



Training Product Submission

This form facilitates [Step 5.1 Submission of draft training products to the Assurance Body](#) of the Training Package Organising Framework (TPOF) Process Requirements.

Completing this form and submitting the required information, including the attachments, provides the Training Package Assurance (TPA) team with the necessary information to assess your Training Product Submission (the submission) against the TPOF. This is an opportunity to describe how the processes you have applied to develop your products and the products themselves comply with the requirements of the TPOF.

Refer to the Training Package Assurance (TPA) Submission Compliance Guide for detailed information about the evidence required for your submission.

Components of the submission include:

- this form
- completed attachments including the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

About this form

There are three sections to this submission form:

Section 1: Submission Details

Section 2: Submission Evidence

Section 3: CEO Declaration

Unless otherwise indicated, you must provide a response to each part of each question.



This symbol has been used to indicate where attachments and/or additional information must be uploaded with the submission.

Submission to the Assurance Body

To submit your project for assurance please:

1. Upload this completed submission form and supporting evidence into the relevant project folder in the TPA GovTEAMS Community.
2. Ensure all training package products are entered into Training Product Central (TPC) with the product drafting status set to 'Ready for Submission' and the project status set to 'Assurance Body Consideration'.
3. Publish the submission on your website. This includes:
 - Training Product Submission Form
 - Attachment A – Training Products submitted for assurance
 - Anti-discrimination Assessment
 - Consultation Log
 - Consultation Strategy
 - Technical Committee Details (including Terms of Reference)
 - Training Package Products
 - Companion Volume Implementation Guide (CVIG)
4. Email the TPA team at TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au with the Project ID and Title to advise the submission is ready for assurance.

Incomplete submissions, including where there is insufficient or missing detail in the submission form and/or attachments, will be returned to you and the assurance process will be paused until the required information is received.

One form of evidence may satisfy multiple questions. A checklist is provided at the end of this document to assist you to ensure your submission is complete. You can use the column titled 'Evidence Reference' in the checklist to identify the document title of the specific evidence in your submission, alternatively, you may prefer to produce your own cover sheet to accompany the submission.

Assistance completing this form

Please refer to the TPA Submission Compliance Guide TPOF 1 July 2025 for information about how the TPA team will review the submission, noting that the examples of evidence provided are only a guide and not intended to be an exhaustive list.

If you need help completing this form, please contact TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au.

Refer to the department's website and the TPA Community in GovTEAMS for further information about the Training Package Assurance process.

Section One: Submission Details

1. Jobs and Skills Council Details

Jobs and Skills Council Name:			
Industry Skills Australia			
Contact person: (the person the Training Package Assurance team will liaise with during the assessment process; you can identify more than one person here if required)			
Name(s):	Tricia Fidock Dan Kerr Klausch Schmidt	Position:	Project Specialist Project Specialist Director of Project Operations
Phone:	0409872933 0437736035 0417568967	Mobile:	0409872933 0437736035 0417568967
Email(s):	Tricia.fidock@isajsc.org.au; dan.kerr@isajsc.org.au; Klausch.schmidt@isajsc.org.au – FYI Trish is on leave 10-24 July 2026. Klausch is on leave 10-17 July 2026. Please direct queries to Dan during these dates.		

2. Project Details

Project ID:	TAL_ANN_2324_005
Project Title:	Diploma of Aviation (Flight Instructor) Review

Provide a brief description of the project.

The purpose of this project was to review and modernise the AVI50419 Diploma of Aviation (Flight Instructor), which contained a significant number of outdated units, primarily sourced from the TAE Training Package. In its existing form, the qualification was considered impractical because it effectively embedded the Certificate IV in Training and Assessment within the diploma.

The Technical Committee determined that flight instructors did not require the full Certificate IV in Training and Assessment. Instead, the qualification needed to align with the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) Part 61 regulatory requirements, which specify the competencies required for flight instructors. These requirements are reflected in the Principles and Methods of Instruction (PMI), a key component of flight instructor training and assessment.

As a result, the qualification underwent substantial redevelopment. Core units that were no longer required were removed, while units that mapped directly to CASA Part 61 requirements were made core. During the review, one unit was identified as containing excessive content and was subsequently split into two separate units, with a third unit developed to cover the remaining competency requirements.

The project was originally intended to be completed prior to the implementation of the 2025 Standards. However, progress was delayed while ISA, industry stakeholders, DEWR and ASQA worked together through the mapping exercise to determine the equivalence of the Principles and Methods of Instruction units to the Certificate IV and Diploma of Training and Assessment qualifications. As a consequence, the redevelopment work extended beyond the introduction of the new standards, requiring the units to be transferred to the 2025 unit template. During this process, the units were also revised to improve readability and compliance by changing the language from passive to active voice.

