Recognition of Prior Learning Pilot Project Review Paper - 2006

Recognition of Prior Learning has been a central policy goal of the National Qualifications Framework since before the establishment of SAQA. However, while all accredited providers have RPL policies, there have to date been relatively few projects or organizations that have actually conducted RPL assessments. This will change in 2006/7 as all SETAs invest resources in achieving their RPL targets and many sectors race toward "qualifying" current practitioners to meet new regulatory requirements.

Research into RPL in South Africa and elsewhere has consistently raised a set of concerns about the practice. In the race toward targets, there is a real risk of RPL projects failing to integrate these concerns. If this happens, RPL itself may be undermined as a policy goal, as employers and learners come to regard qualifications achieved through RPL as inferior in status.

The Institute of People Development recently piloted an RPL model for workplace trainers and vocational educators to achieve a qualification in Occupation-Directed ETD Practices. With an eye on the emerging quality assurance relationships between the Council for Higher Education and the SETA ETQAs, IPD set out specifically to identify the concerns around RPL and to explore options for addressing these. Some of the key lessons learned will be shared here today.

The first step in good assessment design is analyzing the target audience. Until about ten years ago, courses aimed at workplace trainers consisted of little more than two-day train-the-trainer courses. Most workplace trainers accordingly developed their skills on the job. In addition, they did so often before there was an NQF or a skills development strategy. Yet the OD-ETDP qualifications and standards require that participants demonstrate the competence in the context of an outcomes-based workplace training system. This could be understood to mean that almost nobody is eligible for RPL.

To design a fit-for-purpose (good practice) RPL assessment, IPD needed to avoid the simplistic matching of evidence to outcomes. The assessment process itself needed to be developmental, helping candidates to:

- Recontextualize existing competencies in new policy environments.
- Develop a sense of the community of practice in which they operate.
- Refresh or develop their foundational (theoretical) competence.
- Develop the reflexive (meta-thinking) competence required.

The model therefore provided retrospective logbooks in which candidates mapped the evidence they could provide against the outcomes of the qualification. This was then used as a basis for guided interrogation, reflection and actual study tasks and/or "challenge" assignments.

Most experienced trainers have loads of industry expertise, but they lack education & training as well as contextual expertise. It is for this reason they need to obtain a formal qualification to prove they are competent trainers. Succession planning at a systems / sector level is also required to develop and retain education leadership; we find there is a strong case for a level 6 post-graduate qualification In OD-ETD Practices, and encourage SAQA not to delay the registration thereof.

South African unit standards and qualifications in many cases are generally so badly written that they don't adequately describe criteria relating to good work or practice, so we still may need to surface these criteria from our own thinking. This is because we are in the early stages of standards setting and over a period of time these tend to become more refined. Standards generating internationally starts off with apriorised standards where a team of people sit around a table and make up the standard, and over a period of years this moves toward posteriorised standards; that is where actual practice is reviewed and the standards are refined. We are only just starting to do this in South Africa now.

The Accelerated Growth Initiative of South Africa (ASGISA) aims to invest R 380 billion in targeted economic sector developments. The JIPSA skills development programmes alongside the National Skills Development Strategy and Sector Skills Plans intend funneling a significant amount of investment in scarce skills training over the next few years. Chasing any substantial target with under qualified or inexperienced resources will almost always compromise a project. Educational leadership in these identified sectors is particularly scarce itself and in some cases non-existent.

One significant tension is the ratio of contact learning time between trainer and learner as a percentage of the learning process. If a qualification at level 2 requires 128 credits or 1280 notional hours of learning, at only 30% of this being contact time, that would amount to: 384 hrs or at least 54 full days of training. There are not too many programmes on the market where the client is willing to pay for the high trainer fees associated with 54 training days! Not at any NQF level for that matter!

SAQA policies state that all assessments need to be integrated. My experience across the FET provider market is that this is not the case. The main reason for this I believe is that providers still have a `train the need against a unit standard' mentality and do not know how to develop a curriculum for a whole qualification(s) and then design integrated modules that support mobility and portability of credits for their learners.

R 21,9 billion is to be spent via the SETAs in the next 4 years – how will we know that it has been well spent? NSDS Success indicator 5.3 states, "By March 2010 there are measurable improvements in the quality of the services delivered by skills development institutions and those institutions responsible for implementation of the NQF/NSDS". All existing quality measurement are about how many enrolments, how many passed, etc. I think these are very poor measures of what learners are able to do. The intention of quality management is to measure the quality features throughout the learning process including impact of the training and ROI. Whilst this is not happening very well across the broader provider landscape, it is both a local and international issue across training providers.

