

PURPLE INFINITY

FEEDBACK SUMMARY

VERSION 4

UPDATE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD
EDUCATION RPL RESOURCES
[13 FEBRUARY 2023]

Background

In July 2022, purple infinity was contracted by the Australian Government Department of Employment and Workplace Relations to re-design and re-purpose an existing RPL Toolkit to support the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care.

The updated RPL resources include the following documents:

- Self-Evaluation Guide
- Assessor Guide
- Mapping Guide

The draft RPL resources were electronically distributed for review during November and December 2022. They were also reviewed internally by Departmental staff in January 2023. This document summarises the feedback received and actioned during the review period.

Contents

Review Summary.....	3
Review Respondents	4
General Comments	5
Industry Perception of RPL.....	6
Workforce Shortages	7
Digital Literacy Concerns.....	8
Compliance Concerns.....	9
Evidence Concerns	11
Self-Evaluation Guide	12
Unit Coverage Concerns.....	13
First Aid Concerns	14
Detailed Comments.....	15
Assessor Guide	26
Assessment Concerns.....	27
Detailed Comments.....	28
Mapping Guide.....	30
Mapping Concerns	31

Review Summary

Feedback was sought on the following RPL assessment resources during the review period (03 November to 30 January 2023):

RESOURCE TYPE	VERSION	WORKING TITLE	COMMENTS
Candidate Resources	1	How To Guide My Background Skill Area 1 – Children’s Health & Safety Skill Area 2 – Professional Practice Skill Area 3 – Relationships with Children Skill Area 4 – Families & Communities	The self-paced and self-directed candidate resources were initially designed as separate documents to reduce the time commitment required of candidates to undertake a self-evaluation against a full qualification (namely the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care). However, review respondents clearly favoured the development of a single candidate resource.
	2	Candidate Guide	This version of the candidate resource required the consolidation of six separate documents into a single document.
	3	Self-Evaluation Guide	This version required a title change to clarify its purpose. It was also extensively amended during the review period.
	4	Self-Evaluation Guide	This version was extensively amended during the review period.
	5	Self-Evaluation Guide [current]	This version required changes arising from Departmental requests.
Assessor Resources	1	Assessor Guide	Designed for use within a model of RTO self-assurance, the assessor guide received significant feedback during the review period.
	2	Assessor Guide	This version was extensively amended during the review period.
	3	Assessor Guide	This version was extensively amended during the review period.
	4	Assessor Guide [current]	This version required changes arising from Departmental requests.
	1	Mapping Guide	The mapping guide was not distributed during the review period.
	2	Mapping Guide [current]	This version required changes arising from Departmental requests.

Review Respondents

The following stakeholders provided extensive feedback on the RPL assessment resources.

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	This respondent was a member of the (now-defunct) Children's Education and Care Industry Reference Committee*
RTO Compliance Expert	This respondent was a member of the (now-defunct) Children's Education and Care Industry Reference Committee*
VET Regulation Experts	These respondents are current employees of the Australian Skills Quality Authority
VET Policy Experts	These respondents are current employees of the Australian Government Department of Employment and Workplace Relations

*The Children's Education and Care Industry Reference Committee ceased operations at the end of 2022

General Comments

Industry Perception of RPL

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	The children's education and care sector does not support the provision of RPL against full qualifications.	NO	RPL is an assessment process that can be used to determine the extent to which a candidate meets the requirements specified in an AQF qualification. This is specified in the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015. The candidate-led resources are designed to identify areas where candidates may need to gather further evidence, or undertake 'gap training', to meet the full requirements of the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care.
Children's Education and Care Expert	The children's education and care sector does not support the provision of RPL to people who are new to the sector. <i>'I believe this [RPL assessment] could only be completed for someone who is already working in the sector.'</i>	NO	Learners should be able to access RPL where they have shown relevant, transferable and current pre-existing skills, knowledge, and experience. This is specified in the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015.
Children's Education and Care Expert	RPL should only be available to those upgrading from the superseded CHC30712 Certificate III in Children's Services to the recently reviewed CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care. <i>'I am assuming this is a resource for people who may have the old Certificate III (prior to the CHC30113).'</i>	NO	Learners should be able to access RPL where they have shown relevant, transferable and current pre-existing skills, knowledge, and experience. This is specified in the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015. A learner's access to RPL should not be dependent on their holding a superseded version of the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care (e.g. the CHC30712 Certificate III in Children's Services).

