



Bridging Education, University and Employment: A Practice-Based Framework for Student Readiness in Australia

Niral Joshi

Head of Faculty, Charlton Brown College, Australia
niral.joshi@charltonbrown.edu.au

Abstract

The transition from education to university and employment is increasingly complex. Students are expected not only to acquire disciplinary knowledge and qualifications but also to become independent learners, effective communicators, responsible users of digital technologies, collaborative problem-solvers and adaptable participants in rapidly changing educational and professional environments. These expectations have particular significance in Australia, where tertiary education reform is placing greater emphasis on participation, pathways between vocational education and training (VET) and higher education, and alignment between education and future workforce requirements. Simultaneously, digitalisation and generative artificial intelligence (AI) are changing how students learn and how professional work is performed. This conceptual and practice-based article examines student readiness as a multidimensional capacity that extends beyond academic achievement or qualification completion. Drawing on contemporary Australian policy, national education and workforce evidence, and relevant academic literature, the article argues that academic readiness, university transition and employment readiness should be understood as connected developmental objectives. It proposes an Integrated Student Readiness Framework (ISRF) comprising six interrelated dimensions: academic foundations; learner agency and independence; communication and collaboration; digital and AI capability; industry and workplace connection; and reflective adaptability. The framework positions readiness as a developmental process that can be embedded within curriculum, teaching, assessment, student support and industry-connected learning rather than treated as an additional activity near graduation. Implications for educators, educational leaders and institutions are considered, together with priorities for future empirical validation of the framework in Australian tertiary education.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; employability; student pathways; tertiary education; university transition; vocational education and training.

I. Introduction

Educational success is frequently represented through visible outcomes: completing a course, obtaining a qualification, gaining university admission or securing employment. These outcomes are important, but they do not fully explain whether students are prepared for what comes next. A student may satisfy the academic requirements for university admission while remaining uncertain about independent learning, academic communication, research or management of competing responsibilities. Similarly, a graduate may possess relevant knowledge while initially finding it difficult to apply that knowledge in an unfamiliar workplace.

The distinction is between educational attainment and transition readiness. This distinction has become increasingly relevant within Australia. The Australian Universities Accord Final Report presents a long-term reform agenda for higher education designed to respond to Australia's future social and skills requirements (Australian Government Department of Education, 2024). The Accord also draws attention to the need for stronger connections across tertiary education. Rather than regarding vocational education and training (VET) and higher education as entirely separate destinations, Australian policy increasingly recognises the importance of pathways that allow learners to move between different forms of tertiary education.

This direction reflects a broader transformation in how people learn and work. Educational pathways are becoming less linear. Students may move from school into VET, from pathway education into university, from employment back into education, or between vocational and higher education at



different stages of their lives. Some students combine work and study, while others enter tertiary education after substantial professional or personal experience.

At the same time, the workplace is changing. Digital technologies, automation and generative artificial intelligence (AI) are altering tasks within occupations and influencing expectations regarding digital literacy, critical thinking, adaptability and communication. Jobs and Skills Australia (2025a) reports that generative AI is more likely to augment many forms of work than simply replace them, reinforcing the need for both technological capability and complementary human skills.

These developments raise a fundamental educational question: What does it mean for a student to be genuinely ready for the next stage of education and work?

Readiness is often addressed through separate educational conversations. Academic preparedness may be associated with literacy, disciplinary knowledge and study skills. University transition may emphasise independence, belonging and adjustment. Employability may focus on communication, teamwork and problem-solving. Digital education may concentrate on technological capability, while career development focuses on pathways and employment.

Each perspective is valuable. However, students do not experience these capabilities as isolated categories. Consider a student completing an authentic project. The task may require disciplinary knowledge, research, critical evaluation of information, time management, collaboration, communication, digital tools and decision-making. If the student subsequently reflects on feedback, the same activity can also develop self-awareness and adaptability. Similarly, an industry workshop can strengthen students' understanding of professional practice while helping them connect classroom concepts with workplace expectations.

This article therefore conceptualises student readiness as an integrated capacity to transfer learning across changing educational and professional contexts.

The article addresses the following guiding question: How can Australian education providers strengthen students' readiness to transition successfully between structured education, university learning and contemporary employment?

