

CHAPTER 2

Qualifications for Australian Career Development Practitioners

Peter McIlveen and Carolyn Alchin

University of Southern Queensland

The practice of career development (or vocational guidance) has a long history in Australia, dating back to the early decades during the fledgling nation's recovery from the Great War and Great Depression. Career development's formal arrival was signaled in 1926 by the state government of New South Wales which invested in the establishment of a vocational guidance bureau "so that all children passing through our schools may be assisted to become self-supporting and self-reliant citizens" (Morgan & Hart, 1977, p. 4). Other states followed suit, but their efforts were interrupted by World War II. Nation building after the war saw redoubled efforts to integrate vocational guidance into education and employment services.

Holland's now famous RIASEC framework was relatively unknown outside the USA in the 1960s (Taylor, 1967) but Australian researchers were quick to recognize its conceptual, empirical, and practical merits (Taylor & Kelso, 1973). In this era, the Graduate Careers Council of Australia (now Graduate Careers Australia) published graduate career information products and conducted research on graduate employment destinations on behalf of universities since the 1960s and 1970s. Similarly, career education has been present at various levels in the school system since the 1960s and formally declared a national priority in 1989 (McCowan & McKenzie, 1994). The landmark review of Australia's career development (guidance) system by the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD) revealed a diverse landscape ranging in extremes from world-leading excellence to disparate and disorganized (Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation, 2002). With this historical background, we overview Australian career development practice in the contexts of education and employment, and begin with the recent emergence of the profession, career development practitioner.

Evolution to Professionalization

As a formally acknowledged and distinct profession, career development practitioner, is a relatively new phenomenon in Australia. Formal degree qualifications with a specific major in career development have a relatively short history in Australia. In the past decade, specific qualifications for career development practice flourished. Of course, there are traditional qualifications that include studies of career development in their coursework curricula, such as master degrees in psychology and education; however, qualifications that are accredited by industry as a specialist major in career development are a relatively recent innovation in the field. The emergence of these specialist qualifications in the Australian education and training system is due to a confluence of factors involving cooperation amongst government, professional associations, and universities, and the impetus provided by a number of government reviews of Australia's career development system (Anderson, Milligan, Caldwell, & Johson, 1994; Koder, 1991) and the education and training needs of practitioners (National Board of Employment Education and Training, 1992). The critique provided by the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation (2002) review is, however, regarded as a watershed moment for the field in the 21st century.

The Australian government's response to the OECD review was nothing less than transformative. The Australian government sponsored the National Career Practitioners Forum in 2004 and commissioned its delegates to develop a strategy toward the professionalization of career development practice under the aegis of the Professional Standards for Australian Career Development Practitioners (Career Industry Council of Australia, 2011). The professional standards are central to the design and delivery of qualifications in career development and for practitioners' membership of a professional association.

This is not to suggest that there were no coordinated efforts and initiatives prior to the government's momentous intervention and the commissioning of the Professional Standards. In other quarters, leading advocates argued for a national career development system (McCowan & Hyndman, 1998; Patton, 2002, 2005) and more effective use of existing expertise in vocational psychology (Athanasou, 2008). Beyond government purview, there were independent professional associations offering professional learning opportunities to practitioners (e.g., school guidance counselors, teachers, psychologists) providing career development services in different industry and educational sectors (e.g., schools, universities). Cooperation amongst 12 professional associations culminated in the formation of the Career Industry Council of Australia (CICA). Voluntary formation of CICA as a cooperative body of professional associations, hereafter referred to as CICA Member Associations (MA), was hailed internationally as a model of good practice. Albeit independent of government, CICA was instrumental in the

implementation of the Australian government's program for a national approach to career development to redress the limitations reported by the OEDC.

CICA's most significant achievement is its release of the Professional Standards in 2006 (Career Industry Council of Australia, 2011). The Professional Standards stipulates the qualifications, continuing professional development, and ethics of professional practice for practitioners belonging to one (or more) of the professional associations that constitute CICA. Concomitantly, CICA established policies and procedures for the endorsement of qualifications that complied with its professional standards. It is crucial to note that the Professional Standards apply only to practitioners who are members of a CICA MA. Other professions (e.g., psychologists) offer career development services within the remit of their profession that is legally prescribed and statutorily registered by the Australian government and within the ethical guidelines of that profession. Whether psychologists' training in career development is aligned with the professional standards is an entirely different matter (McIlveen, Hoare, McMahon, & Patton, 2010). Nonetheless, it is not unusual for psychologists to belong to a CICA MA (e.g., Career Development Association of Australia) and thereby be liable to two sets ethical codes and continuing professional development regimes.

