

Case Study 6: Partnerships in Education

The College Industry Program

Case Study author: Carmel Marock
Case study commissioned by NBI and GTZ

This report has been developed for, or in association with, the 'Partnering with Governments' programme. The programme aims to build the capacity of governments to partner more effectively with business and civil society.

The programme is a partnership between GTZ – Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, IBLF – the International Business Leaders Forum, and corporate partners: Microsoft, Rio Tinto, SAP, Shell and Shell Foundation. It is coordinated by The Partnering Initiative.

For more information, visit: <http://thepartneringinitiative.org/pwg>

Disclaimer: All views expressed in this report are those of the author or are a documentation of the outcomes of a meeting, and do not necessarily represent the views of GTZ, IBLF or any of the corporate partners.

Copyright © 2007 International Business Leaders Forum, GTZ

This document or parts thereof can be reproduced with accreditation of the original author(s), GTZ and IBLF.

GTZ and IBLF wish to express their gratitude to their corporate partners:

Microsoft[®]

**RIO
TINTO**

SAP[®]



**SHELL
FOUNDATION**

CONTENT

Background

Introduction & methodology

Origins of the partnership

The effect of the changing policy context

All about the partners

What Took Place

What took place in the mining project?

Initial outcomes and challenges

What took place in the construction project?

Initial outcomes and challenges

Lessons from the Case Study

Culture of Partnerships

Hypotheses on in Review

A review of the Hypotheses Based on the Lessons Learnt

Appendixes

CIP 10-point plan

List of acronyms

Background

Introduction

Prior to the two specific projects which make up this case study, the National Business Initiative (NBI) has actively worked with a variety of partners over a number of years to support the development of a vibrant Further Education and Training (FET) College sector that is able to offer programmes that are relevant to the needs of the economy. The NBI involvement began with the Colleges Collaboration Fund (CCF) - which ran from July 1999 to June 2004 - and has evolved into the College Industry Partnership (CIP) programme, which provides an overarching framework for college-industry partnerships and, specifically, provides different types of support in three sectors: construction, steel and mining. This case study traces the specific activities that were undertaken as part, respectively, of the Mining CIP and the Construction CIP and arranges the key issues that emerge so that they can be used to further the broader objectives stated immediately below.

The case study is part of a series of studies aiming to build the capacity of governments in Africa to partner more effectively with business and civil society towards achieving sustainable development objectives (in particular the Millennium Development Goals).

The broad aims of the case study series are:

1. To provide input into a paper exploring the opportunities and challenges of business and civil society sectors and governments partnering with one another with the aim of delivering on developmental and particularly millennium development, goals;
2. To be stand-alone 'learning' case study that generates new insights and perspectives, and inspires innovation and improves the effectiveness of cross-sector partnerships in delivering on MDGs;
3. To present practical examples of cross-sector partnerships and the application of partnership skills for use in outreach and awareness raising on the potential of using cross-sector partnerships to deliver on MDGs.

Work for this study is taken from two existing case studies – one in the mining sector in South Africa and the second in the construction sector in South Africa.¹

Methodology

This case study is based on reviews of the two college industry programmes conducted by Singizi Consulting. These reviews consisted of:

- Document reviews
- Interviews with the partnership facilitating organisation - NBI
- Interviews with key players and stakeholders
- Interviews with FET college, industry and learner respondents

These reviews then formed the basis for this case study.

Origins of the partnership

As indicated, the NBI's CIP strategy followed on from the CCF, and the NBI's recognition that certain valuable aspects of college-industry partnerships should best be continued and carried forward. Specifically, the intent of the CIP was to further encourage private sector contribution to the development of the intermediate skills (artisan level) needed for economic growth. The CIP made a case for the role that FET colleges could play in supporting provision towards these intermediate level skills to enable learners to attain occupational qualifications. This imperative was captured within the goal of the CIP, which is to support the development of:

A modern, high quality responsive public FET system contributing significantly to accelerated and expanded skills development and delivery, and improved quality of skills in SA

¹ Both prepared by Singizi Consulting cc.

The NBI, together with its business members, and stakeholders from colleges and the DoE, explored what would need to be done to ensure that this goal was addressed. This led to the development of the 10-point plan, which is summarised as follows²:

1. College Governance
2. Strategic Planning
3. College Management Development
4. College Staff Development
5. Programmes and Curriculum Development
6. Quality assurance:
7. Work-based learning for college and 18.2 (unemployed) learners
8. Career Counselling and Job Placement for College Learners
9. Industry-Standard Training Facilities and Other Resources
10. Strategic Dialogue, Information Dissemination and Policy Engagement

As part of this strategic plan, the CIP also agreed to adopt a sector-based approach to engagement and considered which sectors would be most valuable to make interventions in, and the nature of the support required by each sector. These were selected against certain criteria which included:

- support from business leadership,
- relationship with the FET Colleges, and
- the training mandate of companies.

This led to the decision to initially focus on steel, construction and mining. Specifically, both the mining and construction sectors met the criteria, although for different reasons.

In the case of the mining sector commitments has been agreed upon between employers and government to support skills development and this was given expression in the Broad Based Socio-economic Empowerment Charter for the South African Mining Industry. It was suggested that these commitments would

“be realised only if the sector has reliable education and training partners capable of delivering relevant, high quality products and services.”³

It was further suggested that the FET Colleges could play an important role in this context. Further, the mining industry already had an established relationship with the FET Colleges, which meant that this potential partnership had even more of a possibility to succeed.

In the case of the construction sector, it was indicated that there was and is substantial growth in the sector and industry leaders have been exploring the nature of training interventions that will support this expansion. There was agreement that, whilst it would constitute a challenge, it would be beneficial to work with and through FET colleges to meet some of these skill requirements for expansion. A business interviewee explains that,

“The partnership was borne out of necessity. Given the current and expected growth in the sector, the construction industry needed (and still needs) many more educated and skilled staff and it was felt that the public FET colleges could and should contribute on a far greater scale to addressing the skills challenge.”

Interviewees from industry commented that this was considered particularly important in the industry as they had lost training capacity over the past decade and needed to establish a relationship with an external provider that could address the requirements within the sector. Further, interviewees stated that their skills needs had

² The more detailed description of each of these steps are provided in an Appendix to this document

³ *Proposal for a Strategic Partnership between the Mining Industry and Further Education and Training Colleges*, Glen Fisher and Marianne Scott, NBI, September 2003

changed as the large companies particularly needed supervisory staff as the historical routes that these employees travelled had changed and there is a crisis about how to support the development of this category of employee. The FET Colleges plan to build intermediary level skills which are consistent with the requirements of supervisors and so it was felt that there was a synergy between these plans.