Three objectives guide the discussion. First, the article examines the changing meaning of student readiness within Australia's tertiary education and workforce environment. Second, it considers how teaching, assessment, student support, digital capability and industry engagement can contribute to successful transitions. Third, it proposes an Integrated Student Readiness Framework (ISRF) that brings these dimensions together within a practice-oriented model. The central argument is that readiness should not be treated as a short intervention delivered immediately before students graduate. Instead, readiness should be progressively developed throughout the educational experience.

II. Student Readiness in a Changing Australian Tertiary System

A. From separate sectors towards connected pathways

Australian tertiary education has historically maintained clear distinctions between VET and higher education. These sectors continue to have different regulatory arrangements, institutional structures and educational purposes. Nevertheless, the movement of students between them is increasingly important.

The Australian Universities Accord provides a significant policy context for this development. The final report contains 47 recommendations and presents a long-term reform agenda intended to help higher education meet Australia's future skills needs (Australian Government Department of Education, 2024). It also identifies the importance of reducing barriers between VET and higher education and creating a more connected tertiary system.

This policy direction has significant implications for student readiness. If learners increasingly move between sectors, educational preparation cannot be understood solely in relation to the requirements of the program in which they are currently enrolled. Providers must also consider the capabilities students will need in their subsequent environments.



A learner moving from a structured pathway program to university may encounter greater independence, different assessment conventions and increased expectations regarding research. A VET graduate entering higher education may bring substantial applied capability but need to adjust to different forms of academic inquiry. Conversely, a university student entering employment may possess strong theoretical knowledge while requiring greater exposure to organisational constraints, workplace communication and practical decision-making.

Successful transition therefore requires more than possession of prior knowledge. It requires the ability to transfer and adapt that knowledge when conditions change. This article describes this capability as transfer-oriented readiness: a student's developing capacity to mobilise knowledge, skills, behaviours and judgement appropriately across different educational and professional contexts.

B. The significance of vocational education and training

VET occupies an important position within Australia's education-to-employment landscape because of its explicit relationship with occupational capability and industry requirements.

The introduction of the 2025 Standards for Registered Training Organisations represented a significant regulatory development. The Standards became effective on 1 July 2025 and place stronger emphasis on quality outcomes for students, industry, employers and the broader community (Australian Skills Quality Authority [ASQA], 2025a).

Of particular relevance to student readiness is the expectation that training should be engaging, appropriately structured and paced, and provide sufficient opportunities for instruction, practice, feedback and assessment (ASQA, 2025b). Students are unlikely to develop transferable capability when they encounter knowledge briefly and immediately proceed to assessment. Meaningful learning requires opportunities to practise, receive feedback, reconsider performance and apply knowledge under different conditions.

The Standards also strengthen the relationship between training and contemporary industry practice. RTOs are expected to engage meaningfully with relevant industry, employers and community representatives and use resulting advice to inform training and assessment (ASQA, 2025b). This moves industry engagement beyond procedural exercise. Its educational value lies in ensuring that learning reflects how skills and knowledge are being used and changed within workplaces.

The scale of VET further demonstrates its significance. NCVER's VET Student Outcomes 2025 drew on responses from 276,304 students who undertook nationally recognised VET during 2024 (National Centre for Vocational Education Research [NCVER], 2025). The diversity of these learners and their destinations reinforce the importance of understanding VET not simply as a destination but as part of a wider system of employment, further education and lifelong learning.

III. University Readiness: More Than Admission

University readiness is often implicitly associated with admission requirements and previous academic achievement. These indicators serve legitimate purposes, but admission and readiness are not equivalent.

Entering university can involve a substantial shift in expectations. Students may need to interpret complex assessment instructions, undertake independent research, evaluate competing sources, manage multiple deadlines and communicate through unfamiliar academic conventions. They may also be expected to participate in collaborative learning while taking greater responsibility for identifying when and where they need support.

For students transitioning from more structured learning environments, these changes can be substantial. This suggests that preparatory and pathway education can perform a broader function than simply satisfying entry requirements. Such programs can provide a transitional learning environment in which students encounter the expectations of tertiary study while still receiving structured educational support.



A particularly useful concept is progressive independence. Progressive independence recognises that learner autonomy does not emerge simply because educators withdraw support. Students initially benefit from clear instructions, modelling, examples, structured activities and accessible feedback. As capability develops, however, responsibility can gradually shift towards the learner.

For example, early research activity may provide recommended sources and a structured template. A later activity may require students to identify their own sources and determine how best to organise an argument. Initial presentations may provide detailed guidance about structure, while subsequent presentations may require learners to determine how to communicate effectively for a particular audience. This process develops independence through practice.