3. Scope of the submission

Provide the total number of Qualifications, Units of Competency, and Skills Sets included in the proposed release of the Training Package. This may include any minor changes that will be made in the proposed release.

While the assurance assessment focuses on products that require endorsement by Skills Ministers (i.e. major changes), understanding the context for the entire release may be helpful to the Assurance Body.

Refer to the Categories of Change tables in the TPOF for the definition of major and minor changes.

	Major	Minor	Total
Qualification(s):	1	0	0
Unit(s) of competency:	6	4	10
Skill Set(s):			3

If applicable, provide an overview of minor change updates that will be included in this release.

The following units of competency have been raised with the relevant regulators and they agree to the listed changes:

AVIF0044 – “Negative Rotation” – remove KE 11.3

AVIO0031 – replace “sterile” with “secure” in PCs 2.6, 2.9 & 2.10

AVIO0033 – remove 2 instances of sterile.

AVIO0039 – PC 2.3 reword – change “vehicle” to “vehicle or transport item” or “vehicle and transport item” in 3 places.



Complete and upload *Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance*

4. The Annual Training Product Development Plan

Provide a link to the published plan on your website.

Link/URL:	https://admin.industryskillsaustralia.org.au/sites/default/files/2026-03/Annual Training Product Development Plan - March 2026.pdf
------------------	---

If the activity is not listed in the plan, provide an overview of the unforeseen or urgent need addressed by the activity.

Click here to enter text.

4.1 Where the submission contains major changes to a qualification/s, has the Purpose of any of the products changed from what is recorded in the Annual Training Product Development Plan (ATPDP)? Answer 'Yes' where the Purpose of the products is not included in the ATPDP.

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q5)

If yes, provide details of the changes OR where the purpose of the qualification/s contained in the project is not included in the ATPDP, please provide details below.

Click here to enter text.

Section 2 – Submission Evidence

Technical Committee

5. Technical Committee Composition



Upload details of the membership of the technical committee and their expertise as per Step 1.2 of the TPOF Process Requirements including the Terms of Reference for the committee

Has the composition of the technical committee changed from that published at the pre-submission stage?



Yes



No (go to Q6)

If yes, provide a reason for the change describing any impact of the change on the development activity.

Technical Committee Members that left during the project:

Elise Cottam (Yalga Binbi Institute Community Development Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people) – resigned 03/09/2024

Patrick Murray (University of Southern Queensland)– resigned 13/09/2024

Matthew Munns (Horizon Airways) – resigned 04/10/2024

Geoff Horsley (Geoff Horsley Aviation)– resigned 23/10/2024

Nathan Hassall (Tristar Aviation) – resigned 03/04/2025

Nic D’Alessandro (NCD Consulting and in association with Par Avion Flight Training) – resigned due to ill health

Neil Boag (Learn to Fly)– resigned due to ill health and replaced by Luke Wu.

Members Added:

Chris Godwin (Airflite P/L) – joined 1 May 2025

Shane Wright (HAPTA Group) – joined 1 May 2025

6. Technical Committee Statement

Provide a statement that the technical committee has reviewed the final draft training package products. Include information about the process for the technical committee review (for example, whether the review was completed during a meeting or out of session).

The following is an excerpt from the minutes taken on Tuesday, 12 August 2025 at the project sign off meeting:

- Approval of Project by Technical Committee
 - Tricia advised that she would poll the technical Committee members to get their endorsement to proceed
 - Tricia provided the following statement:
 - **“I have reviewed the draft training products as part of the Flight Instructor Project Technical Committee, and I approve the draft products being submitted to the Skills Ministers for Endorsement.”**
 - The Technical Committee voted as follows:
 - Allan Brooks – Yes
 - Andre Hattingh – Yes
 - Andrew Trease – Yes
 - Chris Godwin – Yes
 - Ian Ryan – Yes
 - Ken Alonso – Yes (Discussed with Tricia prior to the meeting)
 - Maddy Johnson – To follow up
 - Miles Tomkins – Yes
 - Naomi Radke – Yes
 - Neil Boag – To follow up
 - Nic D'Alessandro– To follow up
 - Pamela Ray – To follow up
 - Ric Peapell – Yes
 - Shane Wright – No (provided via email after meeting)
 - Shannon Wells – to follow up.

Luke Wu provided an email and letter of support on behalf of Learn to Fly as Neil Boag's replacement on the TC.

