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This paper examines provision at what are called here mixed sector institutions: that is, those educational providers that offer some VET and some higher education (HE). The paper is part of a series of research efforts that the LH Martin Institute has been leading1, with the support of the National Centre for Vocational Education Research, into the interactions between VET and HE and the spheres of work and learning generally.

The first half of the project from which this paper stems explored higher education in TAFE institutes (see Wheelahan et al., 2009). The second half, which is being reported on here, included private providers that offered both VET and higher education programs, and universities that offered a small amount of VET provision (that is, it excluded the dual-sector universities). For this project the extent and overall nature of mixed sector provision at universities and private providers was mapped. The results of this mapping are outlined below, as is some data on the current extent of pathway use. The project also included interviews with 61 people, including senior regulators and private sector representatives as well as teachers, managers and students at nine institutions: four universities which deliver a small amount of VET, two being registered training organisations (RTOs) in their own right and two owning associated companies for the purpose; and five private providers, including a larger religious college, two colleges focused on health, one involved in hospitality and tourism and another teaching creative arts (see Table 1). Following the presentation of background material the main themes raised by participants are summarised and discussed.

Table 1: Interviewees for the mixed sector project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of interviewee</th>
<th>No. interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State VET registering bodies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior private sector stakeholders/representatives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior staff at 4 universities and 5 private providers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers at 3 universities and 5 private providers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students at 3 universities and 5 private providers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the rationales for mixed sectors provision and the blurring of boundaries between the sectors, as we will see from comments from participants in our project, is that such provision should create opportunities for broader access and particularly for students to transfer between qualification levels and sectors. However, such a rationale may be in some tension with current policy direction, which certainly emphasises

---

1 The researchers from this project were from the LH Martin Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Management and the Centre for Study of Higher Education both at the University of Melbourne, and from RMIT
the need for better pathways and linkages generally between the sectors but also calls for the retention of distinctions rather than the blurring of sectors.

The final report of the Bradley Review into Higher Education (Bradley et al. 2008) put the issue like this:

> The move to a mass higher education system together with the growth of a credentials-driven employment environment has seen a blurring of the boundaries between the two sectors. However, each still has a critical role to play in meeting Australia’s future skills needs. While it is important to maintain the integrity of the VET system and its provision of distinct qualifications in which the content is strongly driven by the advice of industry, the time has come for a more coherent approach to tertiary educational provision. (p. xvi)

> In some cases, an effective way to improve access for people from under-represented groups is to streamline movement from VET to higher education. VET is a common pathway to higher education for many people from under-represented groups. However, while improving pathways is important, it must be recognised that this form of provision is not primarily a feeder for higher education and its primary purposes must not be distorted by the need to increase higher education participation. (p. 21)

The general message seems to have been accepted by the government, with education and employment minister Chris Evans (2011) recently putting it to Universities Australia thus:

> My goal as Minister is to build a joined up tertiary sector that responds to the realities of student and employer needs, but one that also maintains and values the specialist missions of each sector. Universities are strengthening and making new connections with vocational education and training interests. The old days when the TE score was the rigid and only way to go to uni are long gone. The potential for these new pathways to university entry is enormous. It’s why we have improved the Australian Qualifications Framework and other mechanisms to build connections between the two sectors.

In this paper I want to discuss the background to the currently increasing trend for public universities, private colleges and TAFEs to offer a mix of both VET and HE. I also will critically examine whether this trend is part of the solution for building a better post-school education system. The final part of the paper discusses the issues raised by participants in the project, and in particular this shows some of the tension between improving articulation levels and pathways on the one hand, and maintaining sectoral distinctions on the other.

### VET within mixed sector institutions

The following background to mixed sector provision in Australia is mainly a summary of background sections in Moodie (2010) and Wheelahan et al. (2011), which are respectively the initial discussion paper and final report from the project being reported here, with some other useful references cited. In this and related projects the term ‘mixed sector’ was used to distinguish such institutions from both those which are overwhelmingly of a single sector (less than 3% of student load in the ‘other’ sector) and the dual sector universities (which have more than 20% of their load in well-established VET divisions). That is, such institutions have substantial load in both sectors but in the case of the universities examined the VET load is still a small minority overall.