CICA's authority as an industry body was established as much by its MAs amending their respective constitutions to comply with these new professional standards, as it was by the trust and cooperation among the MA that formed CICA. Similarly, education and training providers enjoined this spirit of cooperation by submitting their qualifications to CICA for endorsement. The universities, which sought endorsement of their qualifications, ipso facto, accorded CICA legitimacy as the steward of the Professional Standards. Had the universities chosen to disregard CICA and its presumed status as an industry body—one without statutory authority—then the career development field in Australia would be significantly different from what it is today. To understand the goodwill of the universities submitting their qualifications to CICA for endorsement, it is necessary to understand the complexities of the Australian education and training system. Indeed, it is impossible to appreciate the structure and quality of Australia's education and training system without an understanding of its regulatory environment; thus, we subsequently provide an overview of the controls on providers and qualifications.

Regulatory Framework

Australia, the nation, is a federation of states and territories, with three jurisdictional tiers of government: local, state/territory, and the national Australian government. The national Australian government, and the state and territory governments, regulate the education and training system (or systems to be more precise). In addition, industry and professional bodies are germane to the system and regulation via their setting standards for specific disciplinary

practices and registration of practitioners. This regulatory regime covers private providers (both for-profit and not-for-profit) and public providers operating in the vocational education and training (VET) and higher education (HE) sectors and the qualifications they provide. Qualifications in career development are offered in both systems and are therefore subject to the regulatory framework.

The Australian Qualification Framework (AQF) is the principal platform upon which all formally recognized qualifications are designed, accredited, and delivered. Providers may offer education and training programs that lead to the provision of an endorsement or qualification of some kind (e.g., training offered by a professional body); however, that learning experience is not recognized formally as a qualification, or part thereof, unless the provider and the qualification are offered under the provisions of the AQF (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013).

There are three levels of education and training in Australia: primary (K-6), secondary (7-12), and tertiary. The states and territories are principally responsible for primary and secondary schooling; however, the Australian government has considerable influence, directly (e.g., funding independent non-government schools) and indirectly (e.g., funding strategies for implementation by the States and Territories). Compulsory schooling begins with the preparatory years of early childhood, goes through to primary and finally onward to senior high school, culminating in the AQF qualification, Senior Secondary Certificate of Education. In most circumstances, the Senior Secondary Certificate is required for direct entry into post-compulsory programs in tertiary education. There are other entry pathways (e.g., from VET to HE) but these will be mentioned only when relevant herein. Tertiary education in Australia subsumes HE and VET sectors, and qualifications in career development practice are offered in both these sectors.

The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) stringently controls all HE providers.

TEQSA regulates and assures the quality of Australia's large, diverse and complex higher education sector. The Australian higher education system comprises both public and private universities, Australian branches of overseas universities, and other higher education providers with and without self-accrediting authority . . . TEQSA registers and evaluates the performance of higher education providers against the Higher Education Standards Framework - specifically, the Threshold Standards, which all providers must meet in order to enter and remain within Australia's higher education system. (Australian Government Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, n.d., "TEQSA's role and functions," para. 1-2)

TEQSA operates under the auspices of the Australian Minister for Education. Its authority is established by two acts of the Australian government, the TEQSA Act 2011 and the Yoon, H. J., Hutchison, B., Maze, M., Pritchard, C., & Reiss, A. (Eds.). (2018). *International practices of career services, credentials, and training*. Broken Arrow, OK: National Career Development Association.

Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (TEQSA Act, 2011). The TEQSA Act subsumes the Higher Education Standards Framework that stipulate mandatory requirements apropos Threshold Standards for: (a) student participation and attainment; (b) learning environment; (c) teaching; (d) research and research training; (e) institutional quality assurance; (f) governance and accountability; (g) representation, information and information management; (h) classification of HE providers; and (i) criteria for self-accreditation of courses offered by institutions.

It is important to note the term “self-accrediting authority”, because not all HE providers have this authority. Australian universities are permitted to accredit their own degree programs in compliance with all relevant legislation and standards. The word, “university,” is legally prescribed under the TEQSA Act. Other, non-university, HE providers have limited self-accreditation status but may not claim the status of a university. Other HE providers without self-accrediting status, such as small private institutions that are not universities, must submit their proposed degree programs to TEQSA for accreditation.

In addition to the legislation of the Australian government, universities are established by separate acts of the governments of their home state or territory and are required to report annually to respective parliaments, not only to provide evidence of the quality of their education and research activities but also to demonstrate their good governance and financial position. Other HE providers operating as private entities must additionally comply with corporate laws and regulatory authorities.

Similar to its HE counterpart, the VET sector is regulated by the Australian government, and the state and territory governments. On a national level, the VET sector complies with the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA) which registers providers and accredits qualifications. ASQA’s authority is established by the National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011 and its statutory role is to oversee implementation of the Standards for Registered Training Organizations, the Standards for VET Regulators, Standards for Training Packages, and Standards for VET Courses. These standards must be operationalized in accordance with the AQF.

Unlike the HE sector, there are many VET providers in Australia, ranging from the colleges of Technical and Further Education (TAFE) which are owned by the state governments, through to private training companies that are registered training organizations (RTO). Some of the RTOs are operating as small businesses offering a limited number of quite specific courses whereas others are larger business entities offering courses across a range of disciplinary areas.