Nic D'Alessandro – provided an email response on 7/12/2025 saying he could not provide a response as he was dealing with a chronic illness and subsequently resigned from the TC.

Maddy Johnson – no response.

Pamela Ray provided a letter of support 27 August 2025.

Shannon Wells provided a letter of support 22 September 2025.

Shane Wright – Initially Shane did not support the qualification but he did support the units of competency. This was prior to DEWR/ASQA making their decision that pilots who hold the Part 61 Regulation being recognised to teach and assess Aviation Qualifications. Once the DEWR ruling came out (refer email 6 May 2026) Shane supported the project.

Consultation Activity

7. Stakeholder Consultation Strategy



Upload a copy of the stakeholder consultation strategy

Did the consultation undertaken deviate from the stakeholder consultation strategy (including changes to identified stakeholders, and any delays or changes to consultation timeframes)?

Refer to pg 24-26 of TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

☒ Yes ☐ No (go to Q8)

If yes, provide a summary of what changed and why.

The finalisation of the project was delayed several times due to the previously mentioned DEWR ruling regarding CASA Regulation Part 61. Initially it was proposed the project would be approved by the Assurance Body 15 December 2025.

There was no webinar at the start of the project.

There was not a face to face meeting of the TC.

8. Consultation Timeframes

Provide an overview of when the consultation activities were undertaken.

You can enter more than one set of dates for each consultation phase as required.

Consultation Phase	Dates
Public and government consultation	10/04/2025 to 13/05/2025
Incorporating feedback (additional consultation if required)	17/07/2025 to 01/08/2025
Senior Officials Check	17/06/2026 to 03/07/2026

9. Vulnerable and Minority Cohorts

Describe how consultation activities have been responsive to the needs of vulnerable or minority cohorts, including women, people with disability, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, and First Nations people.

Information should include how vulnerable or minority stakeholders were identified and how consultation activities were tailored to respond to the needs of those stakeholders.

Refer to pg 26 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

The purpose of the project was to align to CASA regulations to ensure the training mapped to the Principles and Methods of Instruction which in turn qualifies pilots to be able to train other pilots. This is the same regardless of sex. There are specific requirements to become a pilot that dictates a certain level of understanding and speaking the English language. There are also physical requirements that not all people with a disability will be able to comply with.

10. Consultation Log



Upload the consultation log including the high-level summary
(an example consultation log is provided in GovTEAMS)

Include information about all consultation activities undertaken, how feedback has been logged, and how feedback has been addressed. For example, if a workshop was conducted and no individual feedback was gathered, describe how the results of the workshop were considered in the project.

Provide as much detail as possible to support the Assurance Assessor's understanding of the consultation process including the treatment of feedback. This detail may be provided in the high-level summary or below.

Refer to pg 27-32 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Click here to enter text.

11. Senior Officials Check



Upload evidence that the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) check was undertaken

Engagement with SROs must be recorded in the Consultation Log.

Use this space to record any additional information about the SRO check to support the Assurance Assessor's understanding of the submission.

Industry Skills Australia conducted a meeting specifically for SROs to explain the purpose and outcome of the project on Tuesday 30 June 2026. There were 9 people in attendance.

Nothing of concern was raised at the meeting however South Australia did raise some questions which we responded to. They have yet to provide support.

12. Support from Regulatory and Licensing Bodies

Do any of the products in the submission include occupational licensing, certification or regulation requirements related to **the person** undertaking the work described in the product?

☒ Yes ☐ No (go to Q12.1)

If yes, ensure the requirement is described in the 'Legislative/Licensing/Regulatory' field in TPC and include information about implementation in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.



Identify products that contain regulatory, licensing or legislative implications in *Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance*



Upload evidence of support from all relevant national/state and territory regulatory and/or licensing bodies

12.1 Other regulatory/legislative information

Is there regulatory/legislative information in the products relevant to the workplace/enterprise?

☒ Yes ☐ No (go to Q13)

If yes, **do not** include the requirement in the 'Legislative/Licensing/Regulatory' field in TPC. You may include this information in the 'Description' of the qualification or 'Application' of the unit of competency. You must include information about implementation implications in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

13. Engagement with other Jobs and Skills Councils

Are any of the products in this submission imported into training package products managed by other Jobs and Skills Councils?

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q14)

If yes, list the Jobs and Skills Council(s) impacted and describe how you have consulted with them. Briefly describe the impact on relevant qualifications.

Refer to pg 29 and 31 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Click here to enter text.