Workforce Shortages

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	<p>Primary school teachers looking to work in the children's education and care sector may have relevant educational knowledge (e.g. child development theory), but they will not necessarily understand the regulatory environment that surrounds working with young children.</p> <p>Primary school teachers would therefore be better suited to a training course, rather than RPL, to attain the revised CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care.</p>	NO	<p>According to a 2019 ACECQA report, the demand for qualified early childhood educators and teachers will outweigh supply within the next five years.¹</p> <p>Primary school teachers are a viable labour source for the children's education and care sector, especially given the chronic workforce shortages currently impacting the sector. By refusing to embrace RPL, RTOs are creating an unnecessary barrier to this cohort.</p> <p>The sector should be encouraging suitably experienced people from other industry areas to seek recognition against the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care, and the recognition process should be engaging (and not unnecessarily difficult).</p> <p>Primary school teachers that undertake an RPL assessment may potentially discover that they have skill gaps, and that they need to undertake 'gap training' in one or more units of competency.</p> <p>Learners should be able to access RPL where they have shown relevant, transferable and current pre-existing skills, knowledge, and experience. This is specified in the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015.</p>
Children's Education and Care Expert	<p>The sector acknowledges that many of the revised units in the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care contain too much Knowledge Evidence (theory) for AQF level 3.</p> <p>However, this is a necessary requirement for the sector.</p>	-	<p>This is poor curriculum design on the part of the Children's Education and Care Industry Reference Committee (IRC), especially given the chronic workforce shortages currently impacting the children's education and care sector in Australia.</p> <p>The IRC's decision to identify a full Certificate III qualification – either the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care or the CHC30113 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care – as a mandatory entry requirement to the recently reviewed CHC50121 Diploma of Early Childhood Education and Care is another example of poor curriculum design.</p>

¹ ACECQA, *Progressing a national approach to the children's education and care workforce* (Workforce Report, November 2019), p7

Digital Literacy Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Access to the RPL resources via an online portal would be appealing to the sector. However, digital literacy is low among candidates at AQF level 3, and many would struggle to upload evidence.	-	A reasonable level of digital literacy will be required by candidates to use the RPL resources in an online setting. Low digital literacy may be a barrier to their uptake. If digital literacy is low within the sector, a better use of funding may involve the development of an online community of practice. <u>Low digital literacy – how extensive is it?</u> Further research is required to determine if low digital literacy applies to the key target group for the updated RPL resources (i.e. school teachers and graduate teachers). Just because some entrants to the sector have low digital literacy, it doesn't necessarily follow that all entrants (including school teachers) will have low digital literacy.
Children's Education and Care Expert	The sector would welcome the development of an online community of practice where RTOs, trainers and assessors can share information and knowledge via an online portal.	-	The development of an online community of practice may be a better use of funding. However, there is no definitive evidence to suggest an online community of practice would be utilised any more than the RPL resources in an online setting. <u>Community of practice – is this viable?</u> Further research is required to determine if low digital literacy will hinder the uptake of the RPL resources in an online setting. If low digital literacy is an issue facing the sector, then project funding may be better spent developing an online community of practice. The development of an online community of practice is ideally suited to Jobs and Skills Councils (JSCs), as they will be <i>'supporting collaboration between industry and training providers to improve training and assessment practice'</i> . The development of an online community of practice would need to be undertaken in consultation with the incoming JSC. However, before this transpires, further research is required to determine if low digital literacy applies to existing workers in the children's education and care sector. If it does, the uptake of an online community of practice will be significantly hindered. <u>Communities of practice – Early Childhood Australia</u> Early Childhood Australia currently facilitates online communities of practice in specific subject areas at a cost of approximately \$1,000 per person. Each community of practice has a 10-week duration. Source: https://shop.earlychildhoodaustralia.org.au/communities-of-practice