Australia’s regulated education and training system is as much complex and bureaucratic as it is transparent and competitive, both domestically and internationally. Infringing the

regulations is regarded as a serious matter by the regulators and governments, and deregistration of courses and providers is a liable outcome. Flagrant infringements may lead to legal action. This ostensibly over-bearing regulatory system assures qualifications at world-class quality so that consumers can trust the brand of an Australian qualification that is accredited against the AQF.

Australian Qualifications Framework

The AQF is an instrument for assuring consistency and transparency across the entire education and training system. Indeed, the AQF is available free of charge to the public. Providers use the AQF when designing or reviewing their qualifications, and regulators use the AQF to judge the quality of the qualifications. Industry or discipline-specific requirements for the curricula of qualifications, such as the Professional Standards for Australian Career Practitioners, are implemented in alignment with the AQF's standards. The AQF is an integrated policy that comprises:

- The learning outcomes for each AQF level and qualification type.
- The specifications for the application of the AQF in the accreditation and development of qualifications.
- The policy requirements for issuing AQF qualifications.
- The policy requirements for qualification linkages and student pathways.
- The policy requirements for the registers of:
 - organizations authorized to accredit AQF qualification;
 - organizations authorized to issue AQF qualifications;
 - AQF qualifications and qualification pathways.
- The policy requirements for the addition or removal of qualification types in the AQF.
- The definitions of the terminology used in the policy (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013).

An important objective for the AQF is to provide pathways into and through formal education and training programs. Thus, a qualification offered by a provider in one state is easily understood and recognizable to another provider in another state, which facilitates a nationally consistent approach to the transfer of qualifications and workforce across the borders of the federation.

Australian qualifications are classified in terms of levels, objectives, outcomes, volume of learning, and nomenclature, ranging from basic certificate I through to doctoral degrees. The AQF levels are:

- Level one – certificate I;

- Level two – certificate II;
- Level three – certificate III;
- Level four – certificate IV;
- Level five – diploma;
- Level six – advanced diploma, associate degree;
- Level seven – bachelor degree;
- Level eight – bachelor honors, graduate certificate, graduate diploma;
- Level nine – master degree; and
- Level ten – doctoral degree.

Qualifications from levels one to six are usually offered in the VET sector whereas Levels seven to ten are offered in the HE sector, but there is not a clear separation between the two sectors. There are some instances where a VET provider has special accreditation to offer a level seven bachelor degree that is a specific vocationally oriented qualification (e.g., degree in nursing). Universities may offer level five diplomas and level six associate degrees; however, these diplomas are regarded as transitional qualifications that enable a person to enter into a bachelor degree rather than take the diploma as a distinctive qualification for a disciplinary field. Furthermore, qualifications earned in the VET sector may be used for entry into and credit toward a bachelor degree.

Career Development Qualifications

The qualifications in career development stipulated in the Professional Standards (CICA, 2009) are offered as a Certificate IV and Graduate Certificate. The AQF states, “the purpose of the Certificate IV qualification type is to qualify individuals who apply a broad range of specialist knowledge and skills in varied contexts to undertake skilled work and as a pathway for further learning” (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013). The Certificate IV qualification is regarded as the absolute minimum entry-level qualification for practitioners working at an associate level practitioner rather than a professional level. Its development as a qualification was given impetus by the Australian government’s response to the OECD (2002) report. It was regarded as a professional development course for individuals working in the field and performing the tasks of a career practitioner but without specialist qualifications in career development (e.g., school teachers, employment counsellors). There are views that as the Certificate IV has provisioned a viable number of qualified and experienced staff, it can now be phased out, to raise, once again the education and qualification level of this emerging, vibrant

and diverse profession. Furthermore, there are now sufficient graduate certificates to meet current demand (shown in Table 2.1).

The graduate certificate is regarded as the minimum for practice at the professional level defined within the Professional Standards. The AQF states, “the purpose of the graduate certificate qualification type is to qualify individuals who apply a body of knowledge in a range of contexts to undertake professional or highly skilled work and as a pathway for further learning” (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013). Graduate certificates are taken by individuals who are qualified in a particular profession (e.g., teacher, psychologist, guidance counsellor, human resources manager) or an academic discipline that is not itself an applied profession (e.g., sociology) but that nonetheless provides an appropriate foundation for career development practice.

Table 2.1. *Degree Qualifications Endorsed by the Career Industry Council of Australia*

Provider	Degree Qualification			
	Vocational Graduate Certificate	Graduate Certificate	Graduate Diploma	Master of Education
QUT		✓		✓
AUT		✓	✓	
ACU		✓		✓
UQ				
RMIT		✓	✓	
JCU		✓		
Swinburne		✓	✓	
CEAV	✓			
UNE		✓		
USQ		✓	✓	✓

Note. These qualifications were endorsed by CICA at the time of writing this article in November 2016. Queensland University of Technology (QUT), Auckland University of Technology (AUT), Australian Catholic University (ACU), University of Queensland (UQ), Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), James Cook University (JCU), Career Education Association of Victoria (CEVA), University of New England (UNE), Swinburne University (Swinburne), and University of Southern Queensland (USQ).