Upload evidence of engagement with all listed Jobs and Skills Councils

Note: where any products in this submission impact other training packages managed by your JSC, describe the impact on those other products at *Q15 Implementation Issues*.

14. Rationale for mandatory workplace requirements

Are any Mandatory Workplace Requirements (MWRs) included in the submitted products?

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q15)



Identify products that contain MWRs in *Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance*

If yes, describe the process undertaken to determine the inclusion of MWR. Consider the process set out in the good practice guide on MWR: On the Mark: 5 Good Practice Principles when completing this section.

Click here to enter text.

14.1 Support for mandatory workplace requirements



Upload evidence of support for proposed requirements (including from small to medium sized enterprises), and employer willingness to support learner work placements

Use this space to record any additional information about how employer support for learner work placements was gained.

Note: support is required to be demonstrated for all training package products containing MWRs in the scope of the submission, regardless of whether they have been changed as a result of the development project. Confirmation of ongoing support for MWR including employer support for work placement needs to be gathered through the consultation process.

Refer to pg 29-32 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Click here to enter text.

15. Implementation Issues

Use this space to record information about implementation issues raised throughout the development process. Please include:

- What intelligence was gathered from stakeholders about implementation of the training package products
- How any implementation issues raised through the consultation process were addressed
- Whether any other training package products within your responsibility are affected by the project.

Refer to pg 30-31 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Nothing was raised.



Include detail about implementation in the *Consultation Log* including information about the stakeholders involved

16. Disputes

Note: This section refers to disputes as described in the Model Dispute Resolution Policy outlined in the TPOF Process Requirements.

Were any disputes recorded during the development activity?

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q18)

If yes, describe the dispute/s and how you applied your internal dispute resolution process to resolve the matter.

Click here to enter text.



Include detail about the dispute/s in the *Consultation Log* including information about the stakeholders involved (See example Attachment B Consultation Log - Dispute Resolution tab)

17. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

Was an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) practitioner engaged?

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q18)

If yes, provide a summary of any disputes that were escalated to ADR. Include the recommendations produced, the final position of the Jobs and Skills Council, and a justification where the ADR practitioner's recommendations were not adopted.

Click here to enter text.



Upload a copy of the ADR practitioner's advice

18. Evidence of broad consensus

Has broad consensus been reached on all products?

☒ Yes (go to 18.1) ☐ No (go to 18.2)



Upload evidence of support (e.g. letters of support)

18.1 Provide a summary of how broad consensus has been determined.

Refer to pg 35-36 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

The TC had robust discussions throughout the project period. It was clear the TC didn't want to have the TAE embedded in the qualification as if they want TAE qualifications they should do that separately.

The TC are asked constantly along the process – does anyone disagree and if so that leads to more discussion and generally once explained in greater detail it clarifies any concerns.

18.2 Where broad consensus is not reached, provide a justification for why the product has been submitted for endorsement, including how you attempted to gain consensus.

Click here to enter text.

Compliance with Requirements

19. Anti-Discrimination Assessment

Provide an assessment that demonstrates that the products meet anti-discrimination legislation, and associated standards and regulations, including the [Disability Standards for Education 2005](#).

Refer to pg 38–40 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.



Upload a copy of the Anti-Discrimination Assessment

20. Pathways

Describe the process undertaken to ensure the training package products have pathways that facilitate movement between education sectors and employment.

Refer to pg 41–42 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Note: Pathways advice must be included in the Companion Volume Implementation Guide.

Obtaining the qualification is only one way or three aviators can become pilot educators.
University is already a pathway.

21. Rationalising and Streamlining

Describe the process undertaken to rationalise and streamline the training package products.

Include information about any units and/or qualifications to be deleted and the results of any analysis of cross sector units and/or other existing units.

Refer to pg 43-44 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Two units of competency that were no longer considered relevant were removed. However, one of the other units contained such extensive content that it was difficult for RTOs to deliver effectively, and meaningful exit points were challenging to achieve. To address this, the content from that unit was redistributed into three units: the original unit was split into two separate units, and a third unit was created to capture the remaining content and ensure coverage of the Principles and Methods of Instruction (CASA requirements).

The review originally consisted of six units. Although two units were deleted, the creation of one additional unit and the division of another unit into two resulted in a final structure of six units.

The two units deleted cannot be delivered as a part of the current qualification as they have to be trained pilot instructors to deliver them. And they are not qualified until they satisfy Regulation Part 61.

21.1 Has the analysis identified any overlap with existing units?

☐

Yes (go to 21.1)

☒

No (go to Q22)

21.2 Provide a justification for why existing products are not suitable.

Click here to enter text.