Compliance Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	<p>It is important for the children's education and care sector to have a solid and robust RPL process in place.</p> <p>I am concerned whether the materials are robust enough, but it is difficult without seeing the complete package. The self-assessment process appears to only focus on a unit's assessment requirements rather than the unit's broader performance evidence.</p>	PARTIALLY	<p>The RPL resources must be usable. They must also meet the rules of evidence and the requirements of the units of competency that comprise the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care.</p> <p>The previous RPL Toolkit (2013) was highly detailed and complex. Although compliant, it was not used by RTOs and candidates. It was RTO-focused and failed to gain any uptake. As a result, the updated RPL resources are candidate-focused.</p>
Children's Education and Care Expert	<p>RTOs that offer RPL in the children's education and care sector must be consistent in their implementation and interpretation of RPL as an assessment process.</p>	PARTIALLY	<p>The RPL resources will include advice to enhance, but not mandate, the implementation and interpretation of RPL assessments.</p> <p>The notion that 'every RTO does everything in exactly the same way' is no longer a policy of the national regulator. With the VET sector working towards effective self-assurance, assessment tools should not be overly prescriptive in design. They should be designed in such a way that allows RTOs to integrate them within their own systems and practices.</p> <p>As a result, the updated RPL resources are not prescriptive. This has been a deliberate design approach, and it is in line with ASQA's model for self-assurance.</p> <p><i>'Self-assurance is when training providers have their own systems and practices to systematically monitor, evaluate and continually improve their training outcomes and performance against the Standards and obligations as an RTO.'</i></p> <p>Source: www.asqa.gov.au/how-we-regulate/self-assurance/draft-model-self-assurance</p>
RTO Compliance Expert	<p>The resources are not fit for purpose. They are not RPL resources. They are self-assessment resources with opportunities for the candidate to consider evidence. They do not give an assessor enough information to make a judgement.</p> <p>There is not enough in the resources to conduct a self-assessment or evaluation. They don't include enough information and candidates may feel if they tick the boxes and then add some evidence they're done – when that's not the case. It could be seen as misleading in this context.</p>	NO	<p>The RPL resources will include advice to enhance, but not mandate, the implementation and interpretation of RPL assessments (see comments above).</p> <p>The Self-Evaluation Guide offers a pre-assessment option to candidates, where they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> identify their capacity to meet the requirements of the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care; and gather evidence prior to a formal RPL assessment process.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	RTOs tend to develop their own self-evaluation resources (in some cases) as they have their own templates. Perhaps you need to investigate why RTOs didn't use the 2013 RPL Toolkits. From my experience, an assessor can undertake a pre-enrolment conversation with a student, and this can be enough to determine whether the student will be able to gather the evidence.	NO	<p>A deliberate decision was made to design self-paced and self-directed RPL resources that allow candidates to complete a self-evaluation <u>without</u> RTO input.</p> <p>This decision was made in response to the systemic reluctance of RTOs to promote RPL as a viable assessment option to individual learners.</p> <p>The previous RPL Toolkit (2013) was RTO-focused and complex, and it failed to gain any uptake. The updated Self-Evaluation Guide is candidate-focused. It has been designed as a self-paced and self-directed product. The initial groundwork for the RPL process will be undertaken by the candidate. This will significantly lessen the evidence gathering burden on assessors, and it will allow RTOs to immediately progress the RPL assessment process when they are approached by candidates.</p>
RTO Compliance Expert	There is no benchmarking guide.	PARTIALLY	Benchmarks and model answers will not be included in the Assessor Guide. Suggestions will be included, but RTOs are encouraged to use their own systems and practices. This is in line with ASQA's model for self-assurance.

Evidence Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	How is evidence being authenticated?	-	Evidence will be authenticated by assessors who operate in the children's education and care sector, and who satisfy the requirements for assessors as specified in the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015.
RTO Compliance Expert	How is permission and confidentiality being applied when involving children?	-	The RPL resources will include advice on how to address the conditional exemptions to safeguard children's privacy when gathering, storing and reviewing evidence.
RTO Compliance Expert	Evidence needs to be sorted and mapped, and candidates need to know how to do this. Just providing a list in a text box is not enough. Maybe suggest a naming convention.	YES	A naming convention for evidence has been included in the Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidates must not provide policy documents from their previous employers, as this is not relevant evidence.	NO	If a candidate contributed to the development of a policy document in a children's education and care service, then it is most certainly relevant evidence.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidates must not provide photos or videos as evidence if they include images of children and their families, as this would be a breach of privacy requirements.	NO	If requisite approvals, permissions and consents are obtained and included by the candidate, photos and videos can definitely be used as evidence.