Importantly, independence should not be confusing with isolation. Effective independent learners recognise when they require assistance and know how to seek it. Help-seeking, feedback use and self-monitoring are therefore components of independence rather than evidence that independence has failed.

University readiness can consequently be understood not simply as what students know before entering university, but as the extent to which they have developed the capability to continue learning effectively once they are there.

IV. Employment Readiness and the Transfer of Learning

The transition from education into employment presents a related challenge. Employers require graduates to use knowledge in environments where problems may be less structured than educational tasks. A workplace problem may contain incomplete information, conflicting stakeholder expectations, financial constraints, time pressures and organisational policies. There may be several defensible solutions rather than one predetermined answer.

Employment readiness therefore involves the capacity to transfer knowledge into situations characterised by uncertainty and context. This does not mean that educational institutions should attempt to reproduce every possible workplace. Such an objective would be unrealistic. Industries differ, organisations change and graduates may move between occupations throughout their careers. A more sustainable objective is to develop capabilities that support adaptation.

Communication illustrates this relationship. In education, students communicate through discussions, presentations, written assessments and collaborative activities. In employment, audiences change to colleagues, supervisors, clients and external stakeholders. The underlying capacity to understand purpose and audience, communicate clearly, listen and respond remains transferable.

Critical thinking operates similarly. Academic learning may require students to compare sources, evaluate evidence and justify conclusions. In employment, individuals may need to evaluate operational information, consider competing recommendations or assess risks before making decisions. Problem-solving, teamwork, digital capability and self-management also cross educational and professional boundaries.

For this reason, university readiness and employment should not be treated as unrelated objectives. Many capabilities developed for successful tertiary learning can become foundations for effective professional practice.

V. Industry Engagement and Authentic Learning

If learning is expected to transfer beyond education, students require opportunities to encounter situations that approximate the complexity of professional practice. Authentic learning provides one mechanism for achieving this. Authentic activities can include realistic projects, simulations, case studies, presentations, meetings, problem-solving exercises and industry-informed scenarios.

Authenticity does not require a classroom to become an exact replica of a workplace. Instead, it involves designing tasks that require learners to use knowledge meaningfully rather than simply reproduce it.



For example, a risk-management activity can move beyond asking students to define risk terminology. Learners could instead receive a scenario containing operational, financial and stakeholder risks, determine priorities and justify proposed treatments. A project-management activity can introduce changing deadlines or resource constraints. A communication task can require students to adjust messages for different audiences. A sustainability activity can ask learners to balance environmental, operational and financial considerations. Such activities provide opportunities for judgement.

Industry engagement strengthens this approach when it is integrated meaningfully into learning. The 2025 RTO Standards explicitly require industry engagement to inform training and assessment and ensure that training reflects current practice (ASQA, 2025b).

This distinction is important because industry engagement can otherwise become symbolic. A guest speaker may provide an interesting experience, but educational value increases when students prepare questions, connect the presentation with curriculum concepts, analyse what they heard and apply relevant ideas afterwards. Similarly, a site visit becomes more meaningful when learners understand what they are observing and subsequently evaluate how professional practices relate to their studies.

Industry engagement should therefore be treated not merely as an event but as a learning relationship between curriculum and professional practice.

VI. Digital Transformation, Artificial Intelligence and Readiness

Digital capability has become central to both education and employment. The rapid development of generative AI has intensified this requirement. Students now have access to technologies capable of producing text, summarising information, generating ideas, analysing data and supporting many other tasks.

The question of education is therefore no longer simply whether students will encounter AI. The more important question is whether they will develop the judgement necessary to use emerging technologies effectively and responsibly.

Jobs and Skills Australia (2025a, 2025b) indicate that generative AI is more likely to augment many occupations than replace them entirely. The resulting transition increases demand for digital and AI capability while preserving the importance of complementary human capabilities such as communication, adaptability and critical thinking.

Digital readiness should not be reduced to operational knowledge of particular software. Specific technologies will change. Students require a more durable capability that can be described as digital judgement.

Digital judgement includes the capacity to select appropriate technologies for particular purposes; evaluate the reliability of digital information; recognise limitations, errors and potential bias; protect privacy and confidential information; understand academic and professional expectations; acknowledge AI use appropriately where required; recognise when human expertise or verification is necessary; and learn unfamiliar technologies as they emerge.

