Workflow Advice

ARISING FROM THE CORE CURRICULUM RECOMMENDATIONS

Xperts

Duncan

This advice is based upon what I know of the sector from my contact with the core curriculum in 2013. It is predicated on what could be achievable in 2014 so as to continue progress on the core curriculum in a manageable and pragmatic manner given you and Phil have other project demands on your time, and relatively limited internal people and resources to draw on.

T.J. Crozier
14 JANUARY 20

Recommendation

Consolidate and formally recognise the various training topics as core curriculum pathways.

Stakeholder agreement in principle is needed that the current internal training pathways, as mapped, are the contributing basis for the Core Curriculum. Those pathways are mostly owned by each organisation; as part of their buy-in to the core curriculum they agree to maintain the identified curriculum topics within their internal training. That way some comfort is gained that the status quo in terms of coverage will be kept whilst the Secretariat manages the gap filling, and the consolidation of the training development work (MTIR Marine, Air Observers, the Management course, etc.) currently in progress.

Action point:

Gain agreement in principle at an appropriate meeting.

Run-time requirement:

Best done as early as possible so the underlying agreement is in place.

Recommendation

Set two meeting dates per year (PAC?) to monitor any changes to each organisations contributing curriculum pathway so that the relevance to the core curriculum is maintained.

The PAC meeting is primarily Tai Poutini fulfilling its academic quality management obligation to consult and maintain links with the SAR sector. If you feel it is inappropriate to use a Polytechnic-lead meeting for that updating purpose, select another meeting where attendee's would have the knowledge to know if training has been, or is going to, change.

Action point:

Decide if you want to use PAC or not. Keep the core curriculum as a focus via the updates. Negotiate maintenance of topics related to the core curriculum.

Run-time requirement:

Select two meeting dates over the year. Have the notification of pathway changes put on the agenda.

Recommendation

Gain agreement to remove Training and Assessment from within the core curriculum. It is not relevant in its coverage and the proposed Train the Trainer course and existing organisational training can fill that gap in more flexible and appropriate ways.

I suggest you do not insert the Train the Trainer into the Core Curriculum to replace Training and Assessment. I cannot perceive the relevance of that to all incident managers on the pathway. Leave the Trainer module be requested from Tai Poutini on a needs basis.

Action points:

Gain agreement to remove Training and Assessment from the core curriculum.

Republish the various training pathways.

Recommendation

Develop and supply cross-sector information booklets for the non-mission critical topics that are not currently trained to the requirements of the core curriculum.

This is about background/underpinning information that should be encountered early in the SAR manager training pathway so what comes after can be placed in context. The information is currently covered patchily, if at all, and I don't see individual organisations being easily convinced to direct effort to developing the details so as to align with the core curriculum—it isn't connected with their prime 'call-out' function, if it was the topics would be more covered than they are.

Nonetheless the resulting booklet would provide a very useful cross-sector SAR perspective, and by having the information as self-study you are permitting flexibility in training delivery, thus making the booklets more likely to be distributed.

The development is not an onerous task—the end result is likely to be a booklet of about 30 broadly set-out pages. There appears to be existing information around as a starting point, it would mean a person locating whatever is missing and putting it all into a cohesive, visually engaging layout. A plan that can be used to guide a writer is in Appendix 1.

Have the booklet drafted, then the draft peer reviewed by a person from each organisation, and publish as a PDF to be emailed out to each organisation (or downloadable from a website if possible).

Action points:

1. *A writer (potentially through a contribution from an organisation) or as a funded project. Any chance of sponsorship?*
2. *A person who could set the written information out in a visually interesting manner (from memory you have a contractor with that skill?).*

Budget estimate:

In my resource production experience, allow $10,000 if commercially produced.

Run-time requirement:

Say 3 months from start to a final product.

Recommendation

Discuss with Surf Lifesaving, LANDSAR and Coastguard the best way to supply overview training information related to areas in which they have no incident mandate or authority: Review and Evaluation and Investigation, Risk Management, Major Resource Utilisation.

These topics can be dealt with at an overview level—this is what happens. The Management course appears as though it might tidy up information about the lead agency practice in these areas through the exercises and scenarios.

Action points:

Talk to a representative from each organisation and gain an understanding of how the information might most conveniently fit into their training schedule. It does occur to me that Tai Poutini Polytechnic may well be able to draw detail out of their existing course materials with a bit of supplemental detail, and offer it as pre-course reading or part of an existing course. That means Surf Lifesaving would need to put their prospective SAR Incident management team members through that course.

Alternatively negotiate with Police and RCCNZ to gain access to their training details. The information is unlikely to be suitable for the wider target audience and will need adjustment before being released.

Budget estimate:

Material development costs which are unknown at this stage.

Run-time requirement:

Ready to offer in the second half of 2014 would seem timely?

Recommendation

For geographic flexibility, time efficiency and economic reasons, discuss with Tai Poutini Polytechnic more online delivery in the sector-wide training they offer.

Apparently Tai Poutini have been talking about offering some information on-line but that hasn't happened yet. They need to be encouraged to hasten that progress. Your sector volunteers will gain genuine flexibility, convenience and cost savings if basic theory is offered that way, plus the delivery cost savings on the Polytechnic's part can be redirected elsewhere in the overall training stream. Look to encourage online learning development where there is currently the most learner numbers so as to maximise the long term benefits.

Action point:
Meet with Tai Poutini Polytechnic to discuss their buy-in/current progress on e-learning and gain some consensus on the pathway forward.

Recommendation

Consider the feasibility of having a cross-organisational SAR Incident Managers training record database.

