
CARPENTRY CONSULTATION FORUMS SUMMARY OF FINDINGS RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS

This document needs to be read in conjunction with the National Summary compiled by CBA Consulting Group as a result of the Consultation Forums held around the country in relation to the first phase of the review of the Carpentry Qualification.

This summary paper addresses some of the critical thinking that went into analysing the results from the forums and highlights:

- background information on industry stakeholders and employer surveys (brown text)
- questions asked in group sessions during the forums (**bolded in black**)
- other relevant information that needed to be considered in conjunction with the forum findings (plain black text)
- the specific points that we considered in determining the pathway forward (bulleted in blue)
- decisions made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group – creating the basis for the formal review of the unit standards and associated material to be undertaken in 2007 (bulleted in green)

For ease of reading, any references to charts, data or information in the National Summary have been highlighted in orange.

If you would like further explanation or on reading this wish to now register your interest in being involved in a regional focus group next year, please do not hesitate to contact:

Pauline Sutton
Qualifications Manager
BCITO
(04) 381 6437
(027) 454 0861
pauline.sutton@bcito.org.nz

Industry Stakeholders

The majority of the Industry Stakeholders consisted of the following types of people:

- Employers
- Employer/Assessors
- Assessors (both of Apprentices and RCC Candidates)
- Apprentices
- Polytechnic, PTE or School tutorial staff

The BCITO relied on people identifying themselves when registering their interest and again when they attended a forum. There were however other people who attended forums – and they included:

- Retired tradesmen
- Supplier representatives to the construction industry (generally trade qualified themselves)
- Partners (generally wives who are involved in the paperwork within the business)
- An NZQA representative
- A representative from BRANZ
- A Site Safe Safety Advisor (also a qualified Carpenter)

The chart that shows who the Industry Stakeholders were at the forums [[Page 3, National Summary](#)] only shows four categories:

- Employers
- Apprentices
- “Others”
- N/A

“Others” embraces everyone who didn’t identify themselves as being an Employer or an Apprentice. N/A indicates they did not note what they do.

There is a discrepancy in the number of Employers as recorded in the forum answer booklets (124) [[data from Page 3, National Summary](#)] versus those who filled in the Employer Survey (168) [[data from Page 4, National Summary](#)]. This was inevitable given that it was left up to an individual’s discretion as to how they identified themselves and whether they chose to fill in the survey or not.

These results or discrepancies in numbers had no affect on the outcomes of this part of the review process – but is worthy of note.

Employer Survey

A short survey was given to Employers to complete so that we could get a feel for the type of work that individual companies undertake, where they operate, how large they are, and how many qualified (or nearly qualified) employees they have.

From the [first chart on Page 4 of the National Summary](#) document, we can identify that 67% of the Employers work in the residential sector and 13% work in both residential and commercial – so there is likely to be a residential slant to the answers to the questions asked at the forums.

From the [second chart on Page 4 of the National Summary](#) document, we can identify that 57% of the Employers work in urban areas and 23% work in both urban and rural areas – so there could potentially be a bit of a “city” slant to the answers to the questions asked at the forums.

Industry Change

1. **Is there any such thing as a well-rounded Carpenter? Yes/No. If yes, how would you describe them? If no, why?**

The Purpose Statement in the current National Certificate in Carpentry states:

This qualification recognises the skills and knowledge required to work as a carpenter in the construction industry. People who gain the qualification will have a ***broad enough knowledge and skill base to work as a competent tradesperson whether they specialise in residential, industrial, commercial or multi-storey construction.*** The qualification consists of compulsory Carpentry Theory and Carpentry Practical unit standards, first aid unit standards, and elective unit standards from the domains of Carpentry, Carpentry Theory, Concrete Construction and Specialist Interiors. This allows for some flexibility in obtaining the practical skills required to be a competent carpenter depending on the type of construction work available while completing the qualification. No matter which of the unit standards are selected from the elective sections, ***the National Certificate in Carpentry (Level 4) is designed to reflect the skills and knowledge of a well-rounded carpenter.*** This qualification can lead to the National Certificate in Construction (Leading Hand) (Level 4) [Ref: 1130] or the National Certificate in Construction (Supervisor) (Level 5) [Ref: 1131].

The descriptions offered in the forum response books **[Pages 6 and 7, National Summary]** tend to indicate that a “well rounded carpenter” is more than trade qualified. In other words, you would not be considered well rounded at the completion of your National Certificate – but you would once you have obtained more experience in the industry once you have qualified.

The descriptions also acknowledge the different facets of building (both residential and commercial).

While there is a resounding “yes” to the question asked (92%) **[Page 6, National Summary]**, the “no’s” start to hit on a “specialisation theme” that we will start to see emerge and offer some reasons why those who said “no” don’t believe that Carpenters are able to be well rounded.