The effect of the changing policy context

Having formed these partnerships with specific imperatives, this section considers how the changes that took place in the macro environment were perceived by the partners and how this changing landscape impacted on the original objectives of the partnerships. There are three areas in which change has impacted most directly on the partnerships:

- The most fundamental challenge that appears to have impacted on the projects has been the changes made to the learning system for intermediate level programmes. This includes the changing demands for apprenticeships, the introduction of learnerships and the recent introduction of the National Certificate Vocational. The recent introduction of the 4 routes towards becoming an artisan is also seen as an important development as it recognises that all of these routes can enable learners to achieve artisan status with the proviso that they access the requisite work experience.
- The legislative context for the FET Colleges is also undergoing change. In particular, the FET College Bill has a number of far reaching implications for the manner in which colleges can operate and their ability to work with their partners; of particular import are the changes in the arrangements pertaining to the employment of lecturers. Lecturers will be employed directly by colleges, rather than the Department, which enables colleges to make arrangements with staff about when they will work and what conditions of service will apply (of course within the broader legislative environment). This recognises the requirement for increased flexibility. The changes also allow for different funding arrangements and specifically encourage the intake of NCV learners.
- For the purposes of this analysis, these changes are located within broader developments pertaining to the National Skills Development Strategy – with the key vehicle being the SETAs and, more recently, to JIPSA which cuts across all government departments as well as the social partners. These highlight the priorities for skills development for the next 5 years and have created additional pressure on certain priorities; for example the NSDS creates real pressures on industry to implement ABET programmes while JIPSA has cast the spotlight on the development of artisans in technical trades. These developments emphasise the role of the Department of Labour as well as the Department of Education, and create an alternative pool of resources to support programmes that could potentially be provided by the FET Colleges.

There are also a number of parallel policy discussions and changes that have taken place that impact on these partnerships. This included the on-going review of the requirements of the fundamentals, as well as the proposed quality assurance arrangements for FET colleges and for industry related programmes.

Perceptions of the changing environment

Individuals from colleges, from industry and from government departments perceive these changes differently, and these divergent views already signal the complexities of these developments and their potential implications for the partnerships. This section considers these changes, and explores the possible impact that these may have had on the ability of the CIP to achieve the objectives for the programme.

There are many debates as to which initiative is responsible for what is perceived as a “negative demand” for programmes offered by the FET colleges. A college interviewee commented that there had been a decline in numbers within the context of the apprenticeship programmes and there are numerous views posited as to the reasons for this and the impact of changing work patterns and in the economy as well as a paralysis caused by uncertainty in the education and training environment – linked to the introduction of the learnership and announcements that the apprenticeships would be phased out. However, college interviewees suggest that with pressure from the JIPSA processes, industry had begun to work more actively with colleges again. As a respondent from the mining sector commented:

“With the decline of the apprentice-scheme, communications with industry were ‘cut’. With the unions and MQA pressurising the mines to improve skills of existing employees, this has meant an increase of students at the college. This has in turn led to re-establishing communication with industry”.

Interviewees suggest that the recent introduction of the NCV has once again transformed the landscape, with differing views as to whether this could be seen as a challenge or an opportunity. Interviewees from industry stated that while over the past period there had been concerns raised about the N programmes, there were practical challenges with regards to the NCV which may make it difficult for companies to simply shift from supporting the N programmes to the NCV programmes. Company interviewee’s comments included⁴,

“We are making more frequent use of the colleges now. But we don’t know what we are going to do now because of the certificate that has been issued. For a guy to get an NI certificate, it used to take 3 months but now for one to get the same qualification under the new certificate it will take 12 months...so how long will it take to get a complete qualification? The time and cost factor is quite serious so we don’t know ...”

Some college interviewees echoed this concern and questioned the ability of the NCV to meet the immediate needs of industry,

“The only challenge is that it’s a long-term, rather than a short-term, strategy in addressing skills shortage (right now). But in the long run, it will ensure that students are properly prepared – having both the theory and the practical”.

“The challenge is the timeframe. There might be a shortage in terms of providing the mines with people when they need them (since the course takes so long)”.

However, interviewees argued that the programme contains within it the potential for learners to enter industry with a greater level of preparation than the N programmes. For example, college interviewees commented that,

“I would call it (the NCV) doing the correct thing! For the first time in many years, the theoretical and practical skills acquisition is brought together – and this is what industry requires”⁵.

“If a person looks at the NCV, and then looks at what is happening in any business sector, you can see the links, and can see that it has been informed by business. The outcomes speak directly to what they will be expected to do in the workplace. The NCV are programmes that prepare a learner to be absorbed directly into the workplace (unlike the NATED). With the NCV, when we talk final assessment, 70% of the marks are theoretical, and 30% are summative which is very practical. This is a national directive, and ensures that the learners have both theoretical and practical learning”⁶.

An interviewee from one of the companies supported this view and stated that,

“With the NCV, we are working towards a student with a solid foundation of construction subjects – a ‘construction matrix!’ Essentially, through this project, we want to facilitate relationships, and create a platform, for relationships between industry and colleges.”

⁴ Company interviewee

⁵ College Interview

⁶ College Interviewee

The extent that the NCV is a positive development is one that is likely to remain a subject of on-going debate. One college interviewee stated that college-industry relations would always be contested:

“It was the businesses that said the NATED wasn’t meeting their needs, and then when government responded and moved in a different direction with the training curriculum (NCV), it is now those same businesses that are saying bring back the NATED, artisan training!”⁷

However, interviewees from companies stated that they believe that the NCV adds value but they expressed frustration about their perceived inability to participate more effectively in discussions about how the NCV could be delivered to meet their needs, and what content should be included in these programmes. Interestingly though, the manner in which this engagement was tackled is one area in which the two cases diverge:

The mining partnership preceded the introduction of the NCV and focused on the manner in which FET Colleges could work with industry through the Learnership system and specifically to support the delivery of the fundamentals to support these programmes and representatives within the Steering Committee commented⁸ that once the NCV was introduced, the colleges had to focus on developing the capacity to offer the NCV and could no longer consider how to work with industry. These competing demands being placed on the colleges is captured by a comment made by an interviewee from the college, who commented that,

“There is a difference in approach to curriculum development – between DoE and the mining sector and the Department of Labour. It became very clear that there is still a major challenge in communication between the two. Colleges are getting stuck in the middle; and can’t do much about it. If we offer programmes outside the DoE curriculum, we are on our own (in terms of funding and resources)”.