### Background to mixed sector provision

It may seem as though what is happening in tertiary education now is a blurring of a very long-standing and traditional division into VET and HE. However, this division is itself relatively recent. It was only with the report of the committee on technical and further education in chaired by Myer Kangan and that reported in 1974 that the designation TAFE was officially adopted (Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education 1974). Previously there had been ad-hoc development of varied post-school colleges, generally designated by industry such as agricultural, mining and nursing colleges and police academies. Some of these had been established by relevant government departments, some were commercial enterprises, while others such as religious colleges were private but not-for-profit.
The Kangan report signalled the grouping of most of the publicly funded colleges into a new TAFE sector. From the mid-1980s the technical and “skills”, as opposed to further education, aspect of TAFEs was emphasised in government policy, exacerbating the HE/VET divide.²

In the last decade however, a number of factors have undercut this sectoral division. Labour market needs though have called for higher skills, higher credentials, and less occupational differentiation in graduates from different sectors (Karmel 2011a). From 2005 the HECS system of income contingent loans was extended to all full-fee higher education places, whether in publicly or privately owned institutions. This encouraged private providers who had previously specialised in vocational education to move into higher education. The private sector has also been stimulated by the increasing availability of income contingent loans for high level VET qualifications and state-level contestable funding for VET delivery, particularly in Victoria. The latter move is likely to be extended nationally according to Wheelahan’s (2011) decoding of the 2011 federal budget papers. The latter article sharply raises concerns about impacts of marketisation on quality: more generally the background to and debates around competition in VET are covered in a collection of essays edited by Karmel, Beddie and colleagues (2009).

The intensification of qualification demands and increasing use of pathway

The trend noted earlier of increasing demands for higher skills, higher credentials, and for less occupational differentiation can be seen graphically from the changing proportions of workers who have differing numbers of post-school qualifications.: Between 2001 and 2009, the proportion of those with no non-school qualification fell from 49 to 43%, and those with three or more qualifications increased from 6 to 9%.

Figure 1: Proportions of people 15-64 who have no, one, two or three or more post-school qualifications, 2001–2009
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There are substantially numbers of students who utilise VET qualifications as a direct pathway to HE. In 2008 9% of bachelor degree students at universities, and 19% of such students at TAFEs were admitted on the basis of a VET qualification (with 3% at private providers) (Moodie 2011). However, aggregate figures on proportions of students admitted on the basis of VET underestimates the number of students who have studied some VET before entering HE, as they may have been admitted on other bases. My own preliminary analysis of a dataset containing details on all those who were offered places in HE programs through application to the Victorian Tertiary Admissions Centre (VTAC) in 2009 indicates that 16.3% per cent of such offerees report that their highest educational participation includes some VET previously, not including 0.8% who reported their highest participation as involving some VCAL programs at school. This is a bit more than the 16.1% who had studied some HE as their highest previous participation. Those who had

² For an influential early argument for a new policy focus on skills formation, in the original Hawke government form of a tripartite training system with input from employers, unions and government, see the chapter on ‘Labour market and training policies’, Australian Council of Trade Unions/Trade Development Council, (1987, pp. 103–134).
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studied some VET previously made up 18.5% of the VTAC offerees. We would expect the proportion of those in HE with prior VET study to be larger in Victoria, the state with nearly all dual sector universities and TAFE HE programs, than other states: relevant figures readily available from DEEWR reports relate to all HE applicants, as opposed to all those offered a place or all those enrolling. The latest report indicates that in 2010 16% of applicants reported prior VET as their highest educational participation, with a figure of 19% for Victoria (Department of Education Employment and Workplace Relations 2011). In any case this all suggests that there are more informal VET to HE pathways worked out by students in their study-work lives than formalised pathways, and that such informal pathway travel is increasing.