In the rush to certificate learners en mass to meet equity and redress strategies; questions around integration, CCO's, fundamentals and currency of competence are high on the agenda.

Quality is a major concern right now and many models and complex means to measure quality will begin to emerge through the ETQAs; so providers will need to step up to the mark. The provider arena has become riddled with price sensitive buyers, but there is still no measure of value or quality transfer to workplace improvement. So what are they actually paying for?

An important concern raised by the higher education sector internationally is that RPL candidates often lack "graduateness" (Wheelahan 2002).

Critical analyses through locally and international research shows evidence that RPL candidates in some way or other tend not to cut it! One problem is the concern that RPL is simply giving away qualifications; that there is something that isn't being assessed. There is an Australian research report on the IPD learner library that refers to this; something is missing that is not being picked up. We intended not just picking this up through the process but also developing it, because RPL candidates tended not to have it.

The RPL process, methodology and approach that IPD designed for this project was fairly unique. It was most probably not the cheapest, easiest and shortest process available. It was, however, an innovative process, carefully designed to address the problems and criticisms associated with RPL in South Africa and the rest of the world.   At the end of this process we asked participants for their critical evaluation as to whether the RPL process was useful; whether it made a difference to them; achieved a completion and an integration of their competence; or whether it was simply a process of jumping through hoops to get a piece of paper.

Combined research shows that the FET training market in South Africa offers around 25,000 active trainers with an output capacity to serve around 625,000 learners in the country each year. This doesn't mean that they are any good or even great.   IPD conducted a targeted recruitment drive for level 5 trainers recently. 140 applications for a senior trainer position were received, but only two satisfied the evaluation criteria which included amongst others testing their experience and understanding of adult learning & teaching, OBE, integrated assessment, action-learning and RPL practices. This statistic signals out a set of very serious concerns:

- Around 13,500 active trainers are currently delivering learnerships and do not have a formal qualification in education and training practices; this questions validity and reliability of the learning provided.
- The ETDP SETA has accredited a whole sector of providers who have been delivering unit standards and qualifications in OD-ETD Practices for the past 4 years. According to the ETDQA last month, there were only a handful of legitimately registered assessors for the N. Dip in OD-ETD Practices; this questions professionalism of active trainers, and the legitimacy of the current train-the-trainer providers.
- If there are so few really competent trainers and the emphasis is on quality outcomes-based learning with billions of Rands thrown at our national skills shortage problem, when will the ETQA's make the qualifying of workplace trainers and raising educational leadership at provider level their highest priority?

An analogy that may illustrate the issue: We are to build a high quality passenger vehicle that will take us to a more productive, employable and entrepreneurial economy.   So we invest in building the roads (SETAs), the traffic laws and signage (SAQA & the ETQAs), the dashboard (assessors), the onboard computer (coaches & mentors), the outsourced specialist chassis designers (consultants) and even some of the passengers (learners), but the engine (providers) has not received much budget for redevelopment yet and the drivers are still unqualified to drive the car.   You can work out for yourselves what will happen around Chapman's Peak or on the N1 between Jhb & Pta for that matter.

IPD realized some two years back that to fast track meeting the demand to better resource the ETD market with qualified and competent ETD practitioners, RPL towards a Diploma in OD-ETD Practices would be the most appropriate strategy. We therefore conducted this pilot study and are now rolling out the RPL process to the target market as planned. To raise the educational leadership in particular those sectors earmarked by ASGISA, the PGC in OD-ETD Practices should be offered through a CPD model that will be launched by IPD later this year.

When designing the RPL process, we analyzed the target audience and asked what candidates were likely to come with and what were they likely to lack? The target audience for this qualification included public FET vocational educators, public sector workplace trainers, private FET provider trainers and private company training department personnel. The process and the tools were then designed to help them to build from what they already had to what they ultimately needed to demonstrate. The RPL process therefore assisted candidates by taking them through to completion; otherwise we would simply be assessing people as not yet competent.

In planning for this RPL process, we interrogated what were the problems in the OD-ETDP field in South Africa; what were the kinds of competence that most people had and what were the probable gaps. Common themes emerged showing that most people were unlikely to have operated within an outcome based framework, hence a challenge component was introduced as well as a set of online learner library resources. Secondly people were likely to lack professionalism as they operated with someone else's criteria as opposed to their own internalized criteria.