An entirely prohibitive approach may leave students underprepared for workplaces where AI-assisted technologies are increasingly used. Conversely, unrestricted use without educational guidance can undermine learning and create risks involving accuracy, privacy, academic integrity and over-reliance. The educational objective should therefore be responsible and critically informed use.

VII. Why Readiness Becomes Fragmented

Most educational institutions already address many components of student readiness. Academic-support services assist with study skills. Teachers develop disciplinary knowledge. Career services help students prepare for employment. Industry teams coordinate engagement with employers. Digital-learning teams support technology. Student-support services assist with adjustment and other barriers.



The challenge is often not absence. It is fragmentation. When these activities operate independently, students may struggle to understand their relationship. Academic skills may be perceived merely as techniques for completing assessments. Employability may appear to be something considered shortly before graduation. Digital capability may be interpreted as software competence. Industry engagement may be experienced as an occasional event disconnected from assessment and learning.

An integrated approach asks a different question: How can ordinary educational experiences develop disciplinary knowledge while simultaneously strengthening capabilities students will need in their next environment?

A collaborative project can develop subject knowledge while requiring communication, planning and negotiation. An industry-informed scenario can combine research, problem-solving and professional judgement. A presentation can strengthen conceptual understanding while developing confidence and audience awareness. Structured reflection can help students identify what they learned and how they would approach future situations differently.

The objective is therefore not continuously adding additional curriculum content. It is designing existing learning more intentionally around transfer.

VIII. The Integrated Student Readiness Framework

Drawing together these considerations, this article proposes the Integrated Student Readiness Framework (ISRF). The framework comprises six interconnected dimensions: Academic Foundations; Learner Agency and Independence; Communication and Collaboration; Digital and AI Capability; Industry and Workplace Connection; and Reflective Adaptability.

The framework does not claim that these six capabilities are individually new. Each has an established relationship with educational practice. The proposed contribution lies in bringing them together as a single developmental architecture connecting education, university and employment.

A. Academic Foundations

Academic foundations include disciplinary knowledge, literacy, numeracy, information evaluation and evidence-based communication. These capabilities remain fundamental even as technology changes educational practice. Indeed, widespread access to AI-generated information may make disciplinary understanding and information evaluation more important.

Students need enough knowledge to recognise when information is questionable. They need to distinguish evidence from assertion, evaluate sources and construct reasoned conclusions. Academic foundations should therefore move beyond procedural compliance. The objective is not simply teaching students how to format an assignment or satisfy assessment requirements. It is developing the intellectual capability to interpret, question, connect and communicate knowledge.

B. Learner Agency and Independence

The second dimension concerns students' increasing capacity to take purposeful responsibility for learning. Agency includes planning, self-management, decision-making, persistence, help-seeking and productive engagement with feedback.

Students develop independence when they are given genuine opportunities to make decisions. If every learning decision is predetermined, students may complete tasks successfully without developing substantial self-direction. Conversely, removing support prematurely can create unnecessary barriers.

The educational challenge is therefore to provide graduated responsibility. Early learning can include modelling and structured guidance. Later activities can require students to select approaches, locate resources, organise work and justify decisions. The goal is not independence from educators. It is increasing independence as a learner.



C. Communication and Collaboration

Education, university and employment all require individuals to interact with others. Communication involves more than written accuracy. It includes listening, questioning, explaining, presenting, negotiating and adapting messages according to purpose and audience.

Collaboration similarly extends beyond dividing a group assignment into individual components. Meaningful collaboration requires shared responsibility, negotiation, responsiveness to different perspectives and management of disagreement. Students require opportunities to experience these processes rather than simply read about them.

Group projects, meetings, presentations, peer discussions and collaborative problem-solving can create such opportunities when carefully structured. Communication and collaboration therefore function as both educational processes and transition capabilities.

D. Digital and AI Capability

The fourth dimension concerns the confident, critical and responsible use of digital technologies. Jobs and Skills Australia (2025b) argues that foundational digital and AI capability is becoming important for participation in work, study and society. Both higher education and VET graduates are likely to work in occupations exposed to generative AI, although the extent of exposure varies.