Having such a record would allow a sector wide understanding of the numbers within the overall pathway. It is a yearly sector training 'snapshot' that reports the numbers who are involved in the SAR management core curriculum training pathway, from within each organisation.

This is a more thorny issue than the other recommendations in my view. Training records will already exist for each organisation and they could see the exercise as unnecessary duplication. However I encountered no cross-sector SAR incident management capability statistics in my travels nor core curriculum linked training figures. If you can get this recommendation agreed, I think you'll find real benefits in terms of Phil's yearly training needs analysis exercise and have a clearer understanding of the overall training environment.

If the recommendation is accepted in principle, but currently appears daunting because of budget or other project pressures, an intermediary step would be to maintain Phil's yearly needs analysis for the meantime and look for an opportunity to implement more data gathering in subsequent years.

Action point:
By discussing with the sector organisations sound out the feasibility of the concept. Promote the concept in terms of further understanding and defining national SAR incident capability.

Budget estimate:
Dependent upon the action to be taken.

Recommendation

Actively promote the Management course as a SAR cross-sector premier event.

This is a very valuable summing up, keystone course. It is cross-sector, you can influence it more than internal organisation training which means you have some facility to use the course to address related training needs that appear in the future by negotiating curriculum adjustment.

Attempt to keep it as a finishing course by seeing the underlying training as a pre-requisite to attendance.

By highlighting the course in SAR publications, you can grow the status and presence in the sector. Likewise, if it is not already done consistently, a paper based recognition for completing the course would help serve the same purpose.

Recommendation

After the current Total Review of Qualifications (TRoQ) exercise being undertaken by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority, aim to be represented on EMQUAL's Board for information flow and SAR influencing purposes in the changed qualification environment.

At a minimum it is important to have a say in any changes that may occur to CIMS 2 and CIMS 4 given the importance of those to the SAR sector.

The Emergency Management Total Review of Qualifications meanders on at its own pace, EMQUAL have a year of (reduced) funding from TEC in 2014 before the Govt. financial support for them as that entity disappears. They will no doubt be looking to position themselves as the arbiters of the emergency management training funding stream announced in late 2014, having already said they would like a role as a Standard Setting Body.

The Secretariat need CIMS 2 and 4 as part of the core curriculum to avoid having to find another means of offering that information, they are unit standard based and currently under EMQUAL's stewardship as qualifications. Plus if EMQUAL is successful in their bid, having an influence in the MCDEM funding stream will achieve concurrence. You will want to monitor, and possibly grow the SAR relevance of CIMS post-TRoQ. Being at primary discussions strategically enables you to bring a SAR voice to the current MCDEM/NZ Fire Service influenced environment.

Recommendation

If cross-sector formal NZQA training certification is deemed important at some future point, apply that certification to collaborative training events.

This would avoid the complexities of having an imposition on agency training that is focussed on meeting mandated authority outcomes.

Action point:

If there is sector pressure to incorporate national qualifications within the core curriculum, in the changed environment post TRoQ, Tai Poutini may be able to certificate the Leadership/Management courses in that way. Overall the recognition of existing training is an easier and less complex path to national qualifications than trying to corral large organisations into agreeing a common qualification that suits all.

Writing Plan for Cross-Sector Information Booklet

TOPIC/PAGE TOTAL GUIDE	THE PURPOSE OF THE INFORMATION IS SO LEARNERS CAN	THE WRITER NEEDS TO EXPLAIN	THESE POINTS SHOULD BE COVERED
Overall Introduction › 2 pages	Understand what they are about to read, and perceive the sector collaboration.	The fact that the information underpins the SAR Incident Management training and the importance of reading the booklet through.	Where to go for queries or further information.
Government Policy and SAR Governance › 6 pages	Identify the flow down of authorisation and the mandated responsibilities.	• The Government authorisations that empower NZ SAR. • How the mandates are implemented by sector organisations. • The funding streams and the obligations that are implicit in that.	• NZ Government/Cabinet/ ODESC • NZSAR Council, Consultative Committee, Secretariat • NZ Police • NZ Defence Force • Ministry of Transport • Civil Aviation Authority • Maritime NZ/Rescue Coordination Centre NZ • Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management • Funding, analysis and reporting.
NZ SAR Structure and Organisations › 8 pages	Understand the overall NZ SAR structure and the working relationships between organisations.	a. The obligations of the lead agencies. b. The strategic partnerships between those agencies and other NZ SAR organisations.	• Definition of SAR • RCCNZ, NZ Police: Structures, roles, responsibilities Partnerships (including Service Level Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding) • Strategic partners • Policies, procedures (CIMS/ IAMSAR) and protocols.

TOPIC/PAGE TOTAL GUIDE	THE PURPOSE OF THE INFORMATION IS SO LEARNERS CAN	THE WRITER NEEDS TO EXPLAIN	THESE POINTS SHOULD BE COVERED
Law, Ethics and Guidelines › 6 pages	Recognise the applicable legal framework, and operational core values and codes of conduct.	a. The legal framework within which NZ SAR operates. b. The core ethical values and codes of conduct within a NZ SAR operational context.	• NZ Law • Common law • Aviation and Maritime law • International law(s) and conventions • Ethics and Codes of Conduct
International relationships › 3 pages	Describe existing international relationships and SAR trends.	a. The international organisations NZ SAR agencies have working relationships with. b. The nature of the relationships. c. Where to look to find information on current international trends, issues, research and development.	• Partnerships, • Trends and issues • International SAR organisation(s) • Interpol • Research and development
Section knowledge test. › 2 pages	Embed key points in their memory. Check their understanding of key facts.	Pick out key ideas and develop short, recall (closed) questions for each.	• Provide answers and explanations with related page references.

Xperts