Fordist work practices had the thinkers who knew what was happening working at the top, and the doers working at the bottom of organizations. In most education systems around the world, this was seen where academic schools taught the thinkers and technical schools taught the doers, universities trained the thinkers, technikons trained the doers. The split between this head and hand philosophy came from Fordist thinking where management are to do the thinking and the workers the doing. There is an international shift away from these hierarchical structures, towards broad banding, flattening organizations, self-directed work teams, integration of thinking and doing and where workers are assuming more responsibility for driving their own work practices.

Most trainers come from a Fordist disposition where they were told what to do, they just did it and someone evaluated it. In future, to a greater extent trainers will need to figure out what to do themselves, manage their own work processes, evaluate their own performance, drive continuous improvement and make adaptations along the way. The IPD RPL process therefore intended modeling such a shift to remain in harmony with the kinds of changes taking place in organizations and to better equip trainers for the world of work.

The following assessment principles applied to the project, were derived from implementing OBET internationally:

- Cost-effectiveness
- Integrated assessment
- Avoiding atomism (losing the wholeness of competence)
- Assessment of essential embedded knowledge
- Assessing critical cross field outcomes

These principles come from:

- Technical concerns (validity and reliability)
- Political concerns (fairness)
- Concerns relating to implementing outcomes-based assessment systems (affordability, sufficiency)
- Specific requirements of learnerships in South Africa (integrated with work and learning)

Up until now, most people have seen a generic RPL process, so let's look at what was different about the IPD process. Firstly is the theory and practice of recognition of prior learning. Judy Harris, a widely regarded researcher from UCT, did the most breakthrough work in RPL internationally since the mid 1990's.

She summarized the 4 ways of doing RPL anywhere in the world and IPD tested these four types of RPL Practice in the project:

1. Firstly there were challenge processes – These were special projects undertaken to earn credits. For example, if someone said: "I can operate this machine!" there is no point asking them to gather testimonials or written evidence, when it makes more sense to say to them: "Well, here's the machine, show me!"   A challenge process was therefore a task they were given to establish if they could actually do the task.

2. Secondly there was portfolio development – individuals explored and interrogated their experience. To many, portfolios just represented a collection of evidence gathered. But in fact, the purpose of a portfolio was also to reflect on the evidence collected, interrogate experiences to see if they had met the criteria, note what was learned and what else could be learned to take forward a particular vocation? The difference with the RPL portfolio was that they needed to explore and interrogate the evidence they provided. They needed to demonstrate their ability to reflect on the lessons learned, describe the process through which they learned and explain the thinking behind why they did this in the way they did.

3. The third type of RPL practice used was the interactive interview. This was `highly individualized and often combined with other assessment methods'.  An interview alone would have related to `under-assessment' and have been insufficient to gather all the evidence of someone's competence, however the interview was the central factor in defining what other types of evidence should be provided and what assessment methods were most appropriate. For example during the RPL of a senior manager, who had many years of experience but no formal qualifications and employment practices disallowed a promotion without a registered qualification, a highly interactive interview process was used with a lot of discussion, backed up with various other assessments to test particular things where evidence was not that easily provided during the interview.

4. Finally, there were standardized tests. Whilst national tests like traditional exams are designed to test some outcomes, the United States offer more than 200 national standardized tests for RPL against various professional qualifications, including business, accounting and medicine, as opposed to candidates undergoing formal training programmes. IPD used a standardized admission testing process that evolved to be particularly useful for screening and streaming candidates.

Besides the actual qualifications the process covered, IPD designed a logbook and suggested participants gather and present the relevant evidence and record it in their logbook. Activity-based logbooks are normally used to document work experience over a period of time as it happens; however, we provided participants with a reflexive learning logbook that was used to reconstruct their work experience history gained over a number of previous years, in relation to each of the outcomes requirements of the OD-ETDP Qualifications. They therefore collected products developed and evidence of services they provided, noted how long they spent on them and what they learned through those experiences.

They also received an assessment plan. Based on the logbook that outlined what evidence they could easily provide us with, what evidence they needed to construct as well as the schedule for doing that. We needed a documented assessment plan containing the evidence they agreed to provide, a comprehensive integrated assessment guide, and a set of assessment rubrics that were used in the portfolio review were also developed through the process.

Performance is observable, but competence underpins performance. Competence can never be observed, it can only be inferred. Constructs are the hypotheses that we hold about competence. We infer their existence on the basis of evidence, but can never observe them directly.