These qualifications range in duration. A graduate certificate if studied “full time” (i.e., four courses in a semester) takes one semester to complete. A graduate diploma requires at least two full-time semesters of study (i.e., one year) and a master degree requires at least three to four full-time semesters (i.e., one and a half years to two years). The programs are designed for individuals who are working and in need of part-time study options; thus, the time taken for each qualification is usually double because students take their courses at half the rate. In some cases,

graduate certificates are embedded into graduate diploma and master degrees, and students may articulate from one degree to the next carrying full credit from their previous studies.

Qualification Endorsement by CICA

The MAs that constitute CICA grant it the authority to “endorse” qualifications on their behalf and providers submit their qualifications to CICA for endorsement. An individual practitioner may use their endorsed qualification to apply for membership of a MA. This process of endorsement spares both practitioners and MAs the onerous task of assessing an applicant’s qualifications on a case-by-case basis. The word endorsement is chosen to distinguish CICA’s process from the word “accreditation,” which is more often associated with the discourse of TEQSA and AQSA. A course may be endorsed by CICA if the provider provides evidence that the course curriculum and the resources of the provider (e.g., academic staff) enable the development of the Professional Standards’ *core competencies* within its graduates. These Professional Standards are similar to others (e.g., International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 2003); therefore, only a summary of the competencies is provided here.

The first core competency is *career development theory*, which focuses on description and application of career development theory and lifespan career development so as to be able to foster career development strategies and refer or assess appropriately. The second, *labor market*, relates to understanding and application of labor market information to support clients in the career needs (e.g., job applications, resume or assessment centers). The third, *advanced communication skills*, is effective teamwork and communications skills, including verbal, written and listening skills. It is important to note that counseling is underpinned by this competency. The fourth, *ethical practice*, applies to professional behavior and networking, and the requirement to take on the ethic of lifelong learning. Fifth, *diversity*, applies to recognition and respect for diversity, inclusive of (dis)ability, ethnicity, gender, age, sexuality, and more. Sixth, *information and resource management* relates to collecting, analyzing, and utilizing information, staying up to date with technology. Finally, *professional practice*, relates to maintaining and evaluating client services, procedures and processes, and to apply innovation, planning and organizational skills to continuous improvement.

It is important to note that there are statutes across the Australian federation (national, state governments, and territory governments) that protect privacy and confidentiality, and impose strict regulations on the collection, storage, and release of personal information. Other statutes in Australia, across the federation, proscribe discrimination and harassment. Thus, the

core competencies, particularly ethical practice, diversity, and information and resource management, must be understood in this legal context.

The Professional Standards also include *specialist competencies*. These specialist competencies include assessment, counseling, program delivery, working with people with disabilities, project management, and employer liaison. Not all the qualifications endorsed by CICA equally teach for all the specialist competencies. For example, the coursework in some providers' degree programs may be proportionally weighted toward one or other of the specialist competencies. In effect, this provides diversity in the HE market and enables providers to emphasize their strengths based on their faculty resources (e.g., elective coursework, the professional and research interests of faculty staff). Nonetheless, all personnel contracted to teach into the degree programs must have appropriate qualifications, usually one AQF level above the program (e.g., a master degree is required to teach into the graduate certificate degree).

Recognized Prior Learning (RPL) procedures must also be articulated in an application for endorsement. Both TEQSA and AQSA emphasize the importance of RPL to enable the efficient transition between qualifications without the impost of students having to repeat coursework already completed in another qualification. For example, a practitioner who has completed a master of education with a major in guidance counseling should be afforded some credit for similar courses offered within a master of education with a major in career development. Alternatively, a practitioner who has completed a graduate certificate in Rehabilitation Counseling should be afforded some credit for electives in a Master of Education with a major in career development. Ordinarily, the maximum volume of credit is no more than 50% of the program. Unrelated courses cannot be used for credit. For example, it is unlikely that a master degree with a major in mathematics would be attract any credit. The principle of RPL is also alive in the provisions for alternative pathways to membership of professional associations.

Direct and Alternative Pathways to Professional Status

It is the MAs that effectively anoint a practitioner with the status of a professional. The most direct pathway to professional status is completing a qualification that is endorsed by CICA. Presently, the minimum qualification required for this level of membership is the Graduate Certificate in combination with relevant base qualifications (e.g., bachelor in education); however, practitioners with higher qualifications (e.g., master degrees) are well represented in the field.

As a measure of equity, diversity, and inclusivity, an alternative pathway is available to prospective members of a MA. These practitioners must provide a portfolio of evidence attesting equivalence in terms of education and training, and industry experience, and continuing

professional development in a work domain related to career development. Qualifications must be in a cognate field that corresponds to career development. These alternative qualifications typically include disciplinary fields such as: teaching, vocational education and training, guidance, behavioral sciences, psychology, counseling, human services, human resources, management, social science, sociology and rehabilitation counseling. For example, a psychologist with a master degree in psychology and several years working in a career development position, along with continuing professional development, may be admitted to professional status. Alternatively, an employment counselor with a master degree in business and human resources management, may be likewise admitted. It is likely that applicants via this route have qualifications that are higher than a graduate certificate in career development. Unlike the direct route, these applications must be adjudged on a case-by-case basis and each MA has a procedure for doing so. There is an equivalent alternative pathway for associate practitioners.

