TRANSITION FROM TCG TO RAB (RIG)

Introduction
1. The transition from TCG to RAB (RIG) must progress the Blueprint requirement that the Capability Framework be:
   a. nationally consistent,
   b. in-line with adult learning principles, and
   c. incorporate assessed competency and accreditation standards.
2. This discussion paper is grounded in development of the Blueprint by CFMG Panels. It proposes policy for the transition from TCG to RAB. Once discussed by SGB-CFMG (2-3 June), an agreed policy framework will be promulgated.

Situation
3. The Blueprint proposes that TCGs transition to RAB from 01 January 2017. A number of TCG are, however, convening their final meeting in the June-July 2016 period.

Assumptions
4. The following assumptions are made:
   a. Current TIP and Blueprint terminology is to be used for now.
   b. A consensus on ATDP-specific terminology is to be developed.
   c. Responsibility and authority is to be vested at the ATDP level where good governance and maximum assurance of outcomes necessitate principal actions are to be taken.

Roles
5. The start and end states for the transition are defined by:
   a. the TCG roles in TIP Operational Protocols (Version: 01 November 2014, Chapter 8.1.1[a]); and
   b. the RAB roles in the Blueprint at Section 6.3.
6. The start and end-point roles and transition pathways are depicted overleaf (Figure 1).
7. Figure 1 shows that:
   a. administration is a continuing role;
   b. training development is vested in the CFMG with RAB input;
   c. conduct of training and presenter management are collapsed into day-to-day delivery of training; and
   d. outcome evaluation and National consistency validation are collapsed into an RAB input into the CFMG; and
   e. a new level of training and development (CoP) is created.
### TCG Roles vs RAB Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCG Roles</th>
<th>Transition Process</th>
<th>RAB Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional input to development of nationally consistent training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and financial management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local administrative requirements in their region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct of training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Day-to-day delivery of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional input to delivery of nationally consistent training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing and supporting ‘Communities of Practice’ (CoP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National consistency validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Comparison: TCG and RAB Roles.
Associated Considerations

8. Accompanying discussion papers address the following membership and selection consequences of these considerations:
   a. Essential and desirable skills and knowledge of RAB Manager and Members.
   b. Selection and appointment of RAB Members and Manager.

Transition Policy Framework

9. From Table 1, transition policy must address the following:
   a. Response to ESO training demand.
   b. Scheduling of formal courses and Presenters.
   c. Direction of ASO.
   d. Administration of the RAB and CoP.
   e. RAB responsibility for National consistency.
   f. Broader engagement with ESO through CoP.

10. Transition policy is grounded on the following:
    a. Past ESO demand resulted in quantitative over-training.
    b. Significant funding is needed initially to contract RTO support.
    c. TIP training will continue for current practitioners’ progression to Level 2.
    d. From 01 July 2016, candidate trainees will enter an ATDP pathway.
    e. Ultimately, ATDP will result in fewer, better trained and developed practitioners.

11. The policy framework must also address:
    a. transition from TIP training outcomes to competency assurance under ATDP, and
    b. human factors associated with the transition.

Response to ESO Training Demand

12. ATDP will support four categories of ESO demand during the transition period:
    a. Training of current Level 1 Welfare and Compensation practitioners to TIP Level 2.
    b. Training of current Level 2 Pension Officers to Advocate Level 3.
    c. Training of current Level 3 Advocates to Advocate Level 4.
    d. New trainees entering ATDP pathways as pre-training candidates.

Current Practitioners - Transition End Dates

13. Level 2. The end-date of the transition period for current Level 1 TIP-trained practitioners is 31 December 2017. This date is defined by:
    a. the need for a definite but sensible end date;
    b. time elapsed since TIP Level 1 formal course not greater than (TIP-advised) 3 years;
    c. completion of the relevant on-line Level 2 course (from 31 December 2016); and
d. Practitioner’s self-assessment of readiness to undertake Level 2 formal course:
   (i) number and outcome of lodged claims,
   (ii) Acts under which claims have been lodged, and
   (iii) complexity of client’s conditions in claims lodged.

14. **Level 3.** The end-date of the transition period for current VRB (Level 3) Advocates is 31 December 2017. This date is defined by:
   a. need for a definite but sensible end date;
   b. reasonable time required for a current ESO-authorised Level 2 Pension Officer to complete the pre-requisites for Level 3; and
   c. probable time required for development of materials for the ATDP Level 3 Advocacy pathway.