When assessing competence, we are always assessing constructs. <u>Knowledge</u> is specified in the EEK, <u>skills</u> are specified in the SO's or ELO's, <u>affective factors</u> are specified in the "values", and <u>transfer</u> is specified in the range statements.   Unit standards do not always reflect constructs but whole qualifications do!

"If you are developing measures for a construct, you had better be fairly clear about what that construct is" – Wolf

Whilst this RPL process comprised both a drive down memory lane as well as a process of learning where candidates gathered and produced the evidence required to be achieve NQF credits, the following whole qualifications were included in the process:

1. NQF level 4 – National Certificate in OD-ETD Practices, or a
2. NQF level 5 – Higher Certificate in OD-ETD Practices, or a
3. NQF level 5 – National Diploma in OD-ETD Practices.

What you test is what you get…or is it? Almost all candidates included in the study had considerable experience; between 10 & 40 years in the field of workplace training.   Almost all were able to present outstanding evidence of their practical competence. As a result, at least some candidates were initially irritated with the process, as they had anticipated this would be a simple review of the evidence they would produce. During the final assessment interviews however, candidates almost universally focused on exactly the issues raised by the target audience analysis and addressed in the assessment design.

Even highly educated, sophisticated senior practitioners were initially unable to describe the theory underpinning their practice. As a result, their ability to formulate alternative ways of doing things was limited. One candidate reported "When you are in the work environment, you are put at a desk and told to do certain things, without always understanding why. The why, the thinking behind it…gives [you] the confidence to innovate. This process has done that for me…".

The same candidate compared herself to another colleague, also a candidate, who had a strong foundational competence: "[she] has like an internal fountain and she gains from this internal knowledge base, she goes there when she speaks". She spoke about never having had "a point of origin" for her own work in the same way.

Several candidates highlighted the importance of developing a sense of the community of practice. One illustrated the point by speaking about the training of skills development facilitators. She said, "Most SDFs go to training to fill in a form to get their money back. They leave understanding if they do it correctly thy can change their organization and make a difference to their sector, and make a difference to economic growth. That's so much more exciting for them…"

A surprisingly large number of candidates could present evidence against each individual outcome without being able to present any evidence that demonstrated the application of the competences in continuous role performance.   For example almost no needs analyses presented related to the assessment design.   Candidates therefore also highlighted the integration of competences. One argued that that "companies love to do course evaluations, but we don' t use them to improve the courses; the quality cycle is broken, instead of using the information to customize the programs to meet the learners needs…"

64 participants completed an RPL application containing key information required by the ETDQA and the National Learner Record Database so as to award and register credits for you on the National Qualifications Framework.

They then completed a more rigorous analysis of their entry-level requirements through an admission test or placement information questionnaire. This was a self-evaluation process where they supplied IPD with their CV, learning history and a self-analysis of their current competence. The results gave the RPL advisor a sense as to what qualification levels they may well be eligible for RPL. We used this to guide and stream candidates for an appropriate level qualification.

Candidates then received a preparation pack by email, confirming their choice of preparation workshop date, various electronic pre-study documents and the task of scrutinizing the criteria in the relevant qualification in preparation for their assessment

During the Preparation Workshop day, we provided 57 participants that arrived, a RPL Toolkit, clarified the RPL process with them and explained the theories that underpin RPL, the IPD policy and procedures for RPL and the range of qualifications they may apply for. We worked through the evidence requirements and criteria for assessment, started planning their portfolio and assessment schedule, provided them with a logbook to track their progress, and reviewed the Portfolio Review Workshop agenda, scheduled for six weeks later.

We set up a learner library with numerous research documents and reference materials that proved most useful to refresh their memories on certain subjects, do some research to support the challenges they were given and explain the theory behind why they do a needs analysis the way they do, what they think a curriculum is, different approaches & theories of adult learning, & so on.

Then there was the preparing the collection of all this historical evidence, using the logbook, portfolio guide and assessment guide provided. We encouraged them to demonstrate their ability to work on their own, in pairs & in groups as well as provide oral, written and non-verbal evidence.