Karmel (2011b) emphasises that “reverse” and horizontal pathway use is also increasing. An examination of public VET enrolment figures from 2002 to 2009 available on the Vocstats website (NCVER 2011) indicates that while over this period total enrolments were stable at around 1 700 000 each year, the numbers of those enrolled with a HE qualification increased from 88 339 in 2002 to 120 915 in 2009, or from 5.2% to 7.1% of the total, as we can see from Figure 2.

Figure 2: Numbers and percentages of those in public VET who have a highest prior educational attainment of a bachelor degree, 2002-2009

Source: VOCSTATS online tables.

Our current work at LH Martin includes statistical analysis of these and other data sources, by field of education, social background and other factors, to provide much a much more detailed picture of educational transitions than previously available.

One thing we already know is that the use of (formal) pathways to HE varies considerably by field and institution. In 2008 TAFEs on average admit 19% on the basis of VET, universities on average 9%, which ranges from the newer, generally suburban post-1988 universities that admit 13%, the dual-sector universities that admit around 18% (which includes around 27% at Swinburne University), a number of single-sector universities such as Charles Sturt University (22%), to the elite Group of Eight universities that admit 2% (DEEWR 2009). Nursing has a considerably higher rate of admission to degrees on the basis of prior VET than all other fields (at universities, 22% compared with 9% for all fields), however this differences varies considerably at different universities with no clear pattern (Moodie 2011). Given the
variation across institutions and fields Moodie (2011, p. 12) concludes that “it seems that no single measure is likely to increase the proportion of bachelor students admitted on the basis of a vocational qualification either within each field of education or within each type of institution, let alone for all fields”.

It may be thought that increasing use of VET pathways will obviously make access to HE more equitable. However, students from low socio-economic backgrounds are under-represented, as are those who are admitted to higher education on the basis of prior VET, and such transfers occurred disproportionately at lower-status universities: findings which all cast doubt on transfers as an equity mechanism (Wheelahan 2009).

Current map of VET within mixed sector institutions

Table 2 summarises the types of institutions that currently deliver both VET and HE.

Table 2: Numbers of each type of institution accredited to deliver both VET and higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual sector self-accrediting institutions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other self-accrediting institutions</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total self-accrediting institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private creative arts colleges</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private health colleges</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private management colleges</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private religious colleges</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private colleges</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total private colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFEs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universities

VET within universities has developed from several processes: as an historical legacy, such as the Adelaide Conservatorium of Music; from amalgamations with particular colleges, such as that between University of Queensland and the Queensland Agricultural College; from universities establishing colleges to provide foundation and English studies, and in some cases broader VET qualifications, as part of a growth strategy of vertical integration, such as Monash College and Wollongong College Australia, and from a perceived need for universities to broaden their role in areas such as corporate training, an example being DeakinPrime. Now a total of 22 universities offer VET, including the six dual sector universities, and universities that have become registered, or formed a registered subsidiary, as a training organisation (for more detail see Moodie, 2010, pp. 11–15, and Wheelahan et al. 2011, 23–24).

