

End-of-Course Assessment:

**Bridging the Pedagogical Design Gap: An Innovative Learning Solution for
SATS Training Officers**

Ho Guang Fu (W2610776)

Institute for Adult Learning Singapore, Singapore University of Social Sciences

BXL642: Innovative Design, Facilitation and Assessment of Learning

Dr Stefanie Chye Yen Leng

23 March 2026

Bridging the Pedagogical Design Gap: An Innovative Learning Solution for SATS Training Officers

Introduction

Training Officers from SATS Ltd. deliver safety-critical procedural training that safeguards aircraft, passengers, and staff. They possess strong technical expertise but many lack the pedagogical skills to design authentic, learner-centred training. This paper proposes a three-session programme to equip SATS Training Officers with theory-informed design and dialogic facilitation. The proposed programme aims not to improve instructional delivery by fundamentally shifting the professional identity of Training Officers from a technical demonstrator to a pedagogical facilitator who can navigate the tensions between rigid safety compliance and learner-centred inquiry.

Learning and Assessment Plan

The Identified Learning Need

SATS Ltd. is one of Asia's foremost aviation services companies, providing ground handling, cargo, and catering services across 215 stations in 27 countries. Training Officers design and deliver safety-critical procedural training to ground operations staff who handle aircraft, baggage, cargo, and passengers under exacting regulatory and safety standards in an operationally complex environment (SATS Ltd., 2025).

Training Officers possess deep familiarity with ground service equipment (GSE) and operational procedures, but their pedagogical practices used to transmit this knowledge often remain underdeveloped. They are frequently promoted from the ground operations workforce based on technical expertise rather than pedagogical skill, and many default to monologic lecture-and-demonstration approaches, presenting procedures step-by-step while learners

observe passively, and rarely consider how adults learn or how to design conditions that promote deep understanding (Bound & Chia, 2020; Merriam & Bierema, 2014).

This pattern is consequential. In aviation ground operations, where errors in handling aircrafts, operating vehicles near runways, or managing security procedures can result in aircraft damage, injury, or loss of life, the gap between surface-level procedural recall and deep transferable competence is not a minor pedagogical concern. It is an operational risk. Learners who can recite a pre-departure checklist when tested may nonetheless fail to apply it correctly when working at speed, managing multiple simultaneous demands, or confronted with a non-standard situation in operational environments (Bound & Chia, 2020).

The identified learning need is therefore: “*SATS Training Officers lack the skills and strategies to design and facilitate learner-centred, authentic training that promotes deep understanding, active engagement, and genuine transfer of safety-critical procedural knowledge to ground operations practice*”. This is less a technical content gap than a pedagogical design gap. Addressing it requires Training Officers to interrogate their assumptions about teaching and learning, understand how adults construct knowledge, and develop a practical repertoire of learner-centred facilitation strategies that can be implemented within the constraints of operational training.

The proposed three-session programme, totalling nine hours of structured learning, aims to address this gap by equipping Training Officers with the theoretical grounding and practical design skills needed to move from compliance-focused instruction towards competence-building learning designs that better support safe, reliable apron operations.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of the programme, participants will be able to:

1. Explain how foundational adult learning theories (e.g. behaviourism, constructivism, and social learning theory) inform training design choices in ground operations safety contexts.
2. Critically examine their own current training design practices, identify underlying assumptions, and infer likely consequences for learning outcomes.
3. Design a training session for a specific safety procedure using at least three of the Six Principles of Learning Design (6PoLD), demonstrating constructive alignment between learning outcomes, activities, and assessment.
4. Facilitate a short training activity using dialogic learner-centred approaches, and reflect critically on the facilitation experience, drawing on peer and self-assessment feedback.
5. Evaluate training designs (their own and peers') against principles of validity, reliability, and fairness in assessment.

These outcomes explicitly target both knowledge and skills dimensions of the learning need. They are pitched at a level appropriate for adult professional learners who bring substantial operational expertise and are expected to apply new learning critically to their own training practice in SATS.

Teaching and Learning Approach

A constructivist, dialogic inquiry approach is adopted because the learning need, i.e. developing capacity to design engaging, learner-centred training, cannot be met through passive instruction without contradicting the very principles being promoted. Simply lecturing Training Officers about learner-centred facilitation would reproduce the monologic practices the programme seeks to change. Instead, participants learn about adult learning through experiential activities underpinned by social constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1978).

The design draws mainly on constructivism and social cognitivism where participants actively construct meaning through engagement with peers who share similar experience, rather than passively receiving transmitted content (Merriam & Bierema, 2014). Dialogue around authentic problems provides a social context for learning via observation, modelling and joint problem-solving. This foregrounds participants' agency and sense-making, consistent with adult learning perspectives.

The programme treats SATS Training Officers with deep existing operational knowledge as raw material for critical reflection and collaborative redesign, rather than positioning them as novices to be filled with new content. Their rich prior experiences become resources for learning, not a deficit to be corrected. In alignment with andragogical principles (Knowles et al., 2015), the programme recognises them as self-directed adults motivated by the immediate relevance of learning to professional challenges, and structures tasks so learners work with their own real training modules and issues.