In contrast to this the construction partnership was developed to coincide with the announcement of the recapitalisation of the FET colleges and the indication that from 2007 FET Colleges would be running new vocational programmes. One of these programmes was the Building and Civil Construction programme and it was indicated that this programme was seen as an opportunity to train a new tier of supervisory staff,

“I think foremen is one of the big areas; its also one of the hardest set of skills to impart, because there is a cultural sensitivity there, e.g. you can’t just bring people in from Europe, they don’t know our environment and our way of working with people. To start off small, in centres of excellence; To have industry define what is required; and then for the colleges to come up and provide that.”

This meant that the focus of the construction programme was primarily on the enhancement of the NCV as a medium to longer term intervention to address the imperatives facing the industry.

As interviewee from the Department of Education commented that industry perhaps had unrealistic expectations as to what colleges could and could not do and that this still needed to be resolved. For example, it was indicated that colleges are not mature institutions and that it may be unrealistic to imagine that they can effectively support both programmes designed to enable the pre-employed to enter industry and to deliver short skills development programmes for existing employees. Another interviewee, also from the DoE, supported this view and stated that it is critical is to determine what the FET Colleges can offer through the NCV and what other skills training is required and where this can best be offered. This would allow for a discussion about what contribution the NCV can make to the skills pipeline, the interviewee argued strongly that their understanding is that the FET Colleges, through the NCV, should support ‘mobile vocational curriculum’, that is individuals with intermediary level skills that can access supervisory level positions after completing the requisite period of work experience.

⁷ College Interviewee

⁸ 12th Steering Committee Meeting Notes – 12 April 2006

Further, interviewees stated that in this analysis it would be important to understand where the limitations of institutional provision are. An interviewee commented that, for example, colleges cannot be expected to simulate the conditions of the mines for assessment purposes and that industry need to understand that. However colleges could provide applied learning insofar as they can have learners practically laying bricks in the specified time requirement. The Department of Education specifically highlighted the FET College Bill as an important development in terms of enabling colleges to better meet the needs of industry, and highlight the possibilities that are created by the increased flexibility of staff. They also point to the recap process and indicate that companies could work with colleges in the provinces to determine what resources are required to ensure that the relevant facilities are in place and could lobby for this.

Industry interviewees acknowledge the importance of this and emphasise that the success of the NCV is dependent on improved flexibility and competence of the lecturing staff and better facilities. However, they suggest that gains in these areas have not yet been realised.

The different ways in which the sectors tackled the NCV and engaged with the changing context is central to the manner in which the partnerships have evolved and these issues will be explored in further sections. It is also touches on the extent that the partnerships have been able to address the competing demands in the system on the colleges and the fact that these emerge out of different government department mandates: that is the NCV and the FET Colleges are within the Department of Education while the NSDS and the SETAs are within the Department of Labour.

To further complicate these sets of relationships is the differing roles of the National and the provincial Department of Education that need to be taken into account. While the CIP is a national initiative it had been anticipated that there would be regional structures with provincial department of education’s involvement, yet this did not take place as planned. The construction partnership had local forums but even these were reported to have been unsuccessful in securing the participation of the Provincial Department of Education and the mining regional forums appear entirely undeveloped. There does not appear to be a shared understanding as to why this involvement could not be arranged. However, the challenge that this posed to the programme was articulated in relation to a number of the objectives and will be explored in more depth.

Rationale for entering the Partnership	
<p>Industry: The mining sector explained that it wanted the partnership to ensure that the N programmes were better able to support the industry and to develop a partnership about the delivery of the fundamentals</p> <p>Colleges: wished to improve their relations with industry and to become provider of choice</p> <p>MQA: indicated that it wished to extend the provider network available for industry with a particular emphasis on the provision of the fundamentals to support the learnerships</p>	<p>Industry: the construction sector stated that the partnership was borne out of necessity. Given the current and expected growth in the sector, the construction industry needed (and still needs) many more educated and skilled staff and it was felt that the public FET colleges could and should contribute on a far greater scale to addressing the skills challenge. It was indicated that there was a view that a relevant NCV had the potential to address these needs.</p> <p>DoE: wished to ensure that the Building and Civil Construction: NCV was perceived as relevant by industry and that learners would be able to access employment when they completed the NCV. This was seen as complimentary to the recapitalisation process</p> <p>Colleges: indicated that they wish to become centres of excellence so that they would become the preferred providers of students for the construction companies.</p>

All about the partners

There are noticeable – and this study would argue – significant differences between the partners as reflected in the two partnerships.

In the construction CIP, the partnership began between two key industry players, Murray and Roberts and Aveng (Grinaker-Lta) on the one hand; and the Department of Education on the other. Both partners were represented by senior people: DoE by the Deputy Director General, FET and the two industry companies by company Executive Directors. Collectively this team of very senior people initially made up the Steering Committee. An interviewee explained that once *“there was some momentum in the programme”*, additional companies were requested to come on board and the partnership was extended to include individuals from WBHO, Group Five and Basil Read (the other 3 listed companies in construction). The individuals that were seconded to the project participated in these meetings, and the NBI served as the secretariat to this committee. The construction partnership then also has a structure at each of the two colleges which are being directly supported to implement the Building NCV. These structures have representation on them from the college as well as regional company representatives. There is also space on these structures for the Provincial Departments of Education though it was reported that this participation has been minimal.

In the mining CIP, the partnership operated differently. The Chamber of Mines represented employers and an individual from the Chamber, together with several employees responsible for training in certain of the mines, represent industry in the partnership. The DoE is not directly a part of the partnership and the education component is represented by a number of the colleges involved in mining provision. The Mining Qualifications Authority is involved in the partnership, though they are not active in the formal structures they have assisted to shape and resource activities. In addition to this structure there was also a subcommittee which focused on the design and implementation of the electro-mechanical learning programme. This subcommittee also included representatives from the colleges and industry.

What is noticeable from these different structures is:

- the more focused nature of the partnership in the construction sector which is between two large industry players and the DoE
- the fact that very senior people populate the highest level of the partnership in the construction CIP and that this potentially allows for a collegiality of seniority in which mutual leadership respect should allow for reasonable give and take
- in the case of the industry players, the respective executive directors in construction are able to make immediate decisions, commit resources without recourse to lengthy processes and to command swift action from subordinates. This also applied to the Department of Education.
- in both sectors the provincial level of DoE is conspicuously absent from the reality of the partnership – though they may in theory be involved.
- In the construction sector though there are active local working groups which have focused on the assessment of each of the colleges requirements and the development and implementation of a plan to support the colleges to implement the NCV
- All partners have broadly defined roles;

In the mining sector the resources primarily come through the MQA though colleges and industry make in-kind contributions

In the construction sector the resources come through the Department of Education and industry. Specifically industry is directly supporting individuals to assist with the college support programme and with the overarching curriculum review and development and are providing learners with bursaries.