Specific Points Considered:

- The appropriateness of using the term “well rounded carpenter” in the qualification if a well rounded carpenter is much more than the National Certificate.
- Whether there are things in the descriptions of a well rounded carpenter from the forums that need to be considered for inclusion in the qualification that aren’t currently there.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That the purpose statement in the qualification remove reference to the “well rounded carpenter” so that there is not the assumption that someone who has just graduated with the qualification is “well rounded” – as that takes considerable more time and application working in the industry to achieve that status.
- That the reworded purpose statement, look in the first instance, at a simpler statement that removes the implication of specialising (in residential, industrial, commercial or multi-storey) and just talks about a qualification that creates “a competent carpentry tradesperson”.

- That the reworded purpose statement somehow reflects the six factors of commercial competence that apprentices are assessed against and that has become the hallmark of determining competence against the unit standards and the qualification.
- That consideration is given to “beefing up” the section on codes, compliance, regulatory requirements, and licensing. (This was the only description that arose from the forums that was considered important to incorporate in the qualification – both as an integral part of an Apprentice’s training and a likely requirement from the Department of Building and Housing. All other descriptions were felt to lie outside the scope of the qualification and within the realm of a well rounded Carpenter who had a lot more experience in the industry.)

2. Has the industry changed in the past 40 or so years? Yes/No. If yes, how?

There was an overwhelming “yes” to this question (99%) [Page 7, National Summary].

The “specialisation theme” mentioned above also emerges here in many of the reasons provided. Some of the reasons are “interesting” but hard to acknowledge (eg less time to do things and more pressure) while others need some careful consideration as to whether there is currently sufficient coverage in the qualification to ensure that it is “up to date” (eg Government regulations, compliance and documentation). Then there are those that would be difficult to teach (eg greater public and customer expectations) – but consideration should none the less be given on whether to include any information on customer service or quality. All of ideas were food for thought – and the full list of reasons were considered and discussed on their merit. [Pages 7 and 8, National Summary]

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether any of these changes in the industry need to be acknowledged in the qualification if they aren’t indeed already acknowledged.
- Whether any of these changes in the industry are at an appropriate level for the National Certificate (ie is it appropriate to be a part of the Carpentry qualification or more appropriately in a higher-level Leading Hand, Supervisor or Construction Management qualification?).
- What impact any additions would have to the current length of time associated with the qualification and whether they could be reasonably expected.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- As with the previous question’s final recommendation, the only thing that needs to be “beefed up” is the section on codes, compliance, regulatory requirements, and licensing. It was not felt that this addition would unduly impact on the current length of the qualification or the level at which the qualification sits.
- While a “specialisation theme” first starts to emerge in a number of the responses to this question, it should not influence the overall shape of the qualification. There are fundamental basics that are considered to be part of a carpenter’s tool-kit and therefore should not be watered down in any way. (This is discussed more fully in answer to some of the questions relating to the composition and content of the qualification.)

3. **Can apprentice Carpenters still rely on learning the traditional skills that were present in the industry 40 years ago? Yes/No. Are these skills important and still a necessity in the industry? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?**

The responses to the first question is close to a 50/50 split (55% No, 43% Yes) **[Page 8, National Summary]**.

It is interesting to note the differences between the Industry Stakeholder responses and the BCITO staff responses. (Industry – 54% No, 45% Yes and BCITO, 63% No, 36% Yes.) **[Page 9, National Summary]** In looking at this variance it is important to consider that BCITO staff potentially have a wider exposure to different Apprentices and Employers given that all Training Advisors generally have a client base of 150 – and therefore they are viewing this question looking at an overall picture as opposed to an individual company perspective.

The No's hold a slim majority, and some of the reasons given once again acknowledge specialisation in the industry. It introduces the dilemma we are facing in acknowledging change in the industry while holding onto skills of the past that have formed the backbone of the trade.

The responses to the second question shows a clear majority of 82% **[Page 10, National Summary]** believing that traditional skills are still a necessity in the industry and therefore lead to the assumption that they will be a part of the Carpentry qualification.

Specific Points Considered:

- Defining “traditional skills” and their place in the qualification.
- How to address the delivery of these skills given the acknowledgement that not all Apprentices can rely on learning them in whatever their current apprenticeship model is.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That there is a mental shift away from focussing on the word “traditional” and a move towards more focus on the word “critical”. Critical skills are the ones that need to be covered in the qualification and relate to those skills that an Apprentice needs to become a tradesperson.

The Composition of the Qualification

1. **Is the present composition of the qualification still meeting the needs of the industry? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?**

With 83% of people answering “yes” to this question **[Page 11, National Summary]**, you could safely assume that people are generally happy that the current composition of the qualification.