Educational preparation must consequently go beyond teaching individual applications. Students should develop transferable digital learning capability: the confidence to encounter unfamiliar technologies, determine their usefulness, evaluate outputs and understand associated responsibilities. A student who can generate content with an AI system but cannot evaluate its accuracy is not fully digitally ready. Neither is a student who accepts recommendations without understanding limitations or who unknowingly shares confidential information. Digital readiness therefore requires technological capability combined with critical judgement and ethical responsibility.

E. Industry and Workplace Connection

The fifth dimension connects educational learning with professional environments. Industry connection can occur through placements, but placements are only one mechanism. Other possibilities include industry guest speakers, site visits, professional workshops, workplace simulations, practitioner-developed case studies, employer consultation and authentic projects.

What matters is not simply whether industry appears within a program. What matters is whether students learn from the connection.

Industry activities should therefore be deliberately integrated with curriculum. Students might prepare before meeting an industry practitioner, identify connections between professional practice and theoretical concepts, and subsequently reflect on how the experience changed their understanding. This converts exposure into learning.

F. Reflective Adaptability

The final dimension concerns the capacity to learn from experience and adjust future behaviour. Education cannot prepare students for every situation they will encounter. Workplaces will change. Technologies will develop. Students may change careers. Professional expectations will evolve. Consequently, one of the most durable forms of readiness is the capacity to continue learning.

Reflection supports this process. Students can consider what occurred, why they selected a particular approach, what worked, what did not work, what feedback revealed and what they would change next time.

Reflection becomes particularly valuable when it moves beyond description. Rather than asking only what happened, educators can encourage students to consider why it happened, what assumptions influenced their response, what evidence they used, what alternative approach was



available and what they will do differently. Reflective adaptability therefore acts as a connecting mechanism across the entire framework.

IX. How the Six Dimensions Work Together

The ISRF should not be interpreted as six additional subjects. Its purpose is integration. Consider a multidisciplinary project in which students investigate a real or realistic organisational problem. Students may need to locate and evaluate information, activating academic foundations. They must determine how to organise their work, demonstrating learner agency. They may need to divide responsibilities, negotiate differences and present recommendations, developing communication and collaboration. Research and project development may require appropriate use of digital and AI technologies, involving digital capability. The project can incorporate actual organisational expectations or practitioner input, providing industry connection. Finally, students can evaluate their performance and identify improvements, developing reflective adaptability.

One well-designed activity can therefore contribute to all six dimensions. This is a central feature of the framework because it avoids treating readiness as an additional burden on already crowded curricula. The framework instead encourages educators to ask how existing curriculum activities might generate greater developmental value.

X. Application Across Multiple Faculties

A further strength of the ISRF is its potential applicability across disciplines. A business student, engineering student, hospitality student, information technology learner and university-pathway student require different disciplinary knowledge and different forms of professional preparation. The framework does not suggest otherwise.

Instead, it provides a common readiness architecture that can be contextualised by individual disciplines. For example, communication within hospitality may emphasise customer interaction, team coordination and service recovery. Engineering communication may involve technical explanation, stakeholder consultation and project documentation. Business programs may emphasise meetings, reports, presentations and negotiation. The communication dimension remains relevant while its expression changes.

Industry connections similarly varies. Hospitality learners may benefit from simulated service environments and workplace exposure. Engineering students may engage with projects, site examples and industry practitioners. Business learners may analyse organisational scenarios or participate in industry-led workshops. Digital capability also differs by discipline, but the underlying principles of critical and responsible technology use remain transferable.

This flexibility is particularly important for educational leaders responsible for multiple programs or faculties. A shared institutional framework does not require identical teaching. It creates a common language around the question: What capabilities should students progressively develop, regardless of the discipline through which they are learning?

XI. Assessment and Student Readiness

Assessment strongly influences what students perceive as important. If assessment consistently rewards reproduction of information, students may reasonably concentrate on memorising and reproducing content. If assessment requires application, interpretation and judgement, students receive a different message about what learning means.

Authentic assessment can therefore contribute significantly to readiness. This does not mean every assessment must imitate a workplace. Academic inquiry has purposes that extend beyond immediate occupational application. However, across a program, students should encounter opportunities to apply knowledge rather than exclusively describe it.



Assessment scenarios can incorporate uncertainty. Presentations can require adaptation to a specified audience. Projects can include resource constraints. Collaborative tasks can require shared decision-making. Reflective components can ask students to analyse their learning process.