IPD understood that RPL is not simply a process of matching of competence evidence to criteria; it is also supposed to be a developmental process. We found that 90% of the participants did not start with all the competences required. In many cases, people had lost an explicit understanding of their competence and needed to foreground a set of issues again. The Portfolio Review Workshop helped people to do just that, and only 36 candidates actually progressed to this stage. We facilitated peer evaluation tasks where people audited each other's work with a purpose of observing different ways of doing the things that they may have done in one particular way. It gave candidates a chance to look at the best samples of work from other candidates' evidence and to give them a chance to learn about alternative ways of doing things. We were able to cost-effectively review the collection of candidates' evidence, which we would otherwise only be able to do if we had visited each person in their respective workplace. This also served as a developmental approach to further enhance learning and provide guidance & support. We made it very clear they had to arrive with a completed portfolio, otherwise it would be unfair to others from whom they would learn from and that the others would not be able to learn from them. This was a process of personal and peer dialogue; everyone needed to contribute to the process as much as learn from it. At the end of the Review Workshop, candidates had a list of the revisions needed to complete their portfolio and were sent away to make those revisions. 34 candidates submitted their portfolios to the IPD assessment center and scheduled their assessment interview; all 34 were assessed.

The assessment had two components, firstly a written knowledge test and secondly an interactive interview where they were asked to explain the thinking behind what they did and why they did it, as well as to suggest alternative ways of doing it. In some cases, the assessor requested further evidence be supplied where the portfolio, challenge tasks or interview results did not provide sufficient evidence to declare competence. The purpose of the interview was largely to authenticate the evidence to ensure that what is submitted was their own work. (It is very difficult to answer questions about someone else's work.)

After the assessment, an assessment panel moderated the results. Participants not yet competent were provided specific feedback and were required to revise and re-submit. 33 participants were found competent against the N.Dip & 1 against the H.Cert. The results were sent to the ETDQA for endorsement, verification and certification. Unfortunately, there were significant administrative delays experienced at this stage due to sector level inefficiencies by the ETQA.

Throughout this project, we evaluated everything about the RPL process, the system and the tools we used. We also conducted various statistical analyses at various points in the process.

The RPL process started with a portfolio development process. Where there was certain evidence that was difficult to present in a portfolio, we set a challenge process for the candidates. Certain knowledge evidence was gathered through a written test and we rounded off the assessment with an interactive interview.

Supporting this is an educational philosophy for RPL that says: `Treat people as if they were what they ought to be, and you help them to become what they are capable of being'
For example: If you are teaching a child to play chess and the child does not want to learn to play chess, and you say to the child: `I will give you R 10 for every game you play me and if you play me and win, I will give you R 20. The child will play and they will play to win. But for as long as it depends on the R 20, they have every reason to cheat and no reason not to cheat. Now you would hope over a period of time that the child will learn to appreciate those things that make chess such a good game, like strategic imagination, competitive intensity, etc. Once they have internalized that, if they cheat then they are not cheating you, they are cheating themselves.

So for as long as we depend on qualifications or pay disbursements to get people to do what we want them to do, they have every reason to cheat and no reason not to cheat. They will do it but they will look for an opportunity to cheat. But the reason why you might still do it is because over a period of time you want those criteria to become internalized, you want them to become their criteria, and then if they cheat they are not cheating us, they are cheating themselves. That's about the development of what we call professionalism. In the South African ETD sector, we don't have a history of professionalism; of trainers having internalized values and the criteria by which good ETD takes place.

Nearly every education analysis speaks of the hidden curriculum: "The hidden curriculum refers to evidence that the way in which people are trained and assessed cultivates their approach to knowledge, learning and performance. Authoritarian training and assessment strategies cultivate subordinate dispositions. Participatory training and assessment strategies cultivate proactive dispositions. The Goethe quotation illustrates my belief that the assessment process itself could – and should be the most important developmental process for practitioners. Self awareness and self-understanding are at the heart of self-mastery; and these are best achieved through sophisticated versions of self-assessment".

Quite simply what I am saying here is, if assessment is a process of me assessing you; then I am doing something to you, and those criteria are my criteria. Psychologically, you don't own them. If you don't own them, you don't regulate your own values. When I am not there to assess you or your manager is not there to assess you, you end up doing whatever you feel. So this RPL assessment process needed to be a process of helping ETD practitioners to internalize the criteria by which they evaluated their own work.

We therefore critically interrogated individuals' own practice using their own criteria to evaluate the extent to which they lived up to their own expectations. And that was the developmental process through which they came to own the criteria by which they regulated what they did.

There are two approaches as to why portfolio development is used in assessment practices and how to go about it. Portfolio development 30 years ago took a self-oriented approach and has evolved into an outcomes-oriented approach over the years. The latter approach measures knowledge and skills more aptly, however the former approach measures affective factors like attitude, thinking dispositions, character and motivation. We are seeing a growing trend toward a combination of these two approaches in RPL practices today.