Continuing Professional Development

Continuous professional development (CPD) is valued by CICA and by their MAs, and CPD is embedded into the Professional Standards. Practitioners across the membership associations are expected to complete a minimum of 15 hours CPD per year for associate practitioners and a minimum of 30 hours for professional practitioners. Some associations have higher levels than the CICA minima. Members must provide evidence of their engagement in CPD activities and attribute their professional development to the competencies as described by CICA professional standards (2009). This professional development can occur in a range of practice areas (e.g., counseling, project management) and in a diversity of ways (e.g., seminars, online learning, work-based learning, supervision). CPD may also include postgraduate studies for upgrading level of membership in an association.

Practitioners are responsible for their recording of their CPD to demonstrate meeting the minimum requirements. Online databases are available for the completion of this requirement. Australian career practitioners have access to an online database sponsored by CICA; however, they are permitted to use another repository that is equivalent and able to furnish evidence should it be required in a random audit carried out by the relevant MA. This flexibility and efficiency of this provision is particularly important for practitioners who belong to another professional association and are obliged to use the system of that association. Although this may seem like double counting, belonging to another profession, particularly the statutory professions (e.g., teacher, psychologist), may carry the impost of CPD requirements in addition to that of their needs as a career development practitioner.

Although CPD can be financially expensive, both in direct cost and opportunity cost (e.g., time away from work), it is noteworthy that Australian Taxation Office allows individuals

to claim the cost of their CPD as a deduction against their gross assessable income for the purposes of calculating income tax, which defrays the financial impost of CPD. Also, some employers provide generous subsidies for practitioners' professional development. In addition, maintaining CPD can be a condition of receiving significantly discounted professional indemnity (insurance) that is available to practitioners belonging to some of the MAs.

Career Development in Educational Settings

There are at least three key instruments that may be used to inform career development learning curricula and pedagogies in Australia's education systems: Core Skills for Work; Australian Blueprint for Career Development, and the Australian Curriculum.

Core Skills for Work Developmental Framework

Core Skills for Work are "non-technical skills, knowledge and understandings that underpin successful participation in work" (Department of Industry Innovation Climate Change Science Research and Tertiary Education and Department of Education Employment and Workplace, 2013, p. 1). The framework is organized into three clusters subsuming ten skills: cluster one - navigate the world of work (1. manage career and work life; 2. work with roles, rights and protocols); cluster two - interact with others (3. communicate, connect and work with others, recognize and utilize diverse perspectives); and, cluster three - get the work done (4. plan and organize, make decisions, identify and solve problems, create and innovate, and work in a digital world). The framework also takes a developmental perspective, suggesting that the skills are progressively enhanced: novice performer, advanced beginner, capable performer, proficient performer, and, expert performer. Core skills may be used to assess people's current level of performance and then formulate a learning program to progress them through the developmental stages.

Australian Blueprint for Career Development

The Australian blueprint for career development (ABCD) is a valuable resource used in education and training settings (Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs, 2009).

The Australian blueprint for career development is a framework that can be used to design, implement and evaluate career development programs for young people and adults. At its core, the blueprint identifies the skills, attitudes and knowledge that individuals need to make sound choices and to effectively manage their careers. These career management skills will help young people to transition successfully to post-secondary training or a job after high school. They will encourage students to value

learning by linking it to their hopes and dreams for the future. These skills will also help adults to transition successfully between learning and work roles that support their family and community responsibilities. The primary aim of the Blueprint is to enable teachers, parents, career development practitioners, employment service providers, employers or others who are in a position to support people's careers and transitions, to work with a nationally consistent set of career management competencies which will help all Australians to better manage their lives, learning and work. (p. 8)

The ABCD presents a detailed framework of career management competencies along with a rich battery of resources for individuals and practitioners. The entire package is available free of charge under the provisions of a creative commons license.

Australian Curriculum

Australian education K–12 is delivered within a complex of national and state curricula, policies, and regulations. The overarching framework of the Australian Curriculum is administered by the Australian Curriculum, Assessment, and Reporting Authority (ACARA). State and territory governments are responsible for the implementation of the national curriculum within their schools. Although the Australian Curriculum specifies learning areas that may indirectly address career development learning, there is no national career development curriculum per se, despite the availability of a K-12 curriculum (McCowan & McKenzie, 1994, 1997). Schools may implement their own career education programs separately to the stipulated curricula.