Self-Evaluation Guide

Unit Coverage Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 There are definitely not enough questions or tasks to cover each unit of competency in its entirety. Candidates cannot be expected to interpret a unit from TGA.	PARTIALLY	The Assessor Guide contains additional knowledge questions and workplace observation tasks to address the requirements of each unit of competency.
VET Regulation Experts	Candidate Guide v2 Many of the self-evaluation questions relate to points in the 'performance evidence' requirements of each unit. I wonder if more points from the 'evidence criteria' of the unit requirements should be included? This may be covered in the competency conversation.	PARTIALLY	The Assessor Guide contains additional knowledge questions and workplace observation tasks to address the requirements of each unit of competency.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Guide v2 It is still confusing about how these two documents [Candidate Guide / Assessor Guide] work together. Is the candidate only providing a self-evaluation and list of evidence to support the self-evaluation? If so, that is not enough to deem a person competent, a self-evaluation should occur before gathering evidence.	YES	The Self-Evaluation Guide (pp 2, 5, 42) and Assessor Guide (p4) clearly describe the self-evaluation activity as the first of six steps in the RPL process. It is not the only step in the RPL process.

First Aid Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 I am concerned that first aid is included in an RPL process. I would take this out, as it can be a CT (i.e. Credit Transfer).	PARTIALLY	The Self-Evaluation Guide includes the following advice for the core unit of competency HLTAID012 Provide first aid in an education and care setting: <i>'Early childhood educators must hold an approved first aid qualification that covers asthma and anaphylaxis emergencies.'</i> If candidates currently hold an approved first aid qualification, they are encouraged to list it as evidence on page 21 of the Self-Evaluation Guide.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 It is extremely unlikely that first aid can ever be RPL'd. This would only occur if candidates were regularly undertaking CPR or managing anaphylaxis.	PARTIALLY	See comment above
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Guide v2 Can't RPL first aid. It is still showing in the Candidate Guide.	PARTIALLY	See comment above