A self-oriented approach:

1. Putting the portfolio together is part of the learning and working process and as you complete tasks, these become items to be included in the portfolio.
2. Structured by sense of identity; in other words the kinds of issues you explore are not only narrowly defined by the assessment criteria and the unit standard outcomes, but extend to how did I feel when doing this? What were the factors that influenced me in the way I did this? Why did I do a sloppy job of this?
3. Self-explored as process including areas considered `private'. It is often said that if you have a persons' head and hand behind the desk, you do not have the whole person until you have their heart.
4. Focus on learning regardless of relevance; this could be something that is not obviously related to any of the outcomes. For example where you may learn something about yourself, like how you can become a better person.
5. And it is holistic

An outcomes-oriented approach to portfolio development include:

1. Portfolios as a product
2. It is structured by the qualification or the job
3. It presents only aspects relevant to the job or qualification
4. It focuses on lists of competencies relevant to the job
5. The portfolio is structured around a specific end purpose

There are only three types of evidence that can be collected; product, process and knowledge evidence. Now a portfolio provided good product evidence whilst a challenge process provided good process evidence; but neither of them provided good knowledge evidence, so a written test was necessary to achieve this.

Most psychometric testing has not been well evaluated in South Africa for validity; diversity and language differences have been severely questioned under psychometric testing. IPD therefore appointed a registered psychometrician to develop its' RPL admission testing to ensure predictive validity in a South African context.

We found that challenges were more cost-effective. It was less expensive to task and review a challenge than to spend hours evaluating large lever arch portfolio files of evidence and/or interviewing candidates one-on-one. A bright matric daughter or a more qualified friend to the candidate may have completed a portfolio, whereas through a challenge process, we quickly established the authenticity of the evidence.

The British NVQ required specific evidence cross referenced to particular range statements, cross referenced to the assessment criteria, cross referenced to the critical cross field outcomes, etc. and that turned portfolio development into an absolute nightmare for everybody. It was time consuming and very costly to assess. In South Africa however, we tend to say if you haven't demonstrated the full range of evidence in your portfolio, an interactive interview can be used to provide supplementary evidence as a way of checking the range statements, assessment criteria and critical cross field outcomes in an assessment to ensure sufficiency.

A decade ago, there wasn't an NQF. Whilst there were versions of criterion referenced education practice, there weren't any `current' outcomes-based education practices in the country. Most evidence that workplace trainers & vocational educators could give us was not actually evidence of their competence within an outcomes-based system, and the OD-ETDP qualifications required this.

The challenge process prompted practitioners to recontextualize their competence within an outcomes-based education and training system. This required re-work of some of the evidence they had produced in the past to ensure currency.The following astounding statistics emerged in an early analysis:

- 92% of participants lacked a contextual understanding of OBE practices, and
- 95% of participants lacked professionalism, or a demonstrable commitment to ensuring educational excellence

The project specifically addressed these two issues through the four types of RPL practices tested.

While the project aimed to address some of the concerns the higher education sector may have with RPL, it also raised some concerns the industry sector has with higher education. As Weelahan argues "graduates from qualifications do not always have functioning knowledge (although they may have prepositional knowledge)". An issue the project grappled with was: `if we require RPL candidates to exhibit "graduateness" should we not also be requiring graduate candidates to have functional experience?' Far from representing an inferior path toward a qualification, the IPD model has certainly illustrated that RPL candidates could potentially become the candidates of choice.

Michael Barber, Special Advisor to the US Secretary of State for Education and Employment, is a strong advocate of the need for global perspectives in education, quotes: "If we're really going to have global perspectives across society, then all of us, Government, teachers, head teachers, and teacher trainers, must take responsibility for promoting a new set of core values for this society ... We need to promote, through the education system and a range of other institutions, the notion that the global economy operates within a moral framework based on democratic values and a respect for global interdependence."   (Barber 1998)

If South Africa wishes to take any stage, never mind center stage in any industry sector, the education leadership established in that sector will mostly influence OBE and professional educator development in that sector.

Thus a increasing demand for a Post Graduate Qualification in OD-ETD Practices is emerging, both from a global perspective (the pull) and from a meeting of ASGISA skills development objectives (the push).

During May 2006, IPD therefore designed a curriculum and a 1-yr continuing education programme toward a postgraduate certificate in OD-ETD Practices, due for launch at the end of 2006.

The purpose of this CPD project is for education leadership to refine good education and training practice directed at delivering the strategic training projects under ASGISA initiatives (including JIPSA & the NSDS2).

Compiled by: Mark Orpen (2006)