TAFEs and private providers

A total of 68 other institutions are now accredited to offer both VET and HE. However only 32 of these report any HE enrolments to DEEWR (reporting only mandatory from this year). Table 3 gives some idea of the distribution of HE load among the main categories of these providers, along with, for private providers, the distribution of scope and qualification levels.
Table 3  Mixed-sector providers reporting HE load in 2009 by VET scope of registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College type</th>
<th>Higher education</th>
<th>Private provider vocational education and training programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Full Time Student Load</td>
<td>Scope of registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>4027</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>11799</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private</td>
<td>2918</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFEs</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>23 996</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 32 providers summarised above, seven were private providers principally involved in creative arts; two were private providers involved in complementary medicine; 12 were business and technology providers; six were private providers with a religious affiliation; five were TAFEs; one was a private provider with an applied psychology focus and one a private provider with an architecture focus. Total HE Effective Full Time Student Load (EFTSL) in 2009 was 23 996, a substantial increase of about 31% on the previous year (18 371) (we do not have details of VET student load, and so the scope of registration, the total number of programs and stand-alone units offered, serves as a rough proxy). Nearly half of this HE load was in the business-oriented colleges. The actual number of providers has decreased somewhat however, with various mergers in the market: SAE has taken over similar multi-media/design college Qantm, and both have become part of the Navitas group. The Think group has become a broad provider by acquiring design, health, and hospitality colleges. The varied and changing organisational forms of providers as well as the different reporting requirements for VET and HE are among the challenges in describing and analysing what is going on in this area. Other general findings from our mapping of this provision include: those private providers with HE enrolments concentrated in one or a few fields tend to have VET qualifications in the same fields at higher levels, allowing the use of pathways from diplomas to degrees in the same field; management colleges, in a number of cases offer certificate II and IV in areas such as hospitality and tourism, which are vocational qualifications in their own right but which can also articulate into degrees in hospitality or tourism management that the colleges also offer; the Navitas owned Institutes of Business and Technology are however another model again, offering foundation diplomas which articulate into degrees at co-located partner universities (for more detail see Moodie, 2010, pp. 16–18, and Wheelahan et al. 2011, 24–25, 51–52).

I now turn to the main relevant themes raised by participants.

Issues raised

Broader participation and better pathways as justifications for mixed sector provision

Among the senior managers that were interviewed for the project the importance of pathways as a central justification for mixed sector provision, similar to current policy settings, was very clear. Managers at a health college sought to be “open to the general public” and offer “whole of career education.” A manager at one university RTO wanted more students to “find ways into university” while those at another we pointed out that their certificate courses served as foundation subjects for the parent university’s degree programs.
The creative arts college in the project began to broaden out when opportunities to partner with universities arose.

**Successful pathways**

Private providers tended to highlight their industry links, and related pathways to jobs, and a student-centred focus, while universities pointed to apparently clear pathways to HE. One university leader explicitly referred to fact that TAFE to HE pathways don’t seem to be changing the HE socio-economic mix much. She contended that a targeted program within individual universities would improve this better.

At one university, a senior university leader’s view that there were smooth and extensive pathways were not by university VET manager and teachers, who pointed to a single, limited pathway in one field. That is, aspirations and claims may not be implemented on the ground, although the VET manager was confident of improvement.

Project participants at a regional university with a history of considerable TAFE linkages pointed out that regional TAFEs were less interested in degrees than their urban counterparts, and put forward examples of how a regional university can work out specific pathways relevant to niche labour market needs, without stepping on any TAFE toes (a potential problem discussed below).

Interestingly, more specific and positive comments tended to refer to studying VET and HE units simultaneously, as complementary learning styles and qualifications in a single institution or through co-enrolment at different institutions. The formalised mapping of curricula between levels, whether at the same or partner institutions, was urged by several participants.

Teachers in the natural health college spoke of the advantages of “spreading out” the considerable knowledge and skills they were seeking to impart, and stated that student appreciated different exit points.

One large private provider that focuses on foundational courses suggested these successful ingredients that support students moving from VET to higher education included: co-location on university campuses; approval by the university of teaching staff (with the use of university teaching staff in one instance); and small classes, more contact hours and better tracking of students.

For the creative arts students interviewed, a more direct entry to HE allowed a more vocational focus, through teaching programs. Students generally understood and appreciated pathway opportunities, some mentioning they found HE a challenge, but in a positive way.

**Problems raised: regulatory nightmares**

There were numerous complaints in this project and in the prior HE in TAFE project about double reporting, double funding arrangements, differing regulations between sectors, the complexity of FEE-HELP applications, different industrial regimes for teachers in two sectors, even two separate calendars. This takes up a lot of resources at a small private provider or a university with a small VET department.