In both sectors the NBI serves as secretariat to the partnership.

Overview	
Description of the Partners	
Mining	Construction
<p>Industry: represented by the Chamber of Mines and individuals responsible for training in certain of the mines</p> <p>Colleges: many of the colleges (16) that are involved in mining provision are represented in the partnership</p> <p>Mining Qualifications Authority is involved in the partnership, though they are not active in the formal structures they have assisted to shape activities</p> <p><i>NBI serves as a secretariat to the partnership</i></p>	<p>Industry: represented by senior management in the construction companies and by regional management at a local level</p> <p>Department of Education: is actively involved in the partnership</p> <p>Colleges: the two colleges that are part of the programme are directly involved at a local level</p> <p><i>NBI serves as a secretariat to the partnership</i></p> <p><i>Note that at the point of writing this case study it had been agreed that the industry bodies would become directly involved in the partnership and the DoE was reviewing the nature of its representation</i></p>
Broad Objectives of the Partnerships	
<p>Establishing and implementing a high-level mutually beneficial partnership initiative between business and Further education and Training (FET) Colleges in the Mining Industry as part of a wider high-level strategic colleges-industry partnership initiative between business and colleges involving the Steel, Mining and Construction Industries;</p>	<p>To enable companies and the Department of Education to work together to assist in addressing the skills challenges of the construction industry</p>
<p>To actively participate in the implementation of a joint initiative of government, business, and organised labour, to accelerate the provision of priority skills to meet the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (ASGISA) and the Joint Initiative for Priority Skills Acquisition (JIPSA) objectives of economic growth, labour absorption and social service delivery; and</p>	<p>To collectively review the NCV to ensure that the curricula addresses the requirements of industry in a manner that allow learners that successfully complete the programme to, after completing further work experience, to access intermediary vocational occupations in the industry, with a particular focus on supervisory</p>
<p>To raise FET Colleges who are on the supply side, to a new level of relevance, responsiveness and quality in a broader demand-led system to support skills development for economic growth.</p>	<p>To promote meaningful change and development in the colleges through a comprehensive programme to develop selected FET Colleges as centres for the accelerated and expanded education of skilled construction personnel for the industry.</p>
Resources to support the partnership	
<p>Industry: contributed time of individuals involved in the project and provided workplace experience for the pilot</p> <p>Colleges: contributed time for involvement in the project</p> <p>MQA: contributed monies for the training and the pilot (development of curriculum, materials and implementation)</p>	<p>Industry: provided two individuals who supported the college processes (including a dimension of staff development) and assisted with curriculum and materials development, and contributed time of individuals involved in the project, providing work place experience for learners during the holiday period and supporting bursaries</p> <p>DoE: supporting curriculum process, recap process as well as bursaries (there are also further staff development activities planned)</p> <p>Colleges: contributed time for involvement</p>

Mandating Process	
Mandating process described by partners as reasonable but did require decision making to happen elsewhere	Mandating process described as good with the majority of decisions taking place within the meeting and not requiring further processes
Challenges in the partnership	
The key challenges that emerged were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources to undertake the agreed upon activities; • The introduction of the NCV was perceived as a challenge, though a few individuals suggested that it could be an opportunity • Engaging in a manner that effectively took into account national and provincial competencies (of the department of Education) 	The key challenges that emerged were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining processes for engaging with the colleges • Agreeing on the process of reviewing the curriculum in a way that took into account different imperatives of the partners (balancing changes wanted by industry with the time frame for implementation required by the Department)

What took place?

What took place in the mining project?

The Mining College Industry Partnership focused on three areas of activities:

- **College Governance** which focused on structures and processes to enable business and colleges to work together, as well as specific training and resources for members of governance councils and management;
- **Staff development** with a particular focus on enabling staff to work effectively in partnerships; and
- **Programme and curriculum development** which focused particularly on a model for joint learning programme development and on the curriculum and materials for the Electromechanics NQF Level 2 programme, which forms part of the pathway to attaining a Millwright Electro Mechanics qualification.

In addition to these in the course of implementation, other programmes such as quality assurance were also implicitly addressed.

College Governance

In Phase One of the project a survey on the composition and development needs of 50 College Councils was undertaken as well as a stakeholder workshop process that brought together a sample of provincial departmental officials, college principals and council chairpersons to reflect on the key governance challenges. These processes resulted in the development of a Handbook on College Governance as a resource for colleges. The Handbook was reportedly not being used effectively by the colleges, and so the NBI facilitated a series of training sessions, using the Handbook as the basis⁹. This was offered to 12 college councils across seven provinces. There were also developments relating to the College Councils and there was an active process of engaging with industry to effect increased involvement at college level.

Staff development

In Phase One of the project, a Partnership Training Programme was developed and implemented for management and other staff to support the colleges to understand the potential value of partnerships as a vehicle for transformation. The programme focused on enabling college staff to establish a close working

⁹ Interview with Natalie Witthuhn, Origo Consultants.

relationship with industry. The series of six workshops took place between 22 February 2005 and 28 February 2006 with participants from 11 FET colleges. This was then built upon in Phase Two where management and staff were trained in a further 4 of 5 partnership modules. This training was completed in 15 colleges. In addition to the above, staff were trained to act as trainers and advocates inside institutions to support the formation and implementation of successful partnerships with industry and others. Again 15 of the 16 colleges were trained by February 2006. Further, outside of the Partnership Training Programme, there were interesting developments that took place between industry and the colleges to support staff development. Some of the ways in which industry supported staff development within the colleges included college staff visited the mines to gain a better understanding of the nature of the sector.

Programme and curriculum development

In Phase One of the project, a survey was undertaken on the uptake of N-programmes by the mining and mineral sector. In Phase Two of the programme, the focus turned to the design and application of a model for joint learning programme development. It was intended that this would lead to the development of a programme that FET colleges could deliver to the mining and minerals sector. The learning programme that was developed for these purposes was based on the core unit standards that form part of the National Certificate Electromechanics at Level 2 on the NQF; this qualification forms part of the Millwright occupation learning pathway. Once the curriculum and the assessment and delivery plan was developed, the programme supported the generation of learning materials. A technical expert was deployed onto this project to support the development of the materials. In addition to this MERSETA provided some of the learning material already developed at no cost, and while these materials were not completely aligned with the outcomes that had been identified for this learning programme. In the event, two companies became involved, i.e. Anglo Platinum and Goldfields. In addition, Westcol FET College was selected as the college where the institutional component of the programme would take place. It was indicated that Westcol was selected because it historically had a relationship with both of the mining houses. In total 20 learners were recruited: one of the companies selected unemployed learners while the other company selected from their existing employees. The learners spent 6 weeks in the institutional learning component and then went to the company to undertake their workplace learning component (this process is currently underway). It was also agreed that once the pilot was complete, there should be an evaluation process and then, taking new learning into account, the model would be written up as a Guide Book for collaboration between industry and colleges in curriculum development activities.