15. **Level 4.** The end-date of the transition period for current AAT (Level 4) Advocates is 31 June 2018. This date is defined by:
   a. need for a definite but sensible end date;
   b. reasonable time required for a current Level 3 Advocate to gain the pre-requisite competence to undertake Level 4 training; and
   c. probable time required for development of materials for the ATDP Level 4 Advocacy pathway.

16. **Transition End-date.** To continue practicing after the preceding transition period end-dates, all practitioners will enter a training pathway:
   a. At their current level of practice: through RTO-assessment for RPL, completion of ‘gap’-training if needed, and certification.
   b. At a lower level of practice: at a point of their choice along the relevant pathway.

**ATDP Pathway Entry**

17. **Current TIP-trained Practitioners.** Current TIP-trained and ESO-authorised Practitioners at all TIP levels have two options
   a. complete TIP formal training courses before the above end-dates; or
   b. enter voluntarily into the relevant ATDP pathway.

18. **Practicing Pension/Welfare Officers and Advocates.** Current TIP-trained and ESO-authorised Pension and Welfare Officer and Advocates have three options for entry into an appropriate ATDP training and development pathway:
   a. complete TIP formal training courses before the specified cut-off date; or
   b. enter voluntarily into the relevant ATDP pathway at a level appropriate to self-assessed training needs based on:
      (i) number and outcome of lodged claims/appeals, or welfare cases;
      (ii) Acts under which claims/appeals have been lodged or welfare support provided; or
      (iii) complexity of client’s:
(a) conditions in claims, or
(b) appeal, or
(c) welfare support needs; or
c. await certification and, if required, complete an RTO-developed ‘gap’ training.

19. **Candidate Trainees.** From 01 July 2016 all candidate trainees will enter the training and development pathway relevant to their preferred advocacy stream.

**Scheduling**

20. **On-line/e-Learning Courses.** ATDP will maintain continuous availability of all on-line/e-Learning courses. Candidate trainees and trainees, and ESO-authorised practitioners undertaking continuous learning or progression to the next level:
   a. may enrol at any time; and
   b. once enrolled, remain enrolled for the duration of their practice.

21. **Formal Courses.** Funding constraints necessitate coordinated scheduling of formal courses by the CFMG. Scheduling of formal courses during the transition period is subject to the following policies:
   a. ESOs that are not members of a CoP will forward their training demands direct to their RAB, which will validate the demand.
   b. CoP will validate member ESOs’ advocacy training demands and dispatch consolidated returns to their RAB.
   c. The CFMG will coordinate RAB demand and:
      (i) maximise cost effectiveness by (wherever possible) negotiating:
          (a) collocation of courses, or
          (b) rescheduling of courses;
      (ii) approve proposed schedules if within allocated funds; or
      (iii) prepare a business case for an increase funds; or
      (iv) mediate demand if additional funds are unavailable.

22. **Presenters.** Funding constraints necessitate coordinated scheduling of Presenters by the CFMG. Scheduling of Presenters during the transition period is subject to the following policies:
   a. The CFMG will encourage as many TIP-Presenters as possible to present for RPL and certification.
   b. The CFMG is to maintain a Register of certified Presenters.
   c. As they are volunteers, certified Presenters are to advise the CFMG of their availability.
   d. Certified Presenters are a national resource.
   e. Available certified Presenters may be scheduled where demand is to be met.
f. The CFMG will maximise cost-effectiveness when scheduling available certified Presenters.

g. Should certified Presenters not be available to satisfy scheduled demand, the CFMG may schedule an uncertified Presenter.

**Direction of ASO**

23. ASO duties and performance are to managed by the RAB Manager in accordance with the ASO’s Job Description.

**Administration**

24. Source of Funds:
   a. RABs’ operation expenses will be met from the allocation of funds to the ATDP.
   b. CoPs and ESOs’ operating expenses will be funded by BEST Grants.

25. **Coordination.** Funding constraints during the transition period necessitate coordination of RABs’ operating expenses by the CFMG.