**Problems raised: Status**

In the related project, examining HE provision in TAFE, which preceded the one being reported on here, which it was found that students and staff had an ambivalent sense of identity in relation to their institution and were generally unclear how to represent their position to friends. This appears to reflect the hierarchy of status within tertiary education (Wheelahan et al. 2009). In this project students were generally positive about institutions and identified with their field and associated professions. However when asked how they described their studies to others, they tended to gloss over the VET and/or private aspects of their programs. A number of non-student participants referred to the views of those working in HE with terms such as “elitist”, “big difference in reputation” and “much higher level”.

While many management and teacher participants saw their work as providing alternatives to elitist and high status education, and were generally positive about their institutions offering both VET and HE, a number of
comments suggested that the existence of status differences could in some cases undermine efforts at broadening participation and constructing pathway opportunities. Most of the institutional leaders and teachers spoke to made comments about academics not valuing or understanding VET teaching or learning, this being related to an overall sense of superiority at HE institutions and difficult student transitions. Elitism leading to lack of communication between sectors, even within the same institutions, was raised by a number of participants. A university VET manager described the attitude of HE staff as seeing VET as the “poor relation”. Another teacher at this institution argued that HE teaching staff had little interest in helping to establish a Diploma due to a “higher level” attitude. One religious college leader described an internalised inferiority at VET: the “Psychology of VET people thinking they are ‘poor cousins’”.

A leader from the regional university with considerable numbers of students from a VET background argued for the importance of recognising different forms of knowledge associated with VET and higher education and the need for more equitable institutions. This leader explained that there may be some internal resistance within the university at times to acknowledging this, but also argued that when this was recognised it could be addressed by ongoing discussions within faculties.

**Problems raised: teaching and learning**

Many managers and teachers in the project raised problematic differences in teaching and learning between VET and HE, with familiar arguments about different teaching styles, expectations and assessment modes and dichotomies of theory/practice. However it should be noted that six of the 17 teachers spoken to teach some VET and some HE, so again entrenched perceptions may differ from what is happening on the ground.

At our health college a teacher argued that the original VET focus encouraged a student-centred and practical perspective across the board: “There is no room for brilliant academics with no people skills”. Similarly at a music college a VET-type focus on industry currency and vocational skills were seen as very important for all teachers in this field: teachers whether in VET or HE or both have little credibility without musicianship. At the health college however a teacher argued somewhat against the idea that teaching skills and methods were easily transferrable across sectors: “You can’t teach the same thing in both sectors… the key difference in HE is that at the end of the degree you are expected to be able to synthesise ideas. VET is about applying what you’ve been taught.” At some colleges some teachers and managers argued that VET students weren’t pushed enough in terms of writing skills and academic standards while others thought that VET students were more experienced and capable and thus did quite well in higher education. More generally the translation of non-graded assessment, specific skill competencies and what are often seen as narrow and low quality training packages into the skills and knowledge needed for HE was seen as problematic. Some staff thought that the different curricular approaches might to some extent undermine resolution of such issues: One teacher commented that there was social rather than academic interaction between teaching staff across sectors.

The student cohorts were seen, by teachers and students, as somewhat different: VET students as older, more focused and enthused and willing to speak up, not least due to life experience. One VET health student saw a “warmth/analytic” dichotomy between VET and HE students. One would hope that health practitioners have both!

**Problems raised: Marketization**

As in the Higher Education in TAFE project, participants’ views about marketisation were mixed, reflecting the ongoing debates referred to earlier (Karmel et al. 2009). Private leaders stressed what they saw as the inherent freedom, choice and quality–driving aspects of an increased marketisation of both VET and HE provision, and in a number of instances argued that it “wasn’t fair” if public institutions were helped to extend their range of provision, as opposed to seeking fee income in competition with each other and private providers. In contrast some public and private teachers and regulators expressed concern that competition, independently of pedagogical and broad social need, was driving institutions moving into the ‘other’ sector, and that this could undercut teaching quality, job security and conditions and collaboration between institutions and sectors.
One university teacher claimed that “universities are looking to skim off the best TAFE students to meet their targets without having any real commitment to the philosophy of inclusion,” and also that entering VET in this way meant needed support was lacking: “What we will get will be students who require bridging support, but we don’t have the funds. We are in danger of having ‘slum areas’ in the field of education. We are dumbing down even more.”

