National Skills Taxonomy Discussion Paper

National Skills Taxonomy Discussion Paper

DEWR Consult hub

Response received at:

August 9, 2024 at 04:59 PM GMT+10

Response ID:

sbm2fcc079b3294d74e5ef39

1   Do you agree with this Privacy Statement?

Yes

2   How do you want your submission published?

Public and anonymous

3   If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what (from the list below) best describes your organisation?

Not answered

4   Your name

███████

5   Your email address

█████████████

6   Would you like to opt-out on being contacted for further information regarding your submission if required?

No

7   Please select how you would like to provide a response.

Complete this survey

8   Thank you for choosing to provide a response to the National Skills Taxonomy Discussion Paper.

Not answered

9   Lessons from existing taxonomies

Skills taxonomies are always problematic and rest on many assumptions about the nature of skill. The existing ASC, of which, to be honest, I was not previously aware (although I have some familiarity with O*NET, seems OK, if we must have one.

10   Potential use cases for a National Skills Taxonomy

I can't really see a benefit at all to having an NST. Since skill is often socially constructed, one can't talk of 'skill' as objectively existing or being readily identifiable. Skill is always exercised in a context. I couldn't imagine either employers or educators using it.

11   Building a National Skills Taxonomy – design considerations

As above, I don't think it would be used and it would be better not to expend more effort on it. There could also be adverse consequences for individuals if any of it was taken literally. e.g. for migration purposes, wage rates etc. None of this was addressed in the paper

12   Building a National Skills Taxonomy: Implementation considerations

N/A