Detailed Comments

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
VET Regulation Experts	Candidate Guide v2 Page 2 – ‘C – Contact a qualified assessor from a registered training organisation’. While it is made clear on page 4 that the student will be required to provide the evidence portfolio to an RTO, I suggest the statement on page 2 is amended to something like, ‘Contact a Registered Training Organisation (RTO)’. As the student wouldn’t be contacting the assessor directly.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Candidate Guide v2 Page 4 – ‘To validate the RPL process, you’ll need to provide this guide (completed) and your evidence portfolio to a registered training organisation (RTO)’. Add, ‘with CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care on their scope of registration’.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Candidate Guide v2 Page 12 – ‘Qualifications and Awards’. Consider adding column ‘Issued by’. While RTO’s must accept and provide credit to learners for studies completed at an RTO or at any other authorised issuing organisation, assessors may wish to verify certificates/transcripts with the issuing entity.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Candidate Guide v2 Pages 15 to 36 – The skills areas listed on the left side of the page list the unit codes only, you might like to consider adding the title as well for ease of reference.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Candidate Guide v2 Evidence tables – Can more lines be added if the student has additional evidence? If not, perhaps direct the student to add an additional page listing evidence if required.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Guide v2 Need to add qualification code.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 Qualification codes need to be in front of the qualification title each time it appears.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 A few of the photos used in the materials are very teacher based (with ABCs etc). However, some photos are good to break up the text. Conversely, the overall size of the RPL resources would be reduced with less images, and this would make them more accessible for candidates (for downloading etc).	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 The purpose of the RPL resources is not clear.	YES	The purpose of the updated RPL resources has been clarified.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 The RPL process depicted in the resources is not clear.	YES	The RPL process promoted in the updated RPL resources has been clarified.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 The RPL resources use a VET Training Package language (direct from the performance assessment). The language should match the audience.	YES	The language used in the updated RPL resources has been better matched to the target audience (i.e. school teachers).
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 There is too much duplication in the six booklets.	YES	The six separate documents have been consolidated into a single Self-Evaluation Guide.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 The use of four 'skill areas' is not an effective way to group similar units and remove equivalent content.	NO	The grouping of similar units was used effectively in the initial RPL Toolkit (2013), and this approach has been enhanced in the updated RPL resources.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 The use of colour to distinguish grouped units is not appropriate.	NO	The use of colour to distinguish the grouped units was used effectively in the initial RPL Toolkit (2013), and this approach has been enhanced in the updated RPL resources.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 It is not easy to select a response to the various questions in each skill area.	NO	The updated RPL resources include interactive check boxes for candidates to select their responses, which is significantly easier than writing their responses by hand.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 It is not easy to create a list of evidence in each skill area.	YES	A dedicated evidence table with naming conventions for each field has been included (at various points) in the consolidated Self-Evaluation Guide.
RTO Compliance Expert	Candidate Resources v1 The draft RPL resources are not fit for purpose.	PARTIALLY	The RPL resources have been significantly enhanced from feedback received during the review period.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 3 (2nd paragraph) As an educator you must hold... [add – <i>or be actively progressing towards...</i>]	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 3 (6th paragraph; last sentence) Once you've... [add – <i>or unit of competency</i>] As the candidate may have evidence for only part of the qualification	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 4 (1st paragraph) Where it states RPL assessment against the Certificate III... [add – <i>or an individual unit of competency</i>]	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 4 (3rd paragraph) <u>Digital evidence</u> Consideration should be given to the digital literacy of potential candidates, and their access to the internet	PARTIALLY	School teachers are the key target audience for this guide. It is assumed school teachers have sufficient digital literacy (and access to the internet) to save files to a flash drive or a file hosting service.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 4 (5th paragraph) <u>Type of evidence</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificate or transcripts – consider other qualifications with transcripts and certificates from other courses • It would be worth adding permission considerations here (re: the use of photos) • Consideration should be given to privacy considerations (re: the use of videos) and how RTOs store these types of records, especially in light of cyber security breaches 	PARTIALLY	Candidates cannot be required to take responsibility for an RTO's digital storage policies and procedures. It must be assumed that RTOs have sufficient digital security in place.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 5 <u>Instructions</u> Should the instructions go on the first page?	YES	The instructions are now summarised graphically on page 2 and explained in detail on page 5 of the Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (How To Guide) Page 6 <u>Image</u> <i>Teacher with alphabet on wall in background</i> This image is very teacher-based with ABC's.	YES	Image removed.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 2 Duplication of the last two paragraphs. I don't think this is required.	YES	All explanatory text has been consolidated in the Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 3 <i>If you have any specific assessment needs...</i> Will learners know what a 'specific assessment need' is? Maybe include some further information to clarify?	YES	Examples are provided as 'mouse-over' text in the response field. An example of a specific assessment need has also been included in the consolidated Self-Evaluation Guide.