Initial Outcomes in mining

Participants of both the governance and staff development workshops stated that these were very useful and that they felt that they had developed a better understanding of partnerships and of the processes related to good governance. However participants indicated that the one drawback was that despite intentions to the otherwise, attendance at the governance training was “dominated by educators” as a result of poor representation at the training from student, industry and community representatives. This, in turn, led to discussions that were “mainly theoretical, rather than being grounded in quality ‘on the ground’ issues and concerns of learners, parents, employers and business people”¹⁰. It was also noted that there was poor representation from Provincial Departments of Education, resulting in “frustration with the Provincial Department. They weren’t there to answer the questions that Councils wanted answers for”¹¹.

However, while it was reported that it had not been possible to ensure full representation at these workshops, many of the companies involved in this process had representatives on the College Councils. In some cases, companies indicated that they had always had representation and that this was not a new development. Others suggested that the initiatives of both the MQA and the CIP have increased the ability of colleges to attract individuals from the industry to serve on college structures. One college interviewee¹² also suggested that the level of company representation would increase once they were able to establish the new college councils, as many colleges were in the process of reconstituting their councils at the point in which this research was undertaken.

¹⁰ Report from Origo Consultants on the Governance Workshops, 10 April 2006.

¹¹ Interview with Origo Consultants.

¹² College interviewee

With regards to the Electro-mechanics learning programme, interviewees cited a number of initial outcomes. Critically, interviewees stated that the development of the learning programme had supported the emergence of a model for the development of College Programmes in which industry and colleges are able to collaborate on curriculum development processes¹³. There were also positive views about the actual programme that was developed and interviewees stated that the quality of the programme was high.

Further, while the selection processes were different across the two companies which posed certain challenges to the programme, interviewees were positive view about the selection process and suggested that it had allowed for the programme to be piloted in a manner that considered the needs of different learners. Companies involved in the pilots also stated that they believed Westcol was the appropriate choice for the provider as they already had a relationship with industry and they had experience in the training of technical skills. Interviewees were also positive about the workplace component and both learners and supervisors stated that this had been very valuable and that learners were well prepared for the workplace component.

However, there were some suggestions as to ways in which the programme could be improved upon;

- Interviewees stated that aspects of the programme needed to be strengthened, in particular that there was a need to review the content of the Drawing learning units, and to further edit certain of the learning materials (particularly the mathematics).
- Learners raised the concern that lecturers did not have the capacity to explain areas that may have been incorrect in the materials;
- There is also the concern that many of the learners that had not been employed within the industry prior to the programme indicated some ambivalence in staying in the industry. This suggests a need to review the selection and induction processes.
- Interviewees commented that there was a lack of clarity re the workplace component and the manner in which it was to extend the learning and how this could support the attainment of any formal qualification.
- The pilot also highlighted the complexity of the relationship between the learning and the workplace as for example one company stated that they only required employees to focus on single trades yet the pilot had focused on the development of multi-skills
- The other issue that was raised is that interviewees are not sure of the current status of the programme. Many of the colleges indicated that they would be eager to use the programme, as they had heard that it was a valuable programme, but they were unclear how to access the programme.
- Related to this, it was reported that there is not yet clarity as to the level of the programme and how it aligns with other qualifications and programmes. This is being explored as part of Phase 4 of this process and needs to be clarified as it has implications for selection as well as for funding arrangements.

This case study highlights the very active process of working in a focused manner with one programme in one college and indicates that interviewees are generally comfortable with this process. However there is little understanding as to how these interventions support any systemic change; both in terms of the relationship of the programme to formal offerings within the FET sector (or elsewhere) and that there appears to be very little relationship between the governance and staff development and any systemic process of engaging with colleges to enable them to offer their programmes in a manner that meets the needs of industry.

¹³ Presentation, A Joint Curriculum Development Model (based on the GTZ Model), G' Lab (Pty) Ltd

What took place in the construction programme?

The construction programme focused on two areas of activity:

- The review and development of the NCV; industry focused on the NCV that had been developed and provided input into the curriculum and materials;
- Support for the implementation of the NCV; this involved direct engagement with two colleges to enable the implementation of the NCV

The review and development of the NCV

In this programme industry worked together with the Department of Education to review the NCV in Building and Civil Construction. It was explained that initially this involved an individual being seconded to the project who was requested to provide input into the NCV curriculum process, with a specific focus on the NQF Level 2 programme as it was planned that this would commence at the beginning of January 2007 – which it did. Interviewees from the programme management team explained that quite soon into the process input was also required for the other levels (3 & 4) both in terms of the curricula and text books. For this reason, additional capacity was sought. This capacity was provided through the active participation of the programme team which actively provided this input; further the PMT appointed an engineering academic to work directly with the curriculum. This individual was selected as it was felt that he would be able to provide both an educational and industry perspective.

Support for the implementation of the NCV

Two colleges were selected to become ‘centres of excellence’; that is colleges which would offer the NCV and would work actively with the industry to ensure that the institution was able to implement this programme to the agreed upon standard. It was understood that there would be considerable challenges in the implementation of project in terms of the capacity of the colleges to implement the revised NCV. To determine what would be required to address these challenges, an assessment of the two colleges was undertaken and a plan for each of the colleges was agreed upon.

Based on this assessment applications were made for the recap monies, and a programme was put in place for staff development. This includes a focus both on the management requirements of these programmes as well as the capacity that lecturers require to deliver the actual NCV. A particular emphasis has been placed on trying to enable lecturers to understand the context in which learners will be placed and to improve their trade skills.

Further, there was a process of assessing the learners that were selected into the NCV and based on this assessment companies determined which learners they would offer bursaries to. A selected group of learners were offered bursaries from companies. Learners also access work experience during their holiday periods to enable them to apply the learning that they are accessing in the college in the workplace.

Interviewees stated that it is anticipated that once the pilot becomes successful, it will be possible to determine quality standards for the FET sector. It is hoped that other colleges will try to reach the same standards as the centres of excellence.