An optional subject within the Australian Curriculum for years nine – ten is *work studies*. For example, in year nine, this subject addresses: learning to learn (e.g., plan and implement strategies and processes to improve their learning and enhance the potential to realize their aspirations and personal wellbeing); work skills (e.g., investigate a wide range of occupations, and the skills and personal qualities required in these fields); entrepreneurial behaviors (e.g., Identify types of entrepreneurial behaviors and their opportunities for application to 21st century work and enterprise); career development and management (e.g., recognize the importance of self-awareness in career and life design); the nature of work (e.g., describe the nature of work in Australia and the implications for current and future work opportunities; and, gaining and keeping work (e.g., identify the importance of rights and responsibilities for employers and workers).

Upon completing year 10 *work studies*, students should have achieved the following standard:

Students process the skills required to manage change and transition. They select learning strategies and career information and sources and evaluate and align their personal capacities. They select and apply appropriate communication methods in a range of

contexts. Students form and work in teams on a range of work-related tasks and observe and incorporate the skills needed to work collaboratively. They apply entrepreneurial skills to plan, implement and complete a negotiated action project. Students evaluate their findings, propose actions, make recommendations and present these to an audience of stakeholders. They synthesize increased self-knowledge and career information to school and career-based decisions and create potential career scenarios. Students research a range of information and data to identify trends in work arrangements emerging over time and evaluate agencies and organizations that support various employment situations. Students practice using and responding to 21st century recruitment and selection tools, methods and skills for accessing real and created work opportunities. Students collect and interpret information on different cultural approaches to ways of working. They explain the importance of culturally diverse workplaces to managing work, work relationships and productivity. Students apply conflict resolution methods and skills to work-related contexts. (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2017)

Ostensibly, the *work studies* subject is ideal; it is a nationally agreed curricular model for career development learning under the aegis of ACARA. Its status as an optional subject and its restriction to years nine and 10 diminish its implementation, however. Several professional associations represent career development practitioners, teachers, and allied professionals (e.g., psychologists) working in schools to provide career counseling and career education. These organizations are MAs that constitute the CICA. For example, at a national level, there is the Career Development Association of Australia, which is the largest cross-sector MA with more than 1000 members, as well as state-based organizations such as the Careers Advisors Association of New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory, the Career Education Association of Victoria, and the Queensland Guidance Counselors Association.

Australian universities have diverse approaches to providing career development services. Many have a “careers service” provisioning students with support from orientation through, and sometimes past graduation. These services are wide ranging. For example, assistance with goal setting, development of employability skills, or career counseling, through to workshops on graduate application methods, and mock interviews. Services distribute and disseminate resources in different ways according to need. Some embed career development in courses, others provide co-curricular, or extra curricula opportunities to engage and learn in this space. Staff in these services are often members of the National Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (NAGCAS) which first became an institutional body in 1997. Their membership body comprises over 400 individual members in Universities and tertiary settings, as well as institutional members across Australia and internationally. NAGCAS provides input to the national careers agenda, drawing on their wide ranging stakeholders across career services,

employers, international organizations and academics. The organization also provides regular state and national professional development opportunities, including a national conference each year. By and large, universities support expectations around their staff holding qualifications endorsed by CICA. On the whole, Australian universities provide professional career services that play an important role in students' transitions into and through their degree programs and the workforce (Phillips, 2008).

Career Development in Employment Settings

“Jobactive” is the Australian government’s current employment service designed to support Australians into work and to enable employers to find staff for their positions. We use the word “current” quite deliberately and critically. The Commonwealth Employment Services (CES) was established in 1946 as a post-war initiative to rebuild the nation. In the era of downsizing, rightsizing, outsourcing, or whatever euphemism may apply to the diminution of government departments by successive administrations, the CES was effectively disestablished only to have some of its services to unemployment people delivered by private sector non-government organizations on behalf of the government (i.e., outsourcing). The merits of the size and function of government departments are not the focus of the present paper; what must be stated, however, is that a long tradition of CES vocational guidance services were obliterated in the process of the CES’ disestablishment. This decision had an impact on the field because vital expertise lost its vortex of collaboration that resided within a central government department.

The current Jobactive initiative funds more than 1700 job active providers (i.e., private, NGOs funded by government) around Australia to connect workers with employers. It provides supports for those from non-English speaking backgrounds, and individuals with disabilities. The Australian government expects these providers to provide quality services to employers and job seekers. The providers do not appear to need to demonstrate that their staff meet the CICA standards for career development practice; however, they are subject to a service guarantee that articulates what job seekers can expect from their provider. Whether this guarantee has sufficient scope and power to enforce the provision of high quality career development services is a question needed to be answered by review and evaluation of “Jobactive.”

Perhaps one of the more laudable achievements of government in recent years is the Australian government’s National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), which is, by-and-large, the beneficiary of bipartisan political support. The NDIS is funded by the Australian tax-payer as national safety net that provides funding for individual support to people with a disability, their families, and their careers. It is promoted as providing a flexible and whole-of-life approach to supporting people to achieve their goals (National Disability Insurance Scheme, 2017). The

NDIS is still in the roll-out phase and the position of career development services in the mix of services to recipients is yet to be determined.