The overall facilitation stance is intentionally positioned towards the dialogic end of Bound and Chia's (2020) monologic–dialogic continuum. Instruction is organised around learner sense-making and knowledge co-construction rather than around content transmission. Sessions use open-ended questioning, authentic problem-solving, peer dialogue and structured reflection, while the facilitator acts as a critical questioner who scaffolds inquiry instead of functioning as the sole authority dispensing answers.

The structural logic across the three sessions is guided by Biggs' principle of constructive alignment (2003, as cited in Bound & Chia, 2020). This alignment strengthens both the pedagogical coherence and the defensibility of the programme as a response to the identified learning need. Learning outcomes, activities and assessments are intentionally

designed to reinforce mutually where every activity serves one or more outcomes, and every assessment provides valid evidence of learning.

Learning Activities, Mediating Tools, Resources, Facilitation and Assessment Strategies

Programme Overview

Table 1

Proposed Programme Structure¹

Session	Title	Duration
Session 1	Why Training Isn't Working: Examining Our Assumptions	3 hours
Session 2	Redesigning for Depth: Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training	3 hours
Session 3	Teaching as We Say: Facilitating, Receiving Feedback, and Reflecting	3 hours

Session 1 (3 hours): Why Training Isn't Working – Examining Our Assumptions

Session 1 opens with experience rather than theory to surface existing mental models. Participants are presented with “The Apron Incident”, a fictionalised but realistic case of a SATS ground handler who scores full marks on a safety assessment but later commits a critical procedural error during aircraft turnaround (see **Appendix A**). Working in small groups, participants diagnose what went wrong before any formal theory is introduced, making their implicit beliefs about training and assessment visible for later examination.

The next activity is a learning theory mapping task. Participants receive six short scenario cards depicting recognisable approaches to SATS ground operations training and are

¹ See **Appendix J** for the learning solution’s set of three On-the-Job (OJT) Blueprints, and **Appendix K** for the associated Workplace Learning Assessment Plan.

asked to match each scenario to one of Merriam's five theoretical orientations using a reference card (see **Appendix B**). Disagreement in groups becomes a productive opportunity for deeper engagement with nuances between theories as the facilitator uses Socratic questioning to probe their reasoning, rather than simply presenting "correct answers".

The session closes with individual structured reflective journalling that inaugurates a learning portfolio maintained across the programme (see **Appendix C**). With assistance, participants identify one key assumption they hold about their learners, explore its origins, and speculate on its consequences for learning. This cultivates habits of critical reflection and provides a baseline artefact against which subsequent shifts in thinking can be tracked.

Formative assessment in this session is low stakes and qualitative. The case study discussions provide diagnostic insight into participants' current theories and dispositions, helping the facilitator calibrate subsequent support. The reflective journal entry is not graded but is central for developing self-directed critical reflection, a capability aligned with the future-oriented aims of the programme (Bound & Chia, 2020).

Key mediating tools and resources include **Appendix A** (The Apron Incident Case Study), **Appendix B** (Learning Theory Reference Card) and **Appendix C** (Session 1 Reflective Journal Prompt). These artefacts embody the focus on authentic context, theoretical framing and structured reflection.

Session 2 (3 hours): Redesigning for Depth – Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training

Session 2 introduces Bound and Chia's (2020) Six Principles of Learning Design (6PoLD) as a practical framework for analysing and redesigning existing training. The aim is to help Training Officers move from intuitive, habit-based design towards principled, evidence-informed design.

The session opens with a gallery walk. Six posters (see **Appendix D**), one for each 6PoLD principle, are placed around the room. Each poster carries a brief description and a question linking the principle to SATS training (e.g. for Authenticity: "How often does your current training present learners with the pressures and ambiguities they face on the apron?"). Working in pairs, participants circulate, annotate posters with observations, and discuss connections to their own practice. This slows down reading, stimulates dialogue and allows the facilitator to listen for patterns that will inform the next task.

The central activity is a training redesign workshop using a Learning Design Canvas (see **Appendix E**). Participants select one actual training session they currently facilitate (e.g. GSE pre-departure checks, aircraft marshalling, or aviation security briefings) and use the canvas to redesign it. The canvas scaffolds writing clear learning outcomes, clarifying authentic contexts, selecting activities that integrate knowing and doing, planning feedback and judgement opportunities, and checking alignment among all components. The facilitator circulates, prompting participants to ground design decisions in the 6PoLD and to ensure designs remain feasible within SATS operational constraints.

Participants then engage in triadic peer review (**Appendix F**). In groups of three, each person presents their draft design and receives structured written and oral feedback mapped to the 6PoLD criteria. Peer reviewers must identify specific aspects that could be made more

authentic, better aligned or more future-oriented. Feedback prompts emphasise appreciative yet developmental comments. Participants are given time after the session to revise their designs in light of feedback, in preparation for Session 3.

Formative assessment is enacted through the peer review process, which serves a dual function: providing designers with targeted feedback for improvement and developing reviewers' evaluative judgement. This aligns with the emphasis in learning design literature on learners' ability to assess the quality of work against explicit criteria as a critical capability. The peer review is explicitly formative and does not involve summative grading so that participants can experiment and revise without fear of penalty.