26. **CoP/ESO Operating Expenses.** ATDP will further strengthen the Departmental preference that ESOs aggregate BEST applications by entry into an MOU. Policies for administration of CoP expenses follow:
   a. **Hub and Spoke.** These structures include any Veterans Centre, Pension and Welfare Network, RSL District Council, or virtual structure that has the capacity to coordinate, lodge, disburse and acquit a BEST Grant.
   b. **Independent ESO.** An ESO (Sub-) Branch that is not a member of a hub and spoke structure:
      (i) is to continue to submit and acquit its own BEST Grant application; and
      (ii) from 31 December 2017, to be eligible for a BEST Grant, must have engaged an experienced (at least) Level 2 practitioner to mentor/provide OJT for its less/in-experienced practitioners and must ensure that its:
         (a) candidate trainees complete all ATDP pre-requisites before nomination for formal training,
         (b) trainees undertake the relevant ATDP training and development pathway,
         (c) all trainee and authorised practitioners are being mentored and provided OJT;
         (d) authorised practitioners are engaged in continuous learning and an RAB competence-monitoring program, and
         (e) authorised practitioners who intend to practice beyond the end-dates at paras 12 to 14 above are assessed for RPL and certified.

27. **RAB Operating Expenses.** Each RAB will submit a budgeted business plan to the CFMG six months before the annual Federal Budget is tabled. The following policies are to be followed:
   a. The CFMG and Department will promulgate the required content and format of the annual RAB business plan.
b. The Department will advise the date of submission of the approved business plan.

c. The CFMG is to:

(i) amalgamate RAB business plans into an ATDP business plan, and
(ii) forward the mediated plan to the RCG for approval.

d. The SGB is to forward the approved ATDP business plan to the Department by the notified submission date.

e. The Department will mediate the ATDP budget within its internal budgetary process.

Responsibility for National consistency

28. CFMG. The CFMG will promulgate no later than 31 June 2017 the National consistency criteria for the training and development of, and quality assurance processes for all practitioners, mentors/OJT-providers and Presenters.

29. RAB. Within their designated region, each RAB will be responsible for:

a. encouraging independent ESO (Sub-) Branches to enter into hub-and-spoke arrangements;

b. conducting activities to disseminate ATDP information;

c. advising ESO Committees on their selection and practitioner-authorisation responsibilities;

d. ensuring their CoP and independent ESO (Sub-) Branches are aware of and, after the end-dates at paras 12-14 and 25.b.(ii) are implementing, the National consistency criteria and quality assurance processes;

e. assisting their CoP and independent ESO (Sub-) Branches identify appropriately experienced practitioners to mentor and provide OJT;

f. developing collaboratively with their CoP and independent ESO (Sub-) Branches a competency-monitoring program for all practitioners; and

g. supporting authorised practitioners who wish to seek certification.

30. Training of Mentors. The following policies apply to the identification and training of mentors and OJT-providers:

a. The CFMG is responsible for promulgating no later than 31 June 2017 selection criteria and a training pathway for mentors and OJT-providers in the compensation and welfare streams.

b. In collaboration with its CoP and independent ESO (Sub-) Branches, each RAB is responsible for identifying suitable, experienced practitioners as prospective mentors and OJT-providers.

c. All transition-period mentors and OJT-providers are to complete the promulgated training by the transition end-date at para 25.b.(ii).

d. Not later than the transition end-dates at paras 12 to 14, all mentors and OJT-providers are to be certified to practice:

(i) at the relevant level in the relevant stream of practice, and
31. **Presenter Training.** The following policies apply to the identification and training of Presenters:

   a. The CFMG is responsible for promulgating no later than the transition end-dates at paras 12 to 14 and:
      
      (i) a training program to transition current Presenters to adult-learning Facilitators;
      
      (ii) criteria for identifying suitable, experienced practitioners; and
      
      (iii) a training pathway for compensation and welfare adult-learning Facilitators.
   
   b. In collaboration with its CoP and independent ESO (Sub-) Branches, each RAB is responsible for identifying suitable, experienced practitioners as prospective Presenters.
   
   c. All transition-period Presenters are to complete the promulgated training by the transition end-date at para 25.b.(ii).
   
   d. Not later than the transition end-dates at paras 12-14, all transition-period Presenters are to be certified to practice:
      
      (i) at the relevant level in the relevant stream of practice,
      
      (ii) as a mentor and OJT-provider, and
      
      (iii) as an adult-learning Facilitator of ATDP formal training courses.