Australia has a large, thriving private sector personnel recruitment industry that provides consulting services, individual services, and online services. It is important to note that it is illegal for employment agencies to charge a fee to client-jobseeker; fees must be paid by the client-employment. Career development practitioners associated with these private enterprises may be members of the CDAA or similar associations that serve human resources or organizational psychology consultants.

Issues and Future Perspectives

Australian universities operate in a competitive market against one another in the domestic market and internationally against universities predominantly in the USA, UK, and Canada. These market forces combine with the heavy burden of regulation to produce a rationale for risk. Graduate certificate and master programs with enrolments that are deemed insufficient for whatever institutional reasons (e.g., financial return on investment, organizational restructures, lack of interest among academic staff) are at risk of cancellation. As with many niche programs or majors, there is always the risk of closure. Without doubt, forces driving the risk of closure will be present in the future. Other related professions facing similar risks have suffered considerable losses in their specialist master degree programs in recent years (e.g., counseling psychology). Thus, in present circumstances, it is unlikely that the number of Graduate certificate and master degree qualifications in career development will go up; in all likelihood, the number of programs will go down, perhaps to an equilibrium whereby the number of enrolments are sufficiently distributed among the number of institutions to mitigate financial risk of closure.

As a voluntary cooperative without statutory status, CICA has no direct influence over the decision-making processes of universities that choose to rationalize their offerings in the competitive market of HE. Closure of qualifications in career development should sound an alarm to the field. The very institutions that afforded CICA its status as an industry body with purview over the endorsement of qualifications in career development, may ultimately erode its status by cancelling the programs it endorses. Alternatively, those universities that continue to offer qualifications may eventually disregard CICA's endorsement regime to defray the concomitant administrative and financial burden of endorsement, and leave the decision of choice up to the customer. After all, there were programs operating before CICA's endorsement regime existed.

Should this scenario materialize in the coming years, the professional associations that constitute CICA as its MAs may have to take a different stance on their requirements for membership that currently require a CICA-endorsed program. Indeed, the Alternative Pathway to professional membership is already effective and currently recognizes qualifications in cognate disciplines (e.g., master degrees in guidance, counseling, psychology) that are not endorsed by CICA. Surely, a master degree in career development would be regarded as a cognate discipline within the conditions of the Alternative Pathway, regardless of whether the degree is or is not endorsed by CICA? Reactively abolishing the Alternative Pathway would be a financial death knell for professional associations that rely on members' annual subscriptions for their existence. Thus, the profession is caught between a rock and hard place at present. Additional administrative or regulatory burdens cannot resolve this complex situation; a new approach is needed.

Compared to the mature professions with statutory imprimatur (e.g., teachers, psychologists) and larger professions without statutory status but wielding market presence due to sheer numbers (e.g., human resource managers), the fledgling profession, perhaps better put as the proto-profession, career development practitioner, is vulnerable to competition from the established professions and from differences within its own ranks. For example, as clinical psychologists compete with and progressively take over the work traditionally available to counseling psychologists, they will find their place again in the work of career development. Similarly, organizational psychologists are already well qualified for career development practice (McIlveen et al., 2010). In 2015, CICA created a new labeling system, whereby career practitioners may apply to CICA to use the label of associate practitioner, professional, or leading certified practitioner. This labeling system supervenes the extant system of MAs affirming professional status on practitioners. Furthermore, it comes as an additional cost to practitioners. Only time will tell if the labeling system develops cache in the market in the eyes of the public, and does not concomitantly diminish the value proposition of being a professional member of a MA.

For good or ill, governments do play a significant role in career development practice within education and training contexts, particularly those contexts under their regulatory gaze. Notwithstanding the Australian government's enthusiasm for career development when The Honorable Dr. Brendan Nelson was the Minister responsible in the mid-2000s, successive governments of both political persuasions have steadily disinvested in national career development policies and programs. One promising initiative, the National Career Development Strategy, was released by then the Minister in the twilight days of the government as it transitioned into a caretaker mode ahead of a federal election. The new Minister subsequently paid scant attention to the strategy released by his predecessor. One can only speculate as to what

would have happened if the Minister had held that strategy back for release by the incoming Minister. These historical notes serve as a reminder that the Australian government can strongly influence the career development system.

The level of under-investment, if not dis-investment, in career development services is revealed in a report commissioned by CICA that produced astonishing findings:

Research shows 1 in 3 career practitioners are provided with less than \$1000 annually to undertake career development activities across their entire school. 1 in 2 schools with a population of over 1000 students have less than \$3 per student to spend on career education. (McCrindle, 2015)

Of course, there are substantial variations among the states and territories, and among schools—public, Catholic, and independent. These findings are, nonetheless, a source of serious concern. Fortunately, there is some hope that the Australian government is once again taking an active interest in career development, in educational settings, at least. The present Minister for Education, The Honorable Simon Birmingham, has initiated a process to create a renewed National Career Education Strategy. The scope and impact of this renewal is yet to be seen.