22. Request to change transition period

Is a change to the standard transition period (12 months) proposed for any products in this submission?

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q23)



Identify products where a change to the transition period is proposed in
Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance

Provide a rationale for the proposed transition period. Include information about the consultation undertaken to identify the need for a changed transition period.

Click here to enter text.

Training Product Content

23. Training Package Products

The Training Package Assurance team will review qualifications, units of competency and Skill Sets through Training Product Central.

Note: The drafting status of each training product must be set to 'Ready for Submission' and the project status must be set to 'Assurance Body Consideration'.



[Upload a copy of the Companion Volume Implementation Guide](#)

24. Pre-requisites

Does the submission include any units of competency that contain pre-requisites?

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q25)

If yes, describe the process undertaken to ensure the use of pre-requisites is minimised.

Click here to enter text.

Were there any issues raised about pre-requisites through the consultation process?

☐

Yes

☒

No (go to Q25)

If yes, provide a summary of the issue/s raised and how the issue/s have been resolved.

Click here to enter text.

25. Foundation skills

How did you determine the required level of performance for each of the ACSF core skills areas?

Refer pg 51-52 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

The units of competency underwent a review by our expert in ASCF core skills. The results were then presented to the Technical Committee for comment. No revisions were required.

26. Stand-alone Units

Does the submission include any stand-alone units of competency?

Note: stand-alone units refer to units of competency that are not packaged into a qualification.

☐ Yes ☒ No (go to Q27)

If yes, provide justification for the use of a stand-alone unit. Explain why it cannot be immediately packaged into a qualification and the proposed plan for embedding it in a qualification in future updates to the training package.

Refer pg 52 of the TPA Submission Compliance Guide.

Click here to enter text.

26.1 Support for Stand-alone Unit/s



Upload evidence of industry need and support for each stand-alone unit

Section 3 – CEO Declaration

27. Submission declaration

- ☒ This submission and proposed training package products were developed in accordance with all components of the Training Package Organising Framework (TPOF).
- ☒ I confirm the training package product/s align with their intended purpose and are structured to meet the needs of industry, employers and learners.
- ☒ I confirm all required attachments are included with this submission.
- ☒ I confirm the final draft products are accurately entered into Training Product Central and are ready for assurance assessment.

Jobs and Skills Council Chief Executive Officer			
Signature*:	REDACTED	Date:	3/08/2026
Full Name:	Vanda Fortunato		

* Options for capturing the CEO signature include: copy and paste an electronic signature above; upload a separate signed document which includes the required declarations to GovTEAMS; send an email from the CEOs email address to TrainingPackageAssurance@dewr.gov.au which includes the required declarations.

27. CEO summary statement

Include a summary from the CEO describing how they have ensured that the submission has been developed in accordance with the requirements set out in the TPOF.

I have been briefed by the GM of Operations (acting). He explained that this project has followed the TPOF process to ensure that ISA are compliant with development and review of the AVI training package product. Industry and the regulator CASA were engaged throughout the project and we also gave stakeholders opportunities to review and provide feedback throughout.

Submission Checklist

To avoid a delay in the processing of your submission, please ensure that your submission is complete. Submissions that are not accompanied by the required attachments will be returned for completion. Confirm the following documents have been uploaded where applicable.

Q.	Submission Requirement	Uploaded	N/A	 Evidence Reference
Other	Publish submission to JSC website as per Step 5.1 of the TPOF. Refer to page 2 for minimum required documents.	☐		Click here to enter the URL/link to the published submission.
3	Attachment A – Products submitted for assurance	☒		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
5	Technical committee membership details	☐		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
7	A copy of the stakeholder consultation strategy	☒		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
10	The consultation log	☐		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
11	Evidence that the SRO check was undertaken	☐		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
12	Evidence of support from all relevant national/state and territory regulatory and/or licensing bodies	☒	☐	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
13	Evidence of engagement with other relevant JSCs	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
14.1	Evidence of support for proposed MWRs including employer willingness to support placements	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
17	The Alternative Dispute Resolution practitioner's advice	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
18	Evidence to support broad consensus	☐		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.

Q.	Submission Requirement	Uploaded	N/A	 Evidence Reference
19	The Anti-Discrimination Assessment	☐		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
23	Training Package products submitted in Training Product Central	☐		
	The Companion Volume Implementation Guide	☐		Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.
26.1	Evidence of identified industry need and support for stand-alone units	☐	☒	Click here to enter the evidence reference/s, e.g. the relevant document title.