However, there are some interesting points that come out of the reasons given by the “no’s” **[Page 12, National Summary]**, including:

- Recognition of changes in products and technology.
- Specifics for Commercial versus Residential versus Civil.
- Achievability of some practical unit standards including elements no longer undertaken.

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether there is anything significant in the findings or reasons provided that needs to be addressed.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That while on the surface the industry represented at the forums seemed happy with the present composition of the qualification, there was not enough representation from the commercial sector of the industry to make a completely informed decision. In order to make a confident recommendation, it was felt that a meeting needed to be held with key commercial construction companies in order to gauge their understanding on the current composition of the qualification.

Note

This question can't be looked at in isolation and decisions made and noted later in this summary go some way to potentially providing solutions for the commercial sector if indeed it is felt that the present composition is not altogether meeting their needs.

2. Is the current qualification achievable by the majority of those who wish to work in the industry as qualified Carpenters? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

There was a resounding “yes” to the question asked (93%) [Page 12, National Summary].

Some answers reflected things like “attitude”, “motivation” and “personal skills” – all relating to how an Apprentice behaves and whether they want to achieve the qualification. There were others that hinted once again at the “specialisation theme” – which is cropping up consistently everywhere in some way, shape or form. [The list of reasons for “Yes” and “No” can be seen on Page 13, National Summary.]

As with the previous question, Specific Points Considered:

- Whether there is anything significant in the findings or reasons provided that needs to be addressed.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- Instigation of a meeting with key commercial construction companies.

3. Given your experience, are apprentices' literacy and numeracy skills sufficient to achieve the unit standards in the qualification? Yes/No. If no, should the qualification include components to assist with this? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

The responses to the first question show a slim majority to the Yes's – (61% Yes, 39% No) [Page 14, National Summary].

It is interesting once again to note the differences between the Industry Stakeholder responses and the BCITO staff responses. (Industry – 60% Yes, 40% No and BCITO, 68% Yes, 32% No.) [Page 14, National Summary] This variance once again could be explained by BCITO staff's wider exposure to different Apprentices and Employers.

Several comments in the reasons for the “yes's” relate to support needed for or provided to Apprentices [Page 14, National Summary]. There are also several comments that acknowledge maths as a “bit tricky”.

Some of the comments in the reasons for the “no’s” should not be overlooked and form the basis for what the Sub-Committee needs to consider [Page 15, National Summary].

It is also worthwhile pointing out a paragraph from the current registered version of the Carpentry qualification that is contained under “Special Notes, Recommended for Entry”:

Due to the health and safety requirements of the sites in which these trade skills are applied, people entering programmes of education and training leading to the award of this qualification must **demonstrate the capacity to understand any and all requirements, instructions, and communications (oral, written and graphic), to the required industry level.** This might be evidenced by **Sixth Form Certificate English, credits from the Communication Skills and English subfields at level 2 or above,** or the demonstration of equivalent knowledge and skills.

For the second question, technically only those who answered “no” needed to answer. However, many of the “yes’s” answered also – thus leading to there being quite a large “no answer” component. (Should the qualification include components to assist with numeracy and literacy? 41% No, 34% No Answer, 26% Yes.) [Page 15, National Summary] This in turn leaves the result fairly non-conclusive, but needing to be considered none the less.

The responses tend to lean towards not including actual unit standards on numeracy and literacy (ie school maths and English units) but rather:

- Providing help where needed.
- Looking at some sort of entry criteria.
- Putting some sort of responsibility back on the schools.
[The full list of reasons can be seen on Page 16, National Summary.]

Specific Points Considered:

- The appropriateness of an entry level to the qualification and whether this should be “mandatory” or “recommended”.
- If there is to be an entry level, the level at which it sits needs to be determined and also whether the requirement should address numeracy and literacy (or just literacy as it currently does).
- Whether the BCITO should be lobbying Government and Schools to pass on industry’s comments regarding the quality of the students coming out of our schools.
- Whether the BCITO should provide any assistance/support to those struggling with the qualification as a result of numeracy and literacy difficulties and what that assistance/support should be.
- The current research being undertaken by the BCITO on numeracy and literacy.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That there is no entry level instituted for the qualification in a mandatory sense, but the expectations of the industry be communicated clearly in terms of what needs to be demonstrated to achieve the qualification.

- That the current recommendation in the actual qualification document (under “Special Notes, Recommended for Entry”) be changed to reflect both literacy and numeracy needs and that the level be more appropriate than that currently in place for literacy. (This will require some input from an educational specialist – but it is suspected that NCEA Level 1 will be considered and that a number of credits be specified.)
- That the BCITO’s current research into literacy and numeracy be considered in all review work undertaken – both from the perspective of NZQA documentation and development of resources.
- That the BCITO investigate means to identify and support those Apprentices who may fall short of the mark when it comes to literacy and numeracy.
- That the BCITO continues to develop pathways for students into the industry that embed the kind of skills needed by the industry including the importance of English, maths and communication.