Conclusion

We write this paper knowing that the Australian system of career development is in flux. Our nation's education systems are under constant government surveillance and review to further enhance their mission, operations, and productivity, within a volatile but lucrative international market, and this is despite its significant contribution to the growth of Australia's society, economy, citizens, and those from abroad. With a focus on the changing world of work, globalization, basification, and mechanization, these issues are of paramount importance to the future workforce, economic growth, and emerging industries. Career development services can play a crucial role in how Australia manages its humanistic and socio-economic aspirations. To play that role will require consistent if not constant promotion of the multifaceted value of career development services.

References

- Anderson, D. S., Milligan, B., Caldwell, G., & Johson, R. (1994). *Careers advisory services in higher education*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Athanasou, J. A. (2008). Vocational psychology: Realising its true potential. *Australian Journal of Career Development, 17*(3), 3-5. doi: 10.1177/103841620801700301

- Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017). *Work studies*. Retrieved from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/work-studies/nature-of-work-studies>
- Australian Government Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (n.d.). About TEQSA. Retrieved from <http://www.teqsa.gov.au/about>
- Australian Qualifications Framework Council. (2013). *Australian Qualifications Framework* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <https://www.aqf.edu.au/sites/aqf/files/aqf-2nd-edition-january-2013.pdf>
- Career Industry Council of Australia. (2007). *Professional standards for Australian career development practitioners*. Retrieved from <http://www.cica.org.au>
- Department of Industry Innovation Climate Change Science Research and Tertiary Education and Department of Education Employment and Workplace. (2013). *Core skills for work developmental framework*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government.
- Koder, M. (1991). *Careers advisory services in higher education institutions: Report of the National Board of Employment, education and training and the Department of Employment, education and training*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- McCowan, C., & Hyndman, K. (1998). A career advisory system for Australia? *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 7(1), 35-41. Retrieved from <https://www.acer.org/ajcd>
- McCowan, C., & McKenzie, M. (1994). *The guide to career education. For careers personnel working in Australian schools and colleges*. Sury Hills, Australia: New Hobsons.
- McCowan, C., & McKenzie, M. (1997). *The guide to career education. For careers personnel working in Australian schools and colleges*. North Sydney, Australia: New Hobsons Press.
- McIlveen, P., Hoare, P. N., McMahan, M., & Patton, W. (2010). Reviewing psychologists' qualifications for career development practice in Australia. *Australian Psychologist*, 45(2), 84-97. doi: 10.1080/00050060903261512
- Mccrindle. (2015, March 24). A snapshot of career practitioners in Australia [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://mccrindle.com.au/the-mccrindle-blog/a-snapshot-of-career-practitioners-in-australia>
- Ministerial Council on Education Employment Training and Youth Affairs. (2009). *The Australian blueprint for career development*. Retrieved from <http://www.blueprint.edu.au/>
- Morgan, C. J., & Hart, G. R. (1977). *Career education in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: CRAC/Hobsons Press.
- National Board of Employment Education and Training. (1992). *A national training framework for careers coordinators: A proposal*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2002). OECD review of career guidance policies. Australia country note. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/australia/1948341.pdf>

- Patton, W. (2002). Training for career development professionals: Responding to supply and demand in the next decade. *Australian Journal of Career Development, 11*(3), 56-62. doi: 10.1177/103841620201100317
- Patton, W. (2005). Coming of age? Overview of career guidance policy and practice in Australia. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance, 5*(2), 217-227. doi: 10.1007/s10775-005-8801-6
- Phillips, K. P. A. (2008). *Review of career development services in Australian tertiary institutions*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. Retrieved from https://works.bepress.com/justin_brown/12/download/
- Taylor, K. F. (1967). Review of the psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and model environments by J. L. Holland. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 19*, 276-277. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1162123>
- Taylor, K. F., & Kelso, G. I. (1973). Course of study and personality: An Australian test of Holland's theory. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 25*(3), 199-209. doi: 10.1080/00049537308255846
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.teqsa.gov.au/about/legislation>

Author Bios

Peter McIlveen, PhD, is Research Director of the Australian Collaboratory for Career, Employability, and Learning for Living (ACCELL). Dr McIlveen is a psychologist and an associate professor with the School of Linguistics Adult & Specialist Education at the University of Southern Queensland, Australia. He serves on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *Australian Psychologist*, and *Frontiers in Psychology*. He has served the career development profession as vice-president of the Career Development Association of Australia (CDAA) and the Career Industry Council of Australia (CICA), and as president of the National Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (NAGCAS). Correspondence to: peter.mcilveen@usq.edu.au

Carolyn Alchin is a Masters qualified Career Development Practitioner, a focused business person, and a motivated educator. She is the Career Development Association of Australia's (CDAA) 2016 practitioner of the year. She has more than 15 years' experience in the business, education and careers sector and currently serves on the National executive committee for the CDAA. She has worked in higher education, public and private sector roles and is passionate about supporting professionals, practitioners and clients to understand and access their potential. Correspondence to: carolyn.alchin@usq.edu.au