LESSON ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE GROUND

| 40 | nal | Asso | |
|-------|-----|---------|---|
| See / | ~ | M. | ö |
| ا) ۴ | PA | CI) | |
| ر الم | | Ų, | é |
| oin | 9 | Instruc | |

| Name of Candidate: | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| Skill being assessed: | | | | |
| Assessment Date: | | | | |
| Place of Assessment: | | | | |
| Industry context of lesson | [] Outdoor rec | [] Public safe | ety [] Industrial roping | |
| Stated Lesson Time Frame | | Ad | tual time frame: | |
| Start Time: | | | | |
| Finish Time: | | | | |

Note to assessor:

The intent is to assess the performance of the candidate, and to confirm if competency has been achieved. Your assessment decision is to be based against explicit and measurable criteria and not against your personal preference of how the skill ought to be presented. You should not interrupt candidates during their presentation (unless imminent danger). Candidates must be advised of their assessment result at the end.

Conditions existing at start of lesson: (agreed between candidate and assessor) - these conditions will vary according to the skill being assessed

- [] existing anchor system already setup and ready for use?
- [] existing ropes pre-deployed (horizontally)?
- [] belaying in progress a person is climbing a route while being belayed (this would be a horizontal simulation)
- [] abseiling in progress a person is abseiling (horizontally) using either a self-belay or via top-managed belay controlled by a third party?
- [] other: (specify)...
- Introduction phase of lesson...

| | KEY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA | ASSESSOR REMARKS | C / NYC |
|---|---|---|---------|
| 1 | Skill is identified | ASSESSOR REWARKS | C) IVIC |
| | | | |
| 2 | Reason for learning is given: | | |
| | [] Stated reason(s) motivates students to be attentive | | |
| | and receptive to learning | | |
| | [] Stated reason(s) is realistic for the industry context | | |
| 3 | Explanation: | | |
| | [] An explanation of how the skill will be | | |
| | learned/conducted is given | | |
| | •class break-up (into pairs or individual performance?) | | |
| | •sequence of exercises? | | |
| | •role of assistant (if assigned for lesson)? | | |
| | [] Information that is <u>crucial</u> to minimisation of risk (ie | | |
| | special safety rules unique to the skill) and promotes | | |
| | successful performance is briefly reviewed with trainees | | |
| 4 | Demonstration: | Assessor score of demonstration (1-5 scale) | |
| | | | |
| | [] skill is slowly and deliberately performed | [] 1 = No level of competency can be inferred | |
| | (a degree of precision is required when demonstrating) | Competence could not be inferred because the candidate | |
| | [] attention is drawn to details that make performing | was unable to complete the skill and/or the performance was poor/unacceptable. | |
| | the skill easier (specific details are clearly brought to the attention of learners) | was poor/unacceptuble. | |
| | [] demonstration indicates correct procedure to safely | [] 2 = NYC | |
| | accomplish skill | Although the skill was eventually completed, significant | |
| | ("safely" is defined as a level of risk that is <u>not significant</u>) | errors and/or problems occurred. Repeated attempts | |
| | [] equipment is operated correctly and used within its | may have been required. | |
| | intended design limitations | III.2. Comment of a management | |
| | [] instructional assistant is effectively used in the | [] 3 = Competent performance Successfully completed the skill with no significant | |
| | demonstration process (if assigned)* | problems observed. | |
| | [] ABCDE safety checks are carried out | | |
| | (even though there is no actual exposure to falls from | [] 4 = Exceeds requirements for competent | |
| | height in a 'ground' lesson – it is meant to be an accurate simulation of procedures used at height – and therefore | performance | |
| | all normal safety checks still apply) | The skill was performed with a high degree of control and | |
| | ан полнаг зајсту спсеко зап арртуј | fluidity but lacked the exemplary quality of a 5 | |
| | *the candidate may elect to employ an 'instructional assistant' | [] 5 = Exemplary performance at video | |
| | for the skill demonstration – if so; the assessor must be | presentation quality (not possible to detect any flaws) | |
| | informed prior to lesson commencement. | 1 4, (, | |

• Skills practice phase of lesson...

Note to assessor:

Secretly pre-assign a particular fault (ie error) that will occur during student practice. The candidate being assessed is not to know ahead of time what that error will be. The intent is to assess whether the candidate is observant and able to detect and correct faults. If a pre-assigned fault goes unnoticed, this implies that the candidate is not observant or is lacking awareness of procedures and techniques.