4. Are there any unit standards or components within the current qualification that have become difficult to achieve? Yes/No.

If yes, what are these unit standards or components? How do you ensure apprentices currently achieve these unit standards or components? (For example, has pre-fabrication off-site of certain building components meant that the skills of “building from scratch” are no longer applied?)

With 83% of people answering “yes” to this question [[Page 16, National Summary](#)], you could safely assume that people are struggling with one or more unit standards in the qualification whether it be because:

- The unit standard is “tricky” or “complicated” (eg calculations) or
- The range of work available for the Apprentice (eg through the effects of pre-fabricated components, preferred claddings used by the Employer etc)

As a rule of thumb, any “theory” unit standards identified would fall into the “complicated” category and any “practical” unit standards would fall into the “range of work” category. Those unit standards identified from the Specialist Interiors or Concrete Construction domains may have been highlighted for a range of reasons that may not be quite so obvious.

For slightly easier identification other than the way the answers are presented in the report [[Pages 17 and 18, National Summary](#)], refer to the following table:

Theory Unit Standards			Practical Unit Standards		
Unit No	Yes/No	Responses	Unit No	Yes/No	Responses
12997	Yes	x1	Compulsory		
12998	No		23036	No	
12999	No		13037	Yes	x2
13000	No		13038	No	
13001	Yes	x17	13039	No	
13002	Yes	x2	13040	Yes	x3
21211	No		13041	Yes	x2
13003	No		13042	Yes	x1
13004	Yes	x1	13043	Yes	x2
13005	Yes	x4	13045	Yes	x4
13006	Yes	x1	13049	Yes	x10
13007	No		18730	Yes	x13

Theory Unit Standards			Practical Unit Standards		
Unit No	Yes/No	Responses	Unit No	Yes/No	Responses
13008	Yes	x1	Compulsory		
13009	No		18732	Yes	x5
13010	Yes	x1	13054	Yes	x12
13011	Yes	x1	13055	Yes	x2
13012	Yes	x4	18729	Yes	x8
13013	Yes	x13	13058	Yes	x3
13014	Yes	x9	13059	No	
13015	No		13064	No	
13016	No		Optional		
13017	No		13044	Yes	x2
13018	No		13046	No	
13019	Yes	x2	13047	Yes	x2
13020	No		13048	No	
13021	No		13051	Yes	x5
13022	No		13052	Yes	x1
13023	Yes	x1	13053	Yes	x5
13024	Yes	x1	13056	Yes	x6
13025	Yes	x3	18731	Yes	x1
13026	Yes	x1	13060	Yes	x1
13027	No		13061	No	
13028	No		13062	Yes	x2
13029	Yes	x3	13063	Yes	x2
13030	No		13065	No	
13031	No		13066	No	
13032	No		13067	No	
13033	No		18727	No	
13034	Yes	x3	18728	No	
13035	Yes	x10			

Units that were identified as difficult to achieve by more than five groups have been highlighted in yellow for easy identification and are:

- 13001 Calculations (Theory)
- 13013 Roof framing (Theory)
- 13014 Alternative roofing (Theory)
- 13035 Plans and Specs (Theory)
- 13049 Wall framing (Compulsory Practical)
- 18730 Roof framing (Compulsory Practical if 13032 not chosen)
- 18732 Erect trusses (Compulsory Practical if 13030 not chosen)
- 13054 Cladding (Compulsory Practical)
- 18729 Insulation (Compulsory Practical)
- 13051 Alternative roofing (Optional Practical)
- 13053 Scaffolding (Optional Practical)
- 13056 Metal roofs (Optional Practical)

When answering the question on how they ensure Apprentices achieve the unit standards that are difficult to achieve, there were a lot of answers (x33) associated with “farming out” Apprentices to get exposure to that type of work – showing an appreciation of the importance of gaining that exposure [Page 18, National Summary]. It can be assumed that these answers relate to the practical unit standards.

The other most popular answer (x9) was block courses or night classes [Page 18, National Summary]. While this could predominantly be related to theory unit standards, it could perhaps also be associated with some practical unit standards covering those skills that are difficult to learn due to prefabrication (eg roof and wall framing).