Initial Outcomes & Challenges

There is considerable enthusiasm about the revisions to the NCV and interviewees from the different partners all indicate that the NCV 2 and the changes that have been made to the curriculum and materials for the other levels have gone a long way towards achieving a curriculum that is relevant to the needs of industry. In terms of the pilot it is perhaps premature to comment as the pilot has not even completed its first year. However, already there are a number of positive developments notably that learners suggest that they are willing to continue for the 3 years and state that their work experience components are very valuable and that they are enthusiastic about entering the industry. There is also a view that there are already changes taking place within the college; such as an increased understanding of the industry context and the imperative for enhanced selection processes. Further, it is reported that colleges are now beginning to involve the industry people in decision making about the equipment that they should buy and where they can access this equipment in the most cost effective way.

However there have reportedly been a number of challenges:

- Some of the interviewees indicate that the selection process for the two colleges was inappropriate, and government interviewees suggest that it should have taken the views of the provincial departments into account to a greater extent.

- Possibly related to the above, interviewees' comment that colleges require considerable input in terms of their management and planning processes. Interviewees commented that while business has indicated its willingness to mentor this requires more time than is considered realistic.

- Further, company interviewees observe that while colleges say that they are eager to participate in processes which ensure that they can offer these programmes at the requisite level, they have found that college lecturers are not entirely willing to participate in staff development programmes. Company interviewees comment that this is a key challenge as they indicate that colleges have traditionally provided the theoretical component of a trade qualification and this programme is asking for colleges to change their mindset and to train supervisors who need different sets of competencies.

- In addition, while the applications for the recap monies have been made, interviewees indicate that they have not yet received a formal response on this matter.

- There have also been concerns raised about the selection process for learners; it was explained that the traditional college mechanisms for recruitment were followed, that is open access if you qualify without any process of engagement to determine whether learners understand the programme that they are entering. Many learners stated that they had come to the college and then enrolled in this programme because they heard that there may be bursaries and the possibility of work. Industry interviewees state that as a result they have not been able to allocate all the bursaries that they had initially intended to as they felt there was not a sufficient number of learners that met their requirements. Some of the local company representatives suggest that certain of the learners do not appear to have any commitment to the programme or any understanding of the industry.

- Companies indicate that the limitations in terms of planning skills and understanding of industry in the colleges has meant that the practical work experience components have been less effective that they should have been. They explain that learners have arrived on site with no preparation and are therefore not effectively slotted into the relevant work opportunities.

- A further challenge is that some learners indicate that they are concerned about their perceived demotion – that is, some of the learners say that they have entered this programme at a lower level than their formal qualifications and are unhappy about this. This suggests a need for a clear induction process prior to the NCV to ensure that learners that enter the programme understand and are committed to the route that they are entering.

The above highlights that while the construction partnership has supported systemic changes in the system – a revised NCV – the challenges in actually enabling colleges to address industry needs cannot be underestimated and will require considerable commitment from the different partners in a sustained manner. However partners state that this initiative can only be seen as long-term, that the process of transforming the colleges to be effectively able to deliver these programmes will take time, but that they are confident that while these challenges are multiple they are *“on the right track to getting there.”*

Lessons from the case studies

Systemic nature of the intervention

Integral to the success of a partnership is that the focus needs to consider levers that effect change across the system. These create an environment in which operational activities can take place. For example, the interventions that focused on the review of the NCV curriculum created the space for a systemic change which has the potential to have impact across the college system and serves as a key lever into the college interventions. By contrast the absence of a systemic lever in the mining case meant that the programme that was piloted while considered a success is not located within the broader frame and there is an impasse as to how to best implement the programme on a wider scale.

These cases also highlight the need for partnerships to continually consider the immediate (in this case changes taking place in terms of the FET Colleges) context and to review what changes means for the partnerships and whether the original objectives for the partnership still hold, and if so how they may need to be revised. Related to this, is the need to understand how best the companies could engage with the other systemic developments (broader education and training environment – such as JIPSA) for the purposes of ensuring that the objectives of the partnership would be realised; in these cases this includes the recap processes as well as the opportunities being created through the JIPSA process which enables learners that progress through the NCV to progress into an internship programme and have the option of undertaking the trade test and achieving artisan status. These broader initiatives carry with them a further learning from the case studies; that the complexity of partnerships increase when over and above the government and private sector partnerships there is a need to take cognisance of the relations, or ‘partnerships’, across government. That is, the extent that there is a shared mandate across the departments which form a basis for the subsequent engagement with other sectors. Equally, it cannot be assumed that the private sector is homogenous and this also needs to be taken into account when considering the manner in which partnerships are conceptualised and implemented. For example it was explained that the needs of the large contractors within construction are different from those requirements of the medium and small contractors and this poses a challenge to government when determining how to most effectively engage. This must to be built into the partnership model and requires processes that can take these diverse needs into account.

A focus on implementation

For partnership to sustain themselves they must result in actual changes at the point of delivery. These are considered important both because they enable partners to realise the benefits of the partnership in a more immediate way, for example the learners that have completed the pilot programme in mining or those learners that are undertaking their NCV and are undertaking their work place experience within the companies, and because they assist to crystallise where the systemic challenges are. The identification of the systemic problematic then allows each of the partners to consider how they could most effectively address the emerging issues. For example, the construction case study has directly allowed for a focus on what the staff challenges are in the colleges – that is in the implementation of the NCV the construction companies have been able to identify where the weaknesses are in terms of staffing capacity in the colleges. Companies have been able to consider how best they can support staff development of lecturers so that they can meet their standards and Government has been able to focus on its role in terms of its mandate. This includes ensuring that the FET Bill is approved as this has the potential to change the manner in which staff can be employed and deployed. Government has also been able to consider how it can work with industry specialists in support of their staff development activities.

There is no short term

A further lesson, in part emerging from the previous point, is the growing understanding that these interventions rely on institutions. This means that the changes cannot be understood as short term in nature; institutional change is a long term process and includes the need to affect the institutional culture. This suggests that partners need to understand what their short term and long term objectives can realistically be. Critically, it emphasises that the key to the partnership working is that partners are well selected and that partners must have the commitment and the people to implement the change. In many cases partners are chosen because they have a history in the sector or because they have some of the relevant infrastructure; yet both case studies highlight that even more important is that there is management and lecturing staff that are able to grapple with the change and are willing to commit additional time to reach the agreed upon standard.

Understanding structure: Defined roles for the partners

Related to this emphasis on people is the imperative that partners understand what they want from the partnership and are committed to playing a role in the partnership. Conversely this assumes that there is mutual respect for the roles that these partners play and the possibilities and constraints faced by each of the partners. These case studies also highlight the role of communication in initiating, cementing, managing and delivering in the partnerships. Communication, at the level of leadership who could 'vision the possible' and create scenarios in which key partners mutually benefited from cooperation; communication at the level of senior management who could respond flexibly to different challenges as they emerged.