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 4 <u>Current Employment</u> <i>Briefly list your duties in this job</i> Why only a brief list of duties? Important information could be missed here if candidates are not aware of the type of evidence that is relevant to an RPL assessment. Maybe suggest candidates attach a job description here as evidence?	YES	A dedicated evidence table with naming conventions for each field has been included (at various points) in the consolidated Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 4 <u>Previous Employment</u> <i>Table</i> Simply listing a previous job title without tasks or a position description may not give enough evidence.	YES	A dedicated evidence table with naming conventions for each field has been included (at various points) in the consolidated Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 4 <u>Previous Employment</u> <i>List some of the tasks you have undertaken</i> Will candidates be aware of the task evidence they need to gather, especially if they are not familiar with the VET system?	NO	An assessor will determine if the tasks identified by candidates are appropriate. The explanatory text in this section is as follows: <i>List the tasks you have undertaken in paid and unpaid work that relate to early childhood education and care.</i>
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 5 <u>Image</u> <i>Teacher with vowel sheet</i> I don't like the picture, as it depicts more of a structured teaching role than an early childhood play-based role.	YES	Image removed.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (My Background) Page 5 <u>Qualifications and Awards</u> As well as listing the 'title' of the qualification or award, candidates should also be required to provide a transcript of the qualification or award to clarify the content of the training (including which electives were undertaken).	YES	A dedicated evidence table with naming conventions for each field has been included (at various points) in the consolidated Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 2 The unit <i>HLTWHS001 Participate in workplace health and safety</i> would be better placed in the professional practice skill area. It could get lost in the children's health & safety skill area, as it has much broader WHS application.	NO	The following concepts are identified as part of Quality Standard 2 (Children's health and safety) in the National Quality Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA2.2 Safety • QA2.2.1 Supervision • QA2.2.2 Incident and emergency management These concepts are covered in the unit HLTWHS001 Participate in workplace health and safety, and for this reason the core unit HLTWHS001 is included in Skill Area 1 (Children's Health & Safety). WHS is not identified as part of Quality Standard 1 (Educational program and practice) in the National Quality Framework.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 2 (2nd paragraph; 2nd line) The term 'teacher' needs to be replaced with 'educator'. There is a reference to 'teacher'. This is not the role of a Certificate III level qualified educator.	YES	The term 'early childhood teachers' will be replaced with 'early childhood educators' throughout the updated RPL resources.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 2 (3rd paragraph) Duplication – not needed (as per other areas).	YES	All explanatory text has been consolidated in the Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 2 Mandatory hours need to be included in this section.	YES	Mandated work hours have been included on page 7 of the consolidated Self-Evaluation Guide.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 5 I would use the term 'experience' instead of 'activity' in Question 6, as this frames it more than a one-off activity.	NO	The term 'activity' has been deliberately used to reflect the performance criteria and Performance Evidence of the unit CHCECE031 Support children's health, safety and wellbeing (see extracts below): PC6.3: Adjust levels of supervision depending upon the area of the service and the skill, age mix, dynamics and size of the group of children, and the level of risk involved in activities and play PE: Demonstrate the principles of active supervision to supervise one group of children for a complete activity or play period, according to service procedures
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 12 <u>Image</u> <i>Topical spray</i> This picture should be changed. Depending on the service, policy will guide whether a topical spray can be used, and many services do not allow the use of these sprays.	YES	Image removed.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 1) Page 14 I would suggest Question 26 should go before Question 24 (so it flows as per a risk framework).	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 2) Page 2 The unit CHCPRT001 Identify and respond to children and young people at risk sits more in the children's health and safety skill area.	YES	The following concepts are identified as part of Quality Standard 2 (Children's health and safety) in the National Quality Framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA2.2 Safety • QA2.2.3 Child protection For this reason, CHCPRT025 Identify and report children and young people at risk, which supersedes CHCPRT001, has been moved to Skill Area 1 (Children's Health & Safety).
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 2) Page 2 (last paragraph) Duplication – not needed (as per other areas).	YES	All explanatory text has been consolidated in the Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 3) Page 2 (last paragraph) Duplication – not needed (as per other areas).	YES	All explanatory text has been consolidated in the Self-Evaluation Guide.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 3) Page 6 <u>Image</u> <i>Teacher with vowel sheet</i> This image is very teacher-based with ABC's.	YES	Image removed.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 3) Page 5 I have concerns about the core unit CHCECE035 Support the holistic learning and development of children being achievable through an RPL assessment process. This unit contains critical foundation knowledge, and it is a key skills gap across the sector.	PARTIALLY	Learners should be able to access RPL where they have shown relevant, transferable and current pre-existing skills, knowledge, and experience. This is specified in the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015. Five additional self-evaluation question have been included in the Self-Evaluation Guide for this core unit.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 4) Page 2 (last paragraph) Duplication – not needed (as per other areas).	YES	All explanatory text has been consolidated in the Self-Evaluation Guide.
Children's Education and Care Expert	Candidate Resources v1 (Skill Area 4) Pages 6 and 7 <u>Images</u> <i>Aboriginal designs</i> Permissions and acknowledgment for these images should be considered.	YES	Images removed. Please Note All images used in the first draft resources, including the two Indigenous images, were free public domain CC0 images provided by rawpixel. This public domain collection is free for personal / commercial use, with no attribution required. creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/ https://www.rawpixel.com/image/5905721/free-public-domain-cc0-photo https://www.rawpixel.com/image/6704915/png-sticker-public-domain