Specific Points Considered:

- What implications there are for the qualification in relation to those unit standards that have been identified as “difficult to achieve”.
- What solutions can be put in place to ensure that these unit standards are more readily achievable. (That is of course assuming that the present composition of the qualification changes little given that 83% of people say that the current composition is meeting their needs.)
- Whether there should be an “importance rating” apportioned to those practical unit standards depending on whether they are compulsory or optional.
- Whether the Specialist Interiors or Concrete Construction unit standards highlighted are significant or not. (6155 – suspended ceilings would have hit the most popular list with 5 responses.) There are currently no theory resources provided with these unit standards which could be part of the “difficult to achieve” problem.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That when it comes to the theory unit standards, it needs to be accepted that some are more difficult than others and this is simply a “fact of life” and not something that should be overcome by making these units optional or simplified in any way. “Theory is theory” and everyone needs to do all of it. (It was however acknowledged that if there are better ways of presenting the theory learning material that makes understanding easier and that it should be modified.)
- When it comes to optional practical unit standards, there are alternatives in place that allow Apprentices to select one over another and therefore whether an individual unit standard is difficult to achieve or not should not impede progress through the qualification.
- That the following three unit standards be put under the microscope:
 - 13049 (wall framing)
It was felt that it is too early to consider splitting this unit standard in a similar way to how the roofing unit standard was split in two (one to reflect fabrication and one to reflect erection where only one or the other need to be completed). There was an element of not wanting to potentially eliminate one of the fundamental skills that underpin the carpentry qualification and therefore it was felt that this unit standard should remain in tact and compulsory. There was however a recommendation to look closely at the ranges within the unit standard (plates [including raking plates], studs and jack studs, trimmers, lintels, beams, braces, nogging [dwangs], posts).

- 13054 (cladding)
The range seemed to be the main contributing factor to this unit standard being difficult to achieve. It was felt that Apprentices should be required to install weather boards (timber or fibre cement) and two of “other” types of exterior claddings. It was also acknowledged that cavity requirements need to be included in this unit standard.
- 18729 (insulation)
Need to look at the credits associated with this unit standard as they seem disproportionately high when comparing with other unit standards and considering the task at hand. Despite being a job often subcontracted out, there seemed to be little inconvenience associated with it remaining a compulsory part of the qualification.
- That the “commercial perspective” be considered for inclusion in 13041 (set out with it potentially included in such a way that Apprentices in both the commercial and residential sectors can achieve this unit standard without applying the “transferable skills” theory).

5. Should there be more of a stair-casing approach taken to the qualification whereby there are basic, intermediate and advanced components recognising the skills of “hammer hands”, “kitset builders”, and “full-blown Carpenters”?

Yes/No.

If yes, why? If no, why not?

The responses to this question show a slim majority to the No’s – (59% No, 39% Yes) [Page 19, National Summary]. The answers were not conclusive either way – however the No’s used emotive language like:

- “watering down”
- “dumbing down”
- “confusing”
- “cowboys”
- “negative public perception”

[The list of “No” reasons can be seen on Page 20, National Summary.]

The Yes’s tended to have a more holistic view – focusing on elements like:

- Progressive learning
- Acknowledging different levels of skill
- Acknowledging more specialist work

[The list of “Yes” reasons can be seen on Page 20, National Summary.]

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether stair-casing the qualification would be of benefit to the industry.
- If stair-casing is the preference, what sort of public and industry awareness campaign would need to take place to ensure that people are aware of what the different levels are in terms of competence.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That the BCITO consider ways of promoting an Apprentices Record of Learning as a means of acknowledging their achievements for those who may not complete the full qualification.

- That the National Certificate in Carpentry remains intact as the national standard for Carpenters.

The Content of the Qualification

1. Is there a good-enough balance between Theory and Practical unit standards in the current qualification? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

With 84% of people answering “yes” to this question [Page 21, National Summary], you could safely assume that people are generally happy with the balance between theory and practical unit standards.

While the No’s only account for 14% of the answers, it is here where some of the interesting reasons lie that should be paid some attention – in particular:

- A number of the optional practical unit standards don’t have any theory equivalent partners or necessarily any theory embedded in them or theory resources provided to the Apprentice. (The unit standards referred to are generally those from the domains other than Carpentry ie Specialist Interiors and Concrete Construction.)
- The total number of credits relating to theory is 106 – or 37% of the total qualification. That leaves 63% dedicated to practical. Some people felt it should be weighted more towards the practical side of things.
[The list of “No” reasons can be seen on Page 21, National Summary.]

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether the current balance and credit rating of theory versus practical is still appropriate.
- What should be done to rectify the shortcomings of any missing theory aspects.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That theory resources be developed for Cement and Concrete and Specialist Interior unit standards that are currently included as practical options but have no learning material to assist Apprentices with their understanding.
- That a careful review of the current theory resources be undertaken to ensure that there is an acknowledgement of both commercial and residential situations in the learning material.

2. Where a practical skill is not completed (because other optional unit standards are seen to be preferable) is the knowledge that underpins that skill covered in the theory unit standards? Yes/No.

If yes, is that theory knowledge sufficient to allow for a thorough understanding should the skill be required at a later date? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

The responses to the first question show a slim majority to the Yes’s– (57% Yes, 38% No) [Page 22, National Summary].

