would contribute to a stronger workforce for the sector. Some stakeholders felt strongly that the qualification “*should be Cert 3 level. Make it more accessible to everyone and assist in keeping educators in the industry.”*

“*This is base level knowledge for effective work in the sector and it should not create a perception that is something more.*”

“*I believe the qualification should be at Cert 3 level as this gives a platform to understanding the requirements before attempting to start studying the diploma and should be a prerequisite to the diploma.*”

Looking at the qualification level specifically in the OSHC sector, there was support from some stakeholders to keep the qualification as a Certificate III as they believe it is the most appropriate for an entry-level qualification into the sector, and others that support raising it to a Certificate IV as this level is seen as more professional and may give better ‘status’ to the sector. Some said Certificate IIIs are operational (entry-level) which suits the majority of OSHC educator roles available, and Certificate IVs are leadership and more advanced for senior or moving into management roles. As outlined above even with the 65% in support of a Certificate IV participants noted caveats and reservations related to this preference.

Some stakeholders stated that the qualification level should be appropriate to and reflect the nature of the OSHC environment, work hours, and staff attraction and retention, which they agreed was a Certificate III level as it is more accessible and achievable. There were also some that compared this qualification with *CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care*, stating they should both be entry-level qualifications at the AQF 3 level. However, some stakeholders in the consultation workshops and survey responses pointed out that they don’t believe *CHC30121* is at the AQF 3 level and should be raised as well.

There were many responses that discussed the actual content and structure of the qualification, most of which believed the current qualification is at the AQF 4 level as it was originally developed at that level, and that students should be recognised for the level of qualification that they completed. Some stakeholders stated they believed the current qualification is accurately listed as a Certificate III, others suggested altering the structure or removing ‘higher’ level units to keep the qualification at the AQF 3 level. There were a few that suggested there should be OSHC qualifications at both the AQF 3 and 4 level to allow both entry-level and more advanced level options for students.

Relevant feedback included stakeholders who agree that “*The OSHC qualification that was deleted was a Certificate IV level qualification. Looking through the units that currently make up the accredited Certificate IV qualification it is clear that it meets the requirements for a Cert IV level qualification. If this qualification was to be endorsed as a Certificate III level qualification that it is perpetuating the ‘aspirational’ qualification such as the Certificate III ECEC and the Certificate III Individual Support. These qualifications are known for being too complex to be Certificate III qualifications.*”

“*The units lend themselves to this AQF level. I think it would be worthwhile developing a Certificate III qualification with reduced units.*”

“*There should be a Cert 3 and Cert 4 on offer to resolve the existing error.*”

A few responses contained feedback specific to the stakeholder’s state or territory, such as comments from WA respondents who believe the qualification is unlikely to be accepted as a ‘first qualified’ qualification in its current form as a Certificate III. The reason for this was that the qualification does not include capabilities required for a ‘first qualified’ educator, such as leadership and management skills.

Due to this extensive feedback with significantly opposing views on the issue of the AQF level of the qualification, a clear outcome has not been obtained from the consultation. Further consultation is therefore required to pursue an appropriate outcome. Developing new replacement units aligned to a Certificate III level would enable the qualification to be added to the *CHC Community Services Training Package*. Following this, an activity submission to review the OSHC qualifications alongside the ECEC qualifications could be prepared and submitted for the November round. This process could explore the review and development based on qualification levels required for the sector, any potential skill sets and pathway opportunities.

**Recommended actions**:

1. Review the 4 units currently aligned to an AQF level 4 and consider which of the four to replace with writing new units more aligned AQF level 3. The four units are listed below.

*CHCSAC006 Support children to participate in school-age care*

*CHCSAC007 Develop and implement play and leisure experiences in school-age care*

*CHCSAC008 Work collaboratively and respectfully with school-age children*

*CHCSAC009 Support the holistic development of children in school-age care*

1. Consider writing a new unit to replace the existing *CHCEDS049 Supervise children outside the classroom* unit in the accredited course to resolve language compliance issues raised.
2. Consider removing *CHCLEG001 Work legally and ethically* and *CHCCCS009 Facilitate responsible behaviour* and writing where required new replacement units more aligned to the OSHC sector and the skill and knowledge gaps identified in the Functional Analysis research.
3. Write a new activity submission to review the OSHC Diploma qualifications. This review could also consider the need for a Certificate IV level qualification or skill set to support jurisdictions requiring this for the work context.