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
VET Policy Experts	<p>Departmental change request</p> <p>Self-Evaluation Guide v4</p> <p>Who should use this guide?</p> <p>Page 2</p> <p>Amend the target cohort statement as follows: <i>This guide has been designed for experienced early childhood educators holding a pre CHC30113 Certificate III and experienced primary school teachers seeking recognition of prior learning for the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care</i></p>	YES	<p>This feedback has been actioned.</p> <p>The amended wording is as follows: <i>This guide has been designed for experienced early childhood educators holding a pre-CHC30113 Certificate III qualification and experienced primary school teachers seeking recognition for the CHC30121 Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care.</i></p>
VET Policy Experts	<p>Departmental change request</p> <p>Self-Evaluation Guide v4</p> <p>Evidence (Type of evidence)</p> <p>Page 6</p> <p>Amend the 'Type of evidence' list to include the following: <i>Policy and procedures used by you in the course of your duties (you should seek document owner permission if not already public)</i></p>	YES	<p>This feedback has been actioned.</p>

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
VET Policy Experts	<p>Departmental change request Self-Evaluation Guide v4 Page 16</p> <p>Provide advice on / expand the types of evidence that are suited to each skill area, as this can help trigger candidates into thinking of other types of evidence.</p> <p>The following examples are suggested for inclusion in the Self-Evaluation Guide (in response to Question 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the section titled Evidence on page 6 of this guide for more information on the type of evidence you can use • For example, you may have followed your service’s policy and procedure for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ an emergency evacuation ○ an outdoor excursion ○ mandatory reporting • For example, you may have followed your service’s Outside Excursions Policy and Procedure, and you may have an email exchange with your employer (with redactions to meet privacy requirements) 	YES	<p>This feedback has been actioned.</p> <p>The following wording has been added (in a mouse-over information box) for each self-evaluation question:</p> <p><i>Please refer to the ‘Evidence’ section on page 7 of this guide for information on the type of evidence you can use.</i></p>

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
VET Policy Experts	<p>Departmental change request</p> <p>Self-Evaluation Guide v4</p> <p>Evidence tables</p> <p>Pages 13, 21-22, 27-28, 34-35, 39-40</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change examples in each evidence table to include additional options (e.g. phone; desk drawer; storage box; Dropbox folder) • Remove Size column and provide advice about storage and data uploads (e.g. you may encounter storage-related issues when uploading large files) • Add a Question / Competency column and ask candidates to identify which question or competency the particular piece of evidence relates to • Add a Number (#) column • Inform candidates that they can use the same piece of evidence more than once if it has relevance in another skill area – they will just need to identify which question it relates to in each skill area) 	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Policy Experts	<p>Departmental change request</p> <p>Self-Evaluation Guide v4</p> <p>Where to from here?</p> <p>Page 41</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include text about regulatory requirement to offer RPL (Standards for RTOs 2015) • Possibly use following text from Summative Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ <i>RTOs are often reluctant to promote RPL as an assessment option to individual learners, despite this being a condition of their registration.</i> (Source: Clause 1.12, Standards for RTOs 2015) • If required, include advice about candidates using RTOs in other states or territories • Check to see if there are any regulatory issues that apply to the qualification at jurisdictional levels. 	YES	This feedback has been actioned.

Assessor Guide

Assessment Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	<p>Assessor Guide v1</p> <p>I'm not sure why you would create a separate document for assessors? A kit that includes all of this material would be more suitable for a candidate. Feedback for a long time has been the amount of paperwork candidates need to wade through. I would suggest one kit with it all included. In their current form they would be misleading, as they don't include all of the unit requirements and therefore have little value.</p>	NO	<p>This feedback is unclear. On the one hand it suggests candidates require access to all of the materials included in the Assessor Guide. On the other hand, it suggests candidates have been inundated with too much paperwork in the past.</p> <p>Candidates do not require access to RPL assessment instruments or mapping guidance. They should not have access to the knowledge questions included in the Assessor Guide. It is imperative that a separate resource be developed for assessors.</p> <p>To ensure the RPL process is successfully engaging, candidates only require access to an intuitive Self-Evaluation Guide.</p>
RTO Compliance Expert	<p>Assessor Guide v1</p> <p>It is unclear how the Knowledge Question Checklists in the Assessor Guide are to be applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the assessor ask these questions? • Are they on the spot? • How does the candidate prepare for these? • Where is the evidence recorded for the knowledge questions? • Where are the benchmark responses for consistency and post validation? <p>One question is not sufficient to address the number of key points that I assume are from the KE in the unit.</p>	NO	<p>The Assessor Guide includes advice on how competency conversation interviews should be conducted (refer page 26).</p>