As with the previous question, the No’s tended to highlight the gaps that are in the current theory material but this time, not just for the “non-Carpentry domain” unit standards – also for those working in the commercial sector.

It is interesting once again to note the differences between the Industry Stakeholder responses and the BCITO staff responses. (Industry – 56% Yes, 39% No and BCITO, 65% Yes, 33% No.) [Page 22, National Summary] BCITO staff may have a slightly greater appreciation for the theory resources provided to Apprentices as they generally will know the package inside out.

For the second question, technically only those who answered “yes” needed to answer. However, many of the “no’s” answered also – thus leading to there being quite a large “no answer” component. (Is the theory knowledge sufficient should it be required at a later date? 39% Yes, 31% No Answer, 30% No.) [Page 23, National Summary] This in turn leaves the result fairly non-conclusive, but needing to be considered none the less.

The Yes’s [Top of Page 24, National Summary] for the second question acknowledged transferable skills and the fact that the theory resource is always there as a reference. However, the No’s [Middle of Page 24, National Summary] contained a lot of comments relating to the need for practical experience to reinforce the theory.

As with the first question, it is interesting to also note the differences between the Industry Stakeholder responses and the BCITO staff responses for the second question. (Industry – 37% Yes, 33% No Answer, and 31% No and BCITO, 49% Yes, 29% No, and 21% No Answer.) [Bottom of Page 23, National Summary] Again, the BCITO staff weighting towards “yes” would be as a result of their knowledge of the contents of the Carpentry Theory package.

Specific Points Considered:

- What should be done to rectify the shortcomings of any missing theory aspects. (Including non-Carpentry unit standards and Commercial sector relevance.)
- Whether anything should be done to encourage exposure to as many practical aspects as possible for the trade to ensure that theory learning is reinforced.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- As per decisions made in question 1 for any theory shortcomings.

3. Is there enough flexibility within the qualification (i.e. choice of optional unit standards) while still ensuring that a qualified person can indeed call themselves a Carpenter?

Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

With 86% of people answering “yes” to this question [Page 24, National Summary], you could safely assume that people are generally happy with the flexibility within the qualification.

It is however worthy of note that some people felt the qualification was too flexible and that some of the optional unit standards should be compulsory. (This is dealt with more in the next question.)

There were also comments relating to the differences between Residential, Commercial and Civil construction and that the current flexibility doesn’t allow for recognition of all sector areas. [The full list of reasons given can be seen on Page 25, National Summary.]

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether the current flexibility (choice of optional unit standards) is still appropriate.
- What if anything needs to be done to address the differences between Commercial, Residential and Civil.

Note

This question and question 4 (below) were dealt with together by the Carpentry National Advisory Group.

4. When looking at the practical unit standards, is the mix of Compulsory versus Optional producing good quality tradespersons? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

There was a reasonably clear majority of Yes's versus No's to this question (69% Yes, 29% No) [Page 26, National Summary].

Once again with this question, it is interesting to note the slightly different percentages for Industry Stakeholder responses and the BCITO staff responses. (Industry – 70% Yes, 28% No and BCITO, 63% Yes, 36% No.) [Page 26, National Summary] BCITO staff have a wide exposure to Apprentices from all walks of life who are employed by many different Companies and may therefore would be in a good position to judge this.

While only accounting for 29% of the answers, there were some unit standards highlighted in the No's that could be worthy of consideration to be made compulsory. The full list of Unit Standards highlighted is shown on Page 27, National Summary. Those hitting a 5 or more response rate are listed below:

Unit No	Description	Responses
13044	Foundations	x7
13046	Reinforcing	x5
13047	Concrete	x6
13048	Floor Framing	x6

To determine whether there are any existing trends in optional unit standards selected by Apprentices, we ran a report on the database in September on Version 7 completions – and the following list shows the number and percentage of Apprentices who have completed the different unit standards in the optional list. (There were 648 Apprentices in total who had completed Version 7 at the date the report was run.)

Unit	Number	% of the 648
13046	643	99%
13052	634	98%
13047	630	97%
13048	615	95%
13044	594	92%
13053	584	90%
18727	540	83%
13067	527	81%
13056	470	73%
13062	456	70%
13066	445	69%
13061	442	68%
18731	421	65%

Unit	Number	% of the 648
13051	386	60%
13063	304	47%
13060	236	36%
18728	164	25%
13065	155	24%
12041	131	20%
12028	80	12%
4346	46	7%
4347	36	6%
6155	36	6%

As you can see by this list, the unit standards mentioned by those at the forums as “should be compulsory” (13044, 13046, 13047, and 13048) all rank in the in the 90’s (92%, 99%, 97%, and 95% respectively).