Feedback is equally important. ASQA's current training guidance emphasises sufficient time for practice and application of feedback before assessment (ASQA, 2025b). Feedback has greatest developmental value when students can do something with it. If feedback is received only after the final task in a course, it may explain performance without influencing subsequent learning. When students receive feedback during development and have opportunities to apply it, feedback becomes part of capability formation.

Assessment for readiness therefore involves not only measuring what students can currently do but also creating conditions in which they can improve.

XII. Student Support and Inclusive Readiness

Readiness should not become a mechanism for labelling students as either prepared or deficient. Students enter education with different experiences, strengths and needs.

Some may already have substantial professional experience but limited familiarity with academic conventions. Others may be academically capable but unfamiliar with workplace expectations. International students may be adapting simultaneously to new educational, linguistic, social and cultural environments. Mature learners may return to education after many years away from formal study.

An integrated readiness approach must therefore be developmental rather than deficit based. The question should not simply be: Is this student ready? A more constructive question is: What is this student's current level of capability, what will the next environment require, and what educational experiences can help bridge the difference?

Student support consequently forms part of readiness rather than sitting outside it. Support can include orientation, academic assistance, language and literacy development, mentoring, feedback, digital guidance and referral to specialised services. The objective is not to remove meaningful academic expectations. It is to create conditions in which students can progressively develop the capability required to meet them.

XIII. Implications for Educational Leadership

Student readiness cannot be achieved solely through the efforts of individual teachers. Educational leaders influence curriculum priorities, staff development, assessment practices, student-support structures, industry relationships and institutional responses to emerging technologies.

The 2025 RTO Standards reinforce the organisational nature of educational quality through their emphasis on training and assessment, student support, workforce capability, governance and continuous improvement (ASQA, 2025a). A whole-of-institution approach to readiness can reduce fragmentation.

Academic teams, student-support services, industry-engagement functions and educational leaders can retain their specialist responsibilities while working towards shared developmental outcomes.

Technology provides a particularly important example. Institutions require coherent approaches to AI that protect academic integrity while acknowledging that AI is becoming increasingly relevant to professional work. Educators themselves require continuing development. Expectations placed on students cannot remain credible if staff have limited understanding of the technologies students are being asked to use critically.

Industry engagement also requires leadership. Meaningful partnerships take time to develop and maintain. Employers and practitioners can provide valuable insight into changing technologies, practices and capability requirements. Educational leaders must then ensure that industry input informs



learning appropriately without allowing short-term workplace trends to replace broader educational objectives.

The leadership task is therefore to balance three priorities: academic integrity, student development and external relevance.

XIV. Discussion

The Integrated Student Readiness Framework advances four central propositions. First, readiness is developmental. Students do not suddenly become ready for university or employment at the end of a course. Independence, communication, digital judgement and adaptability develop through repeated opportunities for practice. Second, readiness is integrated. Academic capability, university transition and employability should not be treated as unrelated objectives. Many of the capabilities supporting success at university also contribute to professional effectiveness. Third, readiness is contextual. The way a capability is expressed differs between disciplines and environments. Communication in hospitality differs from communication in engineering, but both require audience awareness and appropriate professional judgement. Fourth, readiness is transfer oriented. The ultimate educational challenge is not simply whether students can perform a familiar task. It is whether they can draw upon what they have learned when the situation changes. These propositions distinguish the ISRF from a simple checklist of employability skills. The framework focuses on the relationship between capabilities and transitions.

It also recognises an important limitation of educational preparation: institutions cannot predict every situation graduates will encounter. Labour markets change. Technologies develop. Organisations restructured. Students move between occupations and continue learning throughout their careers. The realistic goal is therefore not perfect preparation for a predetermined future. It is greater capacity to navigate an uncertain future.

XV. Contribution to Educational Practice

The principal contribution of the ISRF is its integration of educational, transitional and employment-oriented capability within a single framework.

For educators, the framework provides a practical lens for reviewing learning activities. An educator might ask whether an activity requires students to apply knowledge, creates meaningful learner responsibility, requires communication or collaboration, develops critical digital capability, connects learning with external or professional practice, and creates an opportunity for reflection and improvement.

Not every activity needs to address every dimension. Across a program, however, students should experience repeated opportunities to develop all six.

For educational leaders, the framework can support curriculum mapping. Programs could identify where each readiness dimension is introduced, practised and demonstrated. This may reveal that some capabilities receive extensive attention while others depend on isolated activities.

For institutions, the framework provides a possible common language across faculties. This can help connect teaching, student support, industry engagement and digital strategy without requiring every discipline to adopt identical curriculum.