This also takes into account the need to understand the manner in which partnerships are developed at the different levels; so which partners and at what level the partner should be to take forward system wide strategic objectives (for example National Department of Education and Company Leadership) versus the partners required at an operational level (colleges and regional management as well as provincial Department of Education).

However, it should be noted that the comments made above are not made glibly, it is not always possible for partners to participate at the requisite level; there are capacity constraints that exist as well as competing pressures. This suggests that in conceptualising partnerships realistic roles need to be agreed upon and these roles need to be considered when determining what the partnership is able to achieve.

Role of the interlocutor

And then critically is the role of an interlocutor, in these cases in the form of the NBI, who could act as a coordinating agent and could manage communication between these very disparate potential partners. This role included acting as a go between – the traditional mediation role between players who would not normally come together in forums conducive to strategic conversations as well as spreading the message by talking to other outside players who may be potential partners, funders or simply important and influential supporters. Yet despite these varied perspectives it appears that the NBI was able to ensure that the partnership stayed the course and did not dissipate where issues emerged. This is a difficult role for any organisation to play since the outcomes are often nebulous and count against 'soft' and difficult goals such as improved partnerships.

In both of these partnerships the outsider role was played by the National Business Initiative (NBI). The role of the NBI in these partnerships across two sectors was shaped by the needs of the key players in the partnership. In mining the NBI became the project manager and therefore facilitated the steering committee. In addition, and consistent with the mining partnership plan, the NBI developed a proposal and approached the MQA for funding¹⁴. There was a lengthy process of negotiating with the MQA which, as stated previously, ultimately led to an agreement with the MQA that they would fund components of 3 of the original programme areas. In construction the role of the NBI is to guide and support the partnership and to ensure the sustainability of the initiative as well as ensuring that the strategic engagement and dialogue is ongoing and empowers the partnership at all levels.

An emerging issue related to the above though is the need to understand where the role of an interlocutor begins and ends: in the mining sector there was a view that the involvement of the Department of Education needed to be strengthened and that this should be seen as a key role for the NBI to play. An interviewee from the MQA commented that,

The other critical role that the NBI could play – and I'm not sure the extent to which the NBI understands the importance of this role themselves – is taking information to, and doing the advocacy work, with the DoE. The SETA environment is directly related to the DoL and DoE, so having the NBI playing an advocacy role, particularly with DoE, would greatly assist us. This is crucial.

¹⁴ 12th Steering Committee Meeting Notes – 12 April 2006

However in construction it was understood that this responsibility lays firmly with the companies themselves though the NBI could play an important role in *'the translation'* between the partners. This was a perspective shared by interviewees from the NBI and the Departments who argued that it was critical that companies directly engage on these issues and do not rely on what are called *'intermediaries'*.

This statement highlights an issues dealt with elsewhere – that of the dynamic between formal and informal relationships which plays out in the achievement of the goals of the respective projects. This continues to be a facet of the projects that requires support and review.

Hypotheses in review

One of framework instructions for this case study was to review several hypotheses regarding partnerships between government and others actors. These are done below in the context of the case study and following on from the Lessons section provided above. It is observed that aspects of several of the hypotheses cannot be commented on directly from evidence or deductions in the case studies, where this is the case this is specifically indicated.

It should be noted that these hypotheses are framed in terms of public and private sector partnerships, yet the case studies highlight that the complexities also relate to what are sometimes perceived as competing mandates emerging from different government departments. These are not reflected on below but understanding these nuances is considered critical to framing the manner in which the capacity to engage in partnerships need to be considered. Further, when grappling with some of these issues it is also important to understand that there can also be competing interests within the private sector, the implications of this also warrants further attention.

Hypothesis (1): The framework of national governance (laws, institutions, political system) is critical to the effectiveness of cross-sector partnerships involving government.

The framework provided by policies and legislation were critical in both of the sectors reviewed as were attitudes of key government players. Critically, the FET Act of 1998 and more recently the FET College Bill frame what is possible within the colleges. In addition to this processes that are unfolding out under the auspices of JIPSA, and spearheaded by the Department of Labour, which allow for different routes of learning and prioritise the training of individuals at the intermediate level also shape what is possible within the unfolding context.

At the level of education the frameworks were those of significant changes in the shape and form of the technical college sector. Mergers and new policy on curriculum – the NVCs – shaped the terrain which gave rise to the projects. In the case of the mining sector, shifts in curriculum policy from the old N qualifications to the new NVCs caught the project somewhat from the side and there is some perception that the project never managed to strategically adapt to the new terrain. By contrast the construction sector formed their partnership around the emerging programme landscape and this has fundamentally impacted on what they have been able to implement.

This policy environment directly impacted on what it was possible at the level of implementation: at the level of colleges, many respondents in the evaluations commented on how difficult it was to meet the needs of the private sector. Some interviewees commented that the reality or perceptions of national regulations were seen as restrictions, though other interviewees suggest that the regulations open up opportunities and it is either college procedures or attitudes which hamper the partnering process.

Finally on this issue, is the often somewhat strained relationship in South Africa between government, civil society and the private sector. In a young democracy with South Africa's fraught history this is not surprising. It does, however impact on partnerships. Government is particularly sensitive to its own perceptions that other sectors might be interfering with its mandate to govern or might be suggesting that it lacks the capacity

to implement as per its requirements, whilst at the same time the two other sectors at times feel closed out of government.

In the long run it is these perceptions and the relative maturity of the three sectors – public, private and social – to create a national framework recognising their possible value-adds that will more strongly affect partnerships than will legal frameworks. Further, it is the ability of each of the partners to understand and articulate their needs from the system and the role that they can meaningfully contribute to its development which will most effectively support these partnerships.

Hypothesis (2): Many government agencies are sceptical as to the added value of cross-sector partnership as a means of delivering on their MDG commitments.

MDG commitments were not a part of the original case studies and as such cannot be directly referenced here. On the broader point of government scepticism there was some evidence in these projects that the national Department of Education holds a healthy scepticism as to the actual value added to their ability to deliver. This is *not* to say that DoE is sceptical in general about the potential of partnerships. Rather, but that the experience of Government departments is that often an approach on a so-named ‘partnership’ is in fact an ill-considered attempt to serve very focused agendas that are insensitive or antithetical to Government’s broader mandates. For example the imperative to balance what are perceived as short term needs of industry, which it is argued may rapidly change, versus the imperative to produce graduates that have the mobility and skill to continually develop and learn and access economic opportunities.

Another observation from the case studies is that the likelihood of seeing the potential need for and benefits deriving from partnerships is higher the higher up in Government one moves. At the higher levels in Government, office bearers potentially, have more security and greater authority to seek flexible solutions to delivery dilemmas.