Detailed Comments


RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
Children's Education and Care Expert	The assessor resources must include a Third-Party Report and Workplace Assessment Tasks (which were included in the 2013 RPL Toolkits).	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Assessor Guide v1 Evidence lists Could extra space be provided for the assessor's comments to be made regarding 'Valid, Authentic, Current'? If not valid, why not?	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Assessor Guide v1 Assessor notes Can these boxes be expanded? I believe additional space will be required to accurately record students' responses.	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Assessor Guide v1 Skill Areas <i>To what extent did the candidate's responses align with the 'key points to be addressed'?</i> If the student is 'NS', why are they NS? What are the next steps? Perhaps some additional prompts can be included in the 'Assessor Notes' box?	YES	This feedback has been actioned.
VET Regulation Experts	Assessor Guide v1 Third party report <i>Referee Verification</i> The headings listed should be expanded upon, for example, what does 'Work effectively in children's education and care' actually mean. Dot points could be added below the headings, such as 'engages with parents and carers' and 'minimise risks in the environment'. What behaviours is the third party verifying?	YES	This feedback has been actioned.

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
VET Policy Experts	<p>Departmental change request Assessor Guide v3 Assessor identification fields</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change Assessor to Assessor/s throughout document • Change Signature to Signature/s throughout document <p>This change will allow for RPL assessments where multiple assessors are involved in the evaluation of evidence across different skill areas.</p>	PARTIALLY	<p>The digital signature field in the Assessor Guide can only accept one valid signature. As a result, the following text has been included at each signature field:</p> <p>If multiple assessors have been involved in the evidence evaluation for this skill area, the candidate's supervising assessor must sign here</p> <p>If multiple assessors have been involved in this RPL assessment, the candidate's supervising assessor must sign her4</p>

Mapping Guide

Mapping Concerns

RESPONDENT	FEEDBACK RECEIVED	ACTIONED	RATIONALE FOR NON-ACTION / COMMENTS
RTO Compliance Expert	There is no mapping: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know you've covered all elements, knowledge evidence and assessment conditions? These need to be made explicit. 	YES	A Mapping Guide is included with the RPL resources. This document can only be finalised when all feedback has been received. It is currently under development.
RTO Compliance Expert	There is no mapping: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know all units of competence requirements are being met? What do the Knowledge Questions relate to? 	YES	A Mapping Guide is included with the RPL resources. This document can only be finalised when all feedback has been received. It is currently under development. The Knowledge Questions included in the Assessor Guide relate to the knowledge evidence in each unit of competency.
RTO Compliance Expert	The Workplace Observation Checklists are not mapped: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you know all criteria is being observed? How would the tasks such as risk of harm be demonstrated in the workplace? 	YES	The Workplace Observation Checklists are currently mapped in the Assessor Guide, and they will be mapped (in detail) in the Mapping Guide. Risk of harm reporting should be demonstrated in a simulated assessment environment. The advice included in the Assessor Guide informs assessors that skills demonstrations can be undertaken in simulated environments if the unit permits. The unit <i>CHCPRT025 Identify and report children and young people at risk</i> allows simulated assessments.
RTO Compliance Expert	There is a page titled 'Mapping Guidance' that states: <i>The Mapping Guide has primarily been designed for assessors and RTO compliance personnel, who require accurate 'instrument-to-competency' mapping data for assessment validation purposes.</i> I would suggest this is not the case, and that the mapping guide is to ensure quality assessment is undertaken and all components of the unit/qualification are met. The message needs to be about quality vs compliance and is a key component of the assessor decision making.	YES	The mapping guidance text has been amended (see below) to better reflect the original text used in the 2013 RPL Toolkit: <i>This Mapping Guide has primarily been designed for assessors. However, it may also be of interest to RTO personnel responsible for quality assurance and compliance.</i>
RTO Compliance Expert	Where is the performance evidence?	YES	The performance evidence is mapped to the questions in the Self-Evaluation Guide and the workplace observation tasks in the Assessor Guide.



purple infinity
<https://purpleinfinity.wordpress.com>