XVI. Limitations

The proposed framework has important limitations. First, the ISRF is conceptual and practice-informed. It has not yet been empirically validated. The article therefore does not claim that the six dimensions have been statistically demonstrated to predict university success or employment outcomes.

Second, the framework is deliberately broad. This supports multidisciplinary application but means that individual disciplines will require contextual interpretation.



Third, readiness is influenced by factors beyond educational practice. Labour-market conditions, socioeconomic circumstances, prior educational opportunities, personal circumstances and institutional structures can all affect transition outcomes. The framework should consequently not be interpreted as suggesting that student outcomes are determined entirely by individual capability.

Finally, the rapid development of AI means that the digital dimension will require continuing revision. Current assumptions about AI capability may become outdated as technologies and professional practices evolve.

XVII. Directions for Future Research

The ISRF provides several opportunities for empirical research. An initial study could investigate student and educator perceptions of the six dimensions across Australian pathway, VET and higher education programs. A survey instrument could subsequently be developed to examine whether the dimensions can be measured reliably.

Qualitative interviews or focus groups could explore how students experience transitions and which educational activities they perceive as most influential. Employer perspectives would provide another important dimension. Employers could be asked how they understand graduate readiness and whether the capabilities represented within the framework align with expectations of early-career employees.

University staff could similarly examine whether pathway students demonstrating stronger capability across the framework experience smoother transitions into higher education. Longitudinal research would be particularly valuable.

Students could be followed from preparatory or vocational education into university and subsequently employment. Such research could examine which capabilities remain stable, which develop further and which become particularly important during specific transitions.

Future research should also investigate disciplinary variation. The relative importance and expression of each dimension may differ across business, engineering, hospitality, information technology and other areas.

Finally, AI warrants continuing investigation. Researchers should examine not merely whether students use AI but whether they develop the judgement required to use it responsibly and effectively across educational and professional contexts.

XVIII. Conclusion

The relationship between education, university and employment is becoming increasingly interconnected. Australian tertiary reform is placing greater emphasis on participation, pathways and relationships between VET, higher education and future workforce requirements. At the same time, digital technologies and generative AI are changing both learning and professional work.

Within this environment, student readiness cannot be reduced to qualification completion. Students need academic foundations, but they also need the capacity to become increasingly independent learners. They need digital capability, but also the judgement to evaluate technologies critically and use them responsibly. They benefit from industry exposure, but its educational value depends upon meaningful integration with learning. They require communication and collaboration capabilities that can transfer across educational and professional environments. They also need the ability to reflect on experience and adapt when circumstances change.

This article has proposed the Integrated Student Readiness Framework (ISRF) as a way of bringing these requirements together. The framework comprises six interconnected dimensions: academic foundations; learner agency and independence; communication and collaboration; digital and AI capability; industry and workplace connection; and reflective adaptability.

Its contribution lies not in claiming that these individual capabilities are new, but in positioning them together as a developmental architecture connecting education, university and employment.



For educators, the framework encourages learning experiences that connect knowledge with application. For educational leaders, it provides a structure for considering whether curriculum, assessment, student support, technology and industry engagement collectively prepare students for their next environment. For institutions operating across multiple faculties, it provides a common readiness framework that can be adapted to different disciplines without requiring uniform teaching. For researchers, it offers a conceptual model that can now be empirically tested, challenged and refined.

Education cannot anticipate every university experience, technological development, occupation or professional challenge that students will encounter. Nor should it attempt to. A more sustainable educational objective is to develop students who possess the knowledge, agency and judgement to learn, communicate, collaborate, evaluate, apply, reflect and adapt when their circumstances change.

In this sense, student readiness is not simply preparation for the next destination. It is preparation for the capacity to continue developing across destinations.

References

- Australian Government Department of Education. (2024). Australian Universities Accord final report. Australian Government.
- Australian Skills Quality Authority. (2025a). 2025 Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs). Australian Government.
- Australian Skills Quality Authority. (2025b). Practice guide: Training. Australian Government.
- Jobs and Skills Australia. (2025a). Connecting for impact: Jobs and Skills Report 2025. Australian Government.
- Jobs and Skills Australia. (2025b). Our Gen AI transition: Implications for work and skills. Australian Government.
- National Centre for Vocational Education Research. (2025). VET student outcomes 2025. NCVER.