Key mediating tools and resources include **Appendix D** (6PoLD Gallery Walk Posters), **Appendix E** (Learning Design Canvas) and **Appendix F** (Triadic Peer Review Protocol). These artefacts anchor key principles in concrete tools that participants can reuse in their workplace.

Session 3 (3 hours): “Teaching as We Say – Facilitating, Receiving Feedback, and Reflecting

Session 3 focuses on enacting redesigned training through micro-teaching and structured feedback. Each participant delivers a 15-minute micro-teaching segment drawn from their revised training plan, submitted beforehand as a one-page design. The emphasis is on facilitation and design enactment, not on testing technical mastery of SATS procedures. While each participant facilitates, the rest of the group uses a structured observation checklist (see **Appendix G**) to note the extent to which the micro-teaching embodies the 6PoLD and employs dialogic, learner-centred strategies. Observers attend to aspects such as authenticity of scenarios, opportunities for learner participation and the quality of questions posed.

After each micro-teaching, a five-minute debrief is conducted with the presenter conducts a self-assessment first, followed by peer and facilitator feedback using a set of questions that promote specific, forward-looking and non-judgemental comments, making the session more as dialogue and problem-solving rather than as one-way evaluation.

The programme then closes with a whole-group dialogue using a Plus-Delta-Question protocol. Participants collectively identify what worked well across the three sessions, what they would change, and one new question raised by the experience. This provides a shared sense-making opportunity that validates individual journeys and surfaces shared insights of the programme.

The summative assessment task is a written critical reflection (to be submitted within one week of Session 3, see **Appendix H**) that traces participants' learning from their initial assumptions, to how these shifted, and what they now understand about designing learner-centred training, and to what specific changes they will make in their SATS training practice. The reflection is marked against a criterion-referenced rubric (see **Appendix I**) that stresses depth of analysis, integration of theory and practice, and specificity of intended professional change.

The written critical reflection is the main summative artefact because it best captures learning outcomes 2, 4 and 5. It requires participants to demonstrate critical analysis, theoretical integration and context-specific application that alternative formats such as quizzes or procedural demonstrations would not reveal adequately. Micro-teaching is used formatively to generate feedback for this reflection, rather than as a summative assessment, to avoid conflicting purposes (Newton, 2010).

Key mediating tools and resources are **Appendix G** (Micro-Teaching Observation Checklist), **Appendix H** (Critical Reflection Template) and **Appendix I** (Critical Reflection Rubric), all of which are aligned with the stated learning outcomes and assessment purposes.

Evaluating the Appropriateness of the Learning Programme

Teaching and Learning Approach

The constructivist dialogic inquiry approach used in this programme is underpinned by adult learning theory and is well suited to SATS Training Officers as experienced practitioners. Merriam and Bierema (2014) trace the shift of adult learning theory from behaviourist models, which treat learning as behaviour change produced by external stimuli, to social cognitive and constructivist perspectives that see learners as active agents constructing meaning through experience and dialogue. For experienced SATS Training Officers, purely behaviourist approaches that treat them as passive recipients are both theoretically misaligned and practically limiting.

Reinforcing the programme's teaching and learning approach, andragogical frameworks place adult learners as typically self-directed, bring rich prior experience, and are motivated by learning that is immediately relevant to their professional roles (Knowles et al., 2015). Across the programme, participants work with their own training materials and problems, ensuring relevance; they bring operational experience as a central resource into case discussions and design tasks; and they are encouraged to direct their own inquiry through journalling, peer dialogue and design choices.

The sessions also operationalise Bound and Chia's (2020) monologic–dialogic continuum by intentionally moving facilitation towards dialogic practice. In Session 1, participants analyse an incident and map scenarios to theories rather than listening to a lecture; in Session 2, they use 6PoLD to redesign authentic training modules and engage in peer review;

in Session 3, they practise facilitation and engage in structured feedback and reflection. These activities – requiring active engagement, synthesis and reflection – are associated with deep understanding and the ability to apply knowledge in unfamiliar situations.

This is particularly important because Training Officers themselves are expected to cultivate such deep understanding in their own learners. Traditional technical content transmission is insufficient for developing the kind of flexible, judgement-laden competency required in ground operations. The programme facilitates participants' conceptual understanding and an embodied sense of what learner-centred facilitation look and feel like, allowing first-hand experience of dialogic constructivist learning, making it more likely that they will transfer these practices into their own training rooms.

The proposed learning solution is strategic for high-stakes ground operations leaning toward constructivism. But it will introduce tensions within SATS: the need to balance learner autonomy against the non-negotiable requirement for zero-error procedural adherence. This friction is managed by applying scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development. During simulations, learners engage in "Dialogic Facilitation," while the trainer maintains an "Authorial Stance" to serve as a safety anchor. This allows Training Officers to navigate the inherent "messiness" of the learning process without compromising the "rigidity" of safety protocols.

Learning Activities and Resources

The selected learning activities and resources strongly reflect five of the 6PoLD: Authenticity, Holistic Design, Feedback, Judgement and Future Orientation (Bound & Chia, 2020