**Engagement with ESO through CoP**

32. **Training Constraints.** Under adult-learning principles, only 10% of each training and development pathway is formal training. Most learning will occur on-the-job through structured learning and experience. As few ESOs will be capable of providing high quality mentoring and OJT until later the transition period, ATDP will rely on existing arrangements.

33. **Transition Considerations.** During the transition period, funding constraints will limit TIP formal-training and new-start trainees will be focused on on-line/e-Learning. While a number of current Presenters are engaged in CFMG or Panel activities, the aggregate workload is assumed to allow some Presenters to divert training capacity to mentoring and OJT-provision. Necessary competencies would be facilitated by early training of available Presenters in mentoring and OJT-provision. Allocation of funds to training by the RTO is proposed.

34. **ESO Executive Awareness.** ESO Executive Committees’ unawareness of veteran advocacy and authorisation requirement are key historical weakness in the pre-ATDP training process. Development of an ESO Executive-specific information package and awareness training for ESO Representatives on the RAB are crucial remedial actions as early as possible in the transition period.

35. **Role ESO-Representatives.** The identification of ESO Representatives, development of Duty Statements, training in their responsibilities, oversight of their performance by
the RAB Manager, and robust attention to performance shortfalls are crucial to early remediation of historical failures. Draft selection criteria and Duty Statements for ESO Representatives, and a Job Description for the RAB Manager accompany this discussion paper.

**Human Factors**

36. The Selection Criteria for RAB Membership and the Job Description for the RAB Manager are detailed in the accompanying discussion draft.

37. The policy considerations on which the constituency of the RAB is grounded follow:
   a. RAB will be small with emphasis on robust ‘business’ and human development skills, knowledge and experience.
   b. Adoption of OMS, emphasis on e-learning and a reduced number of formal courses will reduce ASOs’ administrative workload, allowing more time for direct RAB Manager support with CoP and ESO.
   c. The requisite essential skills and knowledge will open RAB Manager appointment to candidates without prior TCG experience.
   d. ESO Executive Committees’ unawareness of advocacy matters will focus RAB Membership on the small number of Executives who do.
   e. CoP will be lead by experienced practitioners, which will transition the locus of advocacy knowledge, advocacy administration, evaluation of training need, oversight of competency, and recommendations on readiness for certification and authorisation from TCG to CoP.
   f. The requirement for in-depth knowledge of TIP is de-emphasised by end-state of transition in RAB.
   g. Human factors associated with TCG Chairs’ loss of contribution/relevance/status etc is a key transition consideration, which is to be resolved to extent possible by TCG Chairs mentoring incoming RAB Member.
   h. The term of TCG Chairs’ interim mentoring is six months (the envisaged start date for RAB operations).
• What are the range of responsibilities and authorities needed within an RAB?
• What are the essential and desirable skills and knowledge for each RAB Member?
• At what level within ATDP and how should RAB Members be selected?
• At what level within ATDP and how should any perceived loss of control by TCGs be mediated?

• What are the essential and desirable knowledge and skills required in an RAB?
• How will membership of the RABs be invited and members selected?
• How should RABs identify the RAB Manager?
• How should ASOs be identified and engaged?
• On what matters and how should RABs interact with CoPs?
• On what matters and how should RABs interact with ESOs?
  o How do we get ESOs at all levels (National, Branch and sub-branch) interested in welfare and compensation training?
  o How do we get a commitment from ESOs to embrace ATDP?
  o What responsibility does ESORT have towards facilitating ESO engagement with ATDP?
  o What support do we expect from ESOs for CoPs?
  o Are ESOs (sub-branches) able to ‘opt out’?
  o Do we seek a commitment from ESOs at National or State level to provide material support (financial, accommodation etc)?
  o Do we need a training program for ESO executive and committee members regarding their responsibilities towards ATDP as the Blueprint envisages?

• At what level within ATDP should competing demands for resourcing be mediated?
• How will RABs identify and communicate their resource needs?
• How will the SGB ensure ESO demand is consistent with policy and met equitably?
• How will RABs coordinate CoP needs, competency development and standards?
• What information is needed to ensure nationally consistent RAB administration?
• How will SGB assure the quality of RAB administration?