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether the current mix of compulsory versus optional practical unit standards is still appropriate.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That the following unit standards be reviewed to better take into consideration those working in the commercial sectors. (The unit standards should however still allow those in either the commercial or residential sectors to achieve them.)
 - 13043 (Excavate and prepare for footings and slab on ground on site)
 - 13044 (Construct residential and/or light commercial foundations on site) [Consider splitting into two unit standards with one concentrating on concrete foundations/beams and the other concentrating on piles. The first would be compulsory and the second optional.]
 - 13045 (Construct formwork for footings, floors and walls up to 1.2 metres on site)
 - 13047 (Transport, place, finish and cure concrete on site)
- That unit standard 13046 (Fabricate and place reinforcing steel on a construction site) be changed from optional to compulsory.
- That unit standard 13051 (Construct timber framed roofs of alternative design) be re-worked to better include the commercial sector and that it be considered as a third alternative to the current “either/or” compulsory roofing part of the qualification. (ie do one of: 18730 – roof framing, 18732 – roof trusses, or 13051 – alternative roofing.)

5. Are there other practical skills that some Carpenters are required to undertake that are not currently covered in the qualification?

Yes/No. If yes, what are these?

There was a reasonably clear majority of Yes’s versus No’s to this question (67% Yes, 32% No) **[Page 27, National Summary]**.

In order to digest the answers properly, you need to look at the full list of suggested practical skills that people identified as “missing” [Pages 28 and 29, National Summary]. It is quite a long and comprehensive list with lots of single entries, however there are a few things that were mentioned on several different occasions. The two that stand out are:

- Communication / people management skills / dealing with clients (x13)
- Legislation and compliance requirements (x5)

Specific Points Considered:

- Each suggestion on its merits and determine whether it is in fact “missing” or is already a part of the qualification.
- A priority rating as to whether the “missing bit” warrants inclusion.
- The level of the qualification and the suggested inclusion so that the two are in-sync to ensure that the requirement is not being pitched too low or too high (eg Construction Management skills probably sit outside the scope of the National Certificate in Carpentry).

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That there is a need to better acknowledge structural steel within the qualification. This could potentially be done in one of two ways:
 - Expanding 13036 (Erect prefabricated beams and components on site) by adding a range and including structural steel along with other prefabricated beams.
 - Adding another optional practical unit standard.

6. Are there sufficient optional unit standards in the qualification to allow those working in the commercial sector and those working in the residential sector to successfully complete? Yes/No. If no, what is missing?

With 83% of people answering “yes” to this question [Page 29, National Summary], you could safely assume that people generally believe there are sufficient optional unit standards for both Residential and Commercial.

However, in looking back at “who does what work” from the Employer survey results for the 168 people who completed this at the forums, 67% of the Employers said they work in the Residential sector and 13% said they work in both Residential and Commercial – leaving only 18% Commercial sector (and 2% with no answer) [Page 4, National Summary]. So the answer to this question may not be quite as well informed as we might have hoped.

The comments by and large simply acknowledged some difficulties in completion, but there were not really any significant “missing bits” highlighted. [All suggested “missing bits” listed on Page 30, National Summary]

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether there needs to be any further research done into the qualification meeting the needs of the Commercial sector.

- Whether there needs to be any consideration given to members of the Civil sector who are currently trying to use the Carpentry qualification but are unable to provide sufficient exposure to all the practical unit standards. (There are pending changes for the Concrete qualifications whose review will be happening in tandem with the Carpentry review in 2007.)

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- Instigation of a meeting with a number of key commercial construction companies to ensure the qualification does meet the needs of those in the commercial sector.
- If further investigation with the commercial sector doesn't identify a need to strand the qualification, that ranges be placed within elements and performance criteria of some unit standards to allow for ease of application within both residential and commercial situations. (If there was a specific range with two items in it – one relating to residential and one relating to commercial, the requirement would be to complete “one of”.)
- That the qualification not be amended to try and embrace the civil sector as it is more appropriate that this is dealt with in the Concrete Construction qualification. (It was acknowledged that support would be given to the concrete/civil sector to pick and mix some Carpentry unit standards to add to their qualification.)

7. Are different materials and construction methods recognised within the current qualification? Yes/No. If yes, how? If no, should they be, and what are they?

The responses to this question is close to a 50/50 split (55% Yes, 43% No) **[Page 30, National Summary]**.

A lot of the comments for both “yes” and “no” can be summed up in the following statement:

“You learn the basics while doing the qualification but staying up to date and getting to know all the different materials that are available is part and parcel of being in the industry.” **[The actual list of “Yes’s” and “No’s” can be seen on Page 31, National Summary.]**

There were a number of items highlighted on a list of materials or construction methods that people think should be recognised within the qualification. **[The list of materials can be seen on Page 32, National Summary.]** The one that scores highest on the list (structural steel and steel frames x6) is dealt with in the next question. A number of the other items identified are already inherent in existing unit standards which begs the question as to whether they need “beefing up” or a clearer explanation offered if people are not aware of their existence.