Hypothesis (3): Government agencies (both politicians and civil servants) do not engage in or promote cross sector partnerships because of a concern that such involvement leads to erosion of their authority and abrogation of their mandate to act in the public interest.

While, these case studies had limited evidence or information on this issue two areas emerged which lend support this concern;

- The dynamic already highlighted between the delivery of programmes that are longer term in duration and develop sustainable skills at an intermediary level or the imperative to offer programmes which support more immediate skills development requirements; and,
- The need for the Department to ensure that it meets a specified schedule – the dates by when the curriculum must be finalised to allow for the development of learning materials to ensure that they can arrive at the college at the beginning of the academic year versus what is perceived as the oft delaying processes of stakeholder engagement and consultation.

The partnerships illustrated here indicate however that where private sector is able to mediate these concerns and are able to recognise these competing pressures and to accommodate these in the manner in which their partnership has evolved.

Hypothesis (4): Vested interests may inhibit the willingness of decision-making individuals to enable public bodies to partner with civic and business sectors to deliver on MDGs

There was no evidence in any of the evaluation work done prior to this case study of malpractice or corruption in or surrounding the respective partnerships.

There was significant anecdotal and some respondent evidence to the effect that partnership between colleges and the private sector raised issues of organisational culture and, ‘not the way we do things around here’. This had application both at institutional level as well as at the level of managers and educators in the colleges. There was no evidence of this at national department levels.

Hypothesis (5): Public bodies (like other sectors) are limited in both the internal management systems and professional skill sets of their staff to be able to partner effectively with civic and business sectors to deliver on MDGs

There is little evidence in these studies that Government generally is in a worse position to partner than the private sector. Players in both sectors find their way through misperceptions, preconceived ideas, and the odd blunder-in-practice in order to reach mature partnering.

There was evidence that the maturity/confidence or authority to achieve this rests higher up in Government rather than at lower levels. By the same token, the project that spoke loudest to this fact – construction – might also be signifying a similar finding in the private sector. This speaks to variables attached to authority and seniority being more important than those attached to sector.

Evidence from both projects was that the skills set for such partnering was largely absent or seriously impaired in colleges. Whilst this was not explored in original evidence collecting, it might be surmised from some of the above argument that a relative lack of authority, or perceived opportunity might well hamper college level partnering ability.

One of the projects – mining – spent significant resources on attempting to build this skills set in colleges. It is too early yet to comment on whether the abstract training in ‘partnering skills’ will produce desired results or whether it will eventually prove more lasting to create partnerships and mentor those involved through the messy reality that this entails.

This issue of whether the difficulties emerge from an inability to partner or as a result of the absence of the skills more related to the capacity to actually deliver the programmes emerges as a critical in these case studies. The cases suggest that the colleges struggled with the emerging requirements of both government and industry rather than in relation to a lack of willingness to partner with the private sector. For example, many college staff complained about the increased requirement in the NCV and expressed their concern that they did not have sufficient knowledge to explain all the concepts contained in the programme and were in fact more comfortable to provide basic skills training where they felt more confidence.

Hypothesis (6): Partnerships which touch on public services and which do not include government as a partner or where government is not sufficiently engaged or active, may never reach their full potential, can be difficult to scale up and may not achieve long term sustainable outcomes.

Partnerships which exclude one of the key sector partners are unlikely to succeed under any circumstances. In a little more detail, the two sectors provided some interesting insights into this hypothesis. In the construction sector the DoE was included at a high level (DDG). A seeming positive outcome of this was that senior players in public and private sector positions could exercise a maturity and openness around issues that were problems. For example, unauthorised approaches to colleges were an issue for which the private

sector was reprimanded and which criticism its senior representatives accepted, apologised for and reached new agreements on. There is little evidence that such compromises or such potentially long-term understandings and relationships have thus far developed in the mining sector.

Interestingly, neither of the sectors showed evidence of convincing provincial participation in the projects despite technical college governance and capitalization being a provincial competence. If continued in future, this lack of full engagement will certainly hamper college partnerships from reaching full potential.

Appendix

CIP 10-point plan

The 10-point plan developed in collaboration by the NBI and the DoE covers:

1. College Governance: strengthened and more strategic business representation and leadership in College Councils;
2. Strategic Planning: capacity and strategic understanding of college leadership to plan and manage the growth and development of the college in relation to industry and regional socio-economic development needs is strengthened;
3. College Management Development: college management operates in a business-like manner to position the college, expand its market and manage the education and training process in a college. Mentoring and management skills of industry managers are enhanced and relations forged with education and training leadership in the colleges sector;
4. College Staff Development: college staff establish a close working relationship with industry, and deliver industry-standard education and training and consultancy products and services. Company managers benefit from mentoring college managers and establishing learning networks in FET colleges;
5. Programmes and Curriculum Development: colleges provide programmes that respond to industry's training, community development and corporate social responsibility priorities and that meet industry standards;
6. Quality assurance: to develop a culture of continuous quality improvement across all aspects of college operations and to ensure that these are aligned with industry expectations and quality processes;
7. Work-based learning for college and 18.2 (unemployed) learners business made a commitment at the Growth and Development Summit to increase the number of 18.2 learners in learnerships. Colleges assist companies in addressing both 18.1 and 18.2 targets; ;
8. Career Counselling and Job Placement for College Learners: to support companies in their recruitment strategy for identifying, nurturing and selecting skilled potential employees from the FET College Sector;
9. Industry-Standard Training Facilities and Other Resources: ensure college learners and potential industry employees are trained in industry-standard technologies and work environments; and
10. Strategic Dialogue, Information Dissemination and Policy Engagement: to share and promote best practice; to promote dialogue through college-industry interaction and through engagement between business and government; and to support business leaders' engagement with government on the wider policy issues affecting economic growth and development, jobs, and skills development.

List of Acronyms

ASGISA	Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa
CCF	Colleges Collaboration Fund
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CIP	College Industry Partnership
DDG	Deputy Director General
DoE	Department of Education
DoL	Department of Labour
ETD	Education and Training Development
ETQA	Education and Training Quality Assurance Body
FET	Further Education and Training
HRD	Human Resource Development
ISO	International Organisation for Standards standard
JIPSA	Joint Initiative for Priority Skills Acquisition
MERSETA	Manufacturing, Engineering and Related Services SETA
MQA	Mining Qualifications Authority
N	Refers to NATED
NATED	National Technical Education
NBI	National Business Initiative
NCV	National Certificate Vocational
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
SA	South Africa
SC	Steering Committee
SETA	Sector Education and Training Authority