One private provider leader argued that “the open market will result in more duplication of existing programs and this will occur because people will see a market and unis are hunting down programs that will attract students, and in particular international students.” A teacher at another provider argued that competition will put further squeeze on a limited pool of qualified teachers, and that “the VET programs will be the bait that universities dangle to get students to their courses.”

One regulator was concerned that TAFEs are “are moving into higher ed because the boundaries are no longer clear as unis move into TAFE, and they need to ensure that they are not left behind. Providers are looking for the best way to use their resources to attract students.”

Many managers and private provider leaders are clearly genuine about using market systems to increase the availability of good quality education and training. They may be doing this with enthusiasm and/or as an adaptation to a changed landscape: Senior managers in the HE in TAFE project explained that they had no choice but to compete in the market because government policies were premised on competition, and they needed to participate in the market because private providers, universities and schools were offering programs normally associated with TAFE (Wheelahan et al. 2009, p. 21). However, perceptions of the negative impacts of markets that we noted suggests that further competition may create distrust between sectors and institutions that are increasingly seen as direct competitors, making for example the collaborative construction of pathways more difficult.

Some teachers also complained about lack of job security and job development, issues which could affect teaching quality and which are likely to be shaped by competitive cost pressures. However, this varied, with one private provider very serious about professional development, sending all teaching staff to a university tertiary teaching certificate.

**Conclusions**

Current labour market realities demand wider and deeper participation in post-school education from many workers. One results of this and a general blurring of what had been for some time two distinct tertiary education sectors has been the development of mixed sector institutions. Broadening the range of tertiary education and building better pathways between levels of education have been a central motivations behind mixed sector provision, and our participants projected strong commitments and relayed positive experiences in these regards. However current regulatory complexities, status hierarchies, and market competition can undermine the construction and extension of pathways.

Among the more concrete and definitely positive examples put forward were programs that involved co-enrolment in HE and VET. This finding complements that of McLaughlin and Mills (2011), who report on very positive outcomes from a pilot co-enrolled program in construction management at RMIT. Perhaps this is one way of addressing the issues of teaching and learning raised above.

Moodie (2011) notes there is a general goal in regard to tertiary education pathways with, however, no detailed strategies to implement it. He raises two broad options for increasing admissions to bachelor degrees from VET: better standards for qualifications in each fields, and incentives for institutions to admit more students on this basis, with the institutions then to work out means of doing so. From the findings of this project a number of policy recommendations were made to address the need for better pathways and more generally to address the realities of more extensive participation in a tertiary education system characterised by a blurring of sectors. These were:
More streamlined and coherent regulation; although the creation of two separate national regulators may be unfortunate there is the opportunity to work together at a national level on the basis of a more coherent qualifications system in the AQF.

A qualitative rather than categorical difference between VET and HE; reflecting a broad but articulated range of skills, jobs and occupations for which tertiary education prepares graduates;

More attention to articulation and pathways; using the new AQF and requirements that all qualifications should prepare students to study at a higher level, and involving skills councils and professionals bodies;

A single national registry of tertiary education; currently there are state-based HE registers, and a VET register in NTIS that doesn’t included any HE information;

The establishment of a national forum for scholarly development for mixed-sector teaching and learning: there are various types of support for VET teaching at a state level, but what the project suggests is a need for coordinated national support for teaching across tertiary education, and also specific support and perhaps a forum for the particular issues and needs for VET teaching in mixed sector institutions.
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