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether there needs to be any further action taken in relation to different materials and construction methods.
- What can be done to assist Apprentices to stay abreast of new materials, manufacturers’ literature etc. (If indeed that is a role that the BCITO should play.)
- Whether existing resources need to be clearer so that people are aware of the full coverage.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That the BCITO investigate ways in which they can encourage Apprentices to maintain an up to date knowledge of new materials and products.
- Support for the continued inclusion of the BUILD magazine in BC News for all Apprentices.
- Investigation into the inclusion of DBH publications within the Carpentry package and/or BCITO mail outs.

8. Does there need to be recognition for steel frame construction within the Carpentry qualification? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

The responses to this question shows a slim majority to the Yes's– (57% Yes, 42% No) [\[Page 33, National Summary\]](#).

It is interesting to note the quite large difference between the Industry Stakeholder responses and the BCITO staff responses. (Industry – 53% Yes, 46% No and BCITO, 76% Yes, 24% No.) [\[Page 33, National Summary\]](#) BCITO staff may be more aware of the unit standards that have already been developed for steel frame construction. They may also have more exposure to those Companies undertaking steel framing – and therefore see the benefits of inclusion within the qualification.

For those who did answer “yes” the most popular reason stated that any inclusion should be “optional” (x26). The next most popular answer (x16) simply acknowledged its use as a growing trend [\[Top of Page 34, National Summary\]](#).

The “no’s” tended to have more traditionalist answers – along with seeing it more as a specialist area [\[Middle of Page 34, National Summary\]](#).

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether there is a place for steel framing in the National Certificate.
- How the 6 existing steel framing unit standards should be dealt with (4 practical, 2 theory, compulsory, optional, strand, separate qualification etc).

Note: This needs to be carefully considered as it is documented in the current version of the National Certificate under “transition” that:

Although standards that cover steel framing recognise important skills, their inclusion in the Elective B List affected the original design and intent of the qualification. The standards have been removed from the qualification until a full review is completed. Industry and the BCITO are working together to find a suitable way for them to be included in the qualification. The review will be carried out in 2006.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- From a theory perspective, investigation into incorporating steel framing into existing unit standards and resources for 13012 (wall framing), 13013 (roof framing), and 13014 (alternative roofing).

- From a practical perspective, looking at having the four practical steel framed unit standards added as optional unit standards to the elective section of the Carpentry qualification with the proviso that a person could only select two of the four units as part of their requirement to complete 12 optional practical unit standards. (The reason for limiting the number of optional unit standards an apprentice has recognised in any one specialist area was so that a broad range of skills was still being demonstrated by completing the combination of compulsory and optional practical unit standards.)
- All of the above recommendations would need to be run past steel framing industry representatives.

9. Given the move to proprietary plaster cladding systems in the past 15 years, should there be units dedicated to the fixing and detailing of fibre cement board and polystyrene board as stand-alone components of exterior claddings? Yes/No. If yes, why? If no, why not?

The responses to this question show a reasonable majority to the No's – (65% No, 34% Yes) **[Page 35, National Summary]**.

Fibre cement is already covered in the claddings unit standard (13054) – which is already a pretty large unit standard and one that our Regional staff tell us a lot of Apprentices struggle with in terms of covering the range expected. (five claddings from the following range: vertical boards, timber, metal and PVC weather boards, plywood, fibre, cement planks and sheets, metal sheets.)

However, polystyrene is not covered in the claddings unit, but is a substrate that has become more prevalent.

The responses however are clear when it comes to polystyrene in that Carpenters see this as a job undertaken by a specialist contractor (licensed applicator) who takes responsibility for the cladding (plaster and substrate) as a complete system.

While the Yes's only account for 34% of the responses, the top three reasons all present some interesting points. **[Page 36, National Summary]**.

- As an optional unit/s – theory and practical (x10).
- Claddings are an important part of building, so apprentices need to know how (x6).
- Need to know basics now a mainstream part of cladding – especially flashings (x5).

While there may not be a place in the qualification for practical recognition, the idea of a better theory understanding is an interesting one given the importance of Carpenters knowing how Proprietary Plaster Cladding Systems work and what the specialist flashing requirements are.

Specific Points Considered:

- Whether it's time to take a closer look at the claddings unit standard.
- Whether there's a place for polystyrene substrate in the qualification – considering whether it should be included as a theory component, practical component, compulsory component, or optional component.

- What type of recognition if any should be given to Proprietary Plaster Cladding Systems within the qualification.

Decisions Made by the Carpentry National Advisory Group:

- That the previous recommendation relating to the claddings unit standard be upheld.
- That fibre cement continues to be a part of the claddings unit standard (13054).
- That there is no requirement to include fixing of polystyrene in the Carpentry qualification.