NOTE: The 'student' who is assigned to deliberately make a mistake must execute the error in the exact manner prescribed by the assessor—and not alert the 'instructor candidate' as to what that particular error is by body language or other subtle means. Doing so would be compromise the assessment process.

| | KEY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA | ASSESSOR REMARKS | C / NYC |
|----------|---|------------------|---------|
| 5 | Student practice session: | | |
| | [] sufficient time is allocated for student practice | | |
| | [] opportunities for student practice are provided | | |
| | (more than just once) | | |
| | [] the 'students' personal space is not invaded – they are | | |
| | given sufficient latitude (freedom) to develop and 'own' | | |
| | their skills without constant interruption and/or micro- | | |
| | management | | |
| | [] individual enabling skills are correctly executed and | | |
| | linked in an appropriate sequence which leads to an | | |
| | effective performance outcome Note: All skills are built from a series of smaller 'enabling skills' | | |
| | For example; building an anchor system requires: | | |
| | # knot tying skills | | |
| | # identification of suitable individual anchor points | | |
| | # selection and use of relevant PPE and equipment | | |
| | # concept of angles and basic Newtons laws of physics | | |
| | # fall prevention when working near an exposed edge (fall risk) | | |
| | [] APCDE cafety chacks are carried and | | |
| | [] ABCDE safety checks are carried out [] PACI protocols and industry standards are followed | | |
| | [] FACI protocols and industry standards are followed | | |
| 6 | Student faults are identified and corrected: | | |
| | [] detected and identified pre-assigned fault | | |
| | [] faults are allowed to progress – the instructor | | |
| | candidate did not prematurely 'pounce' on the student | | |
| | (Note : In ground training, there is no risk of falls from height. In | | |
| | many instances, it may be advantageous to allow mistakes to | | |
| | progress – because this is how people learn – mistakes can be thought of as opportunities to find solutions and build | | |
| | judgement) | | |
| | [] intervention to student faults/errors does not have an | | |
| | invasive or threatening character/tone | | |
| | | | |
| 7 | Objective assessment of performance: | | |
| | [] student performance is assessed to ensure their | | |
| | readiness to progress to training at height | | |
| | There must be no critical intervention by the instructor | | |
| | candidate to the extent that it interrupts and corrects the | | |
| | student's performance. The student must eventually be capable | | |
| | of performing the skill without prompting or assistance. The | | |
| | instructor candidate must decide if the student is in fact ready to | | |
| | take the next step and practice the skill at height – if not, practice continues until such time as the student is ready. | | |
| | procuce continues until such time as the stadent is ready. | | |
| 8 | Debrief student practice session: | | |
| | [] positive feedback is given | | |
| | [] suggestions for improvement are given | | |
| | (suggestions are realistic and if applied – would solve the | | |
| | problems that occurred and would lead to effective application | | |
| | of the skill) | | |
| | [] students are informed that practice session has ended [] questions are solicited ("any questions?") | | |
| | [] questions are solicited (ally questions:) | | |
| <u> </u> | | | l . |

• Control and conduct...

| | KEY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA | ASSESSOR REMARKS | C / NYC |
|----|--|------------------|---------|
| 9 | Site: | | |
| | [] chosen site is reasonably free of obvious hazards | | |
| | [] choice of site is appropriate for learning objectives to be achieved | | |
| | | | |
| | [] site does not expose students to risk of falls from height | | |
| | [] students are not placed in a situation where they are | | |
| | exposed to environmental extremes to the extent that | | |
| | learning effectiveness is compromised | | |
| | (direct burning sun, excessive heat, excessive cold, strong wind | | |
| | force, excessive humidity, no ventilation, excessive industrial | | |
| | noise, etc are all factors that would severely impact on student | | |
| | well-being) | | |
| 10 | Work Health and Safety: | | |
| | [] conduct of activities not in breach of WHS laws | | |
| | [] duty of care obligation is met | | |
| 11 | Interaction with class: | | |
| 11 | Interaction with class: [] responded effectively to questions when asked | | |
| | [] friendly social atmosphere maintained | | |
| | []e.a., social atmosphere manitames | | |
| 12 | Use of voice and gestures: | | |
| | [] effective use of voice | | |
| | [] use of voice and gestures clearly contributed to | | |
| | learning | | |
| 13 | PPE: | | |
| | [] equipment meets relevant manufacturing standards | | |
| | [] PPE is used within its intended design limits | | |
| 14 | Supervision: | | |
| | [] students are continuously monitored | | |
| | [] instructor candidate is alert and focussed on the | | |
| | learning process | | |
| | | | |

Automatic NYC criteria:

- 1. Inaccurate information that would lead to serious injuries of death
- 2. Demonstration (if given) was incorrect and would have created confusion and/or exposed students to undue levels of risk
- 3. Technical inaccuracies that are not insignificant
- 4. Content delivered did not fulfil learning objectives
- 5. Disorganised and/or chaotic lesson structure (if the lesson was presented in this manner to real clients it would result in confusion and/or anxiety)
- 6. Significant deviation from stated lesson time frame
- 7. Information presented would cause *considerable harm* to the reputation of the candidate or PACI.
- 8. Information presented is of a defamatory or discriminatory nature.
- 9. Equipment design limits would be exceeded triggering catastrophic system failure.
- 10. There was a near miss (could have led to a catastrophic outcome)
- 11. PACI instructor assessor was forced to intervene and stop the lesson.

| Qualitative impression of lesson delivery (mark an 'X' on the line to indicate impression) | | |
|--|---|--|
| Poor | Average | Outstanding |
| Assessor comments: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Assessor name: | | (print) |
| interfere with or subtly provide | clues to steer the candidate tow The presentation given was a fail | ition given by the candidate. I <u>did not</u> ard a successful presentation covering al r example of the candidate's current leve ol the conduct of training and |
| Assessor signature: | | Dated: |
| Candidate signature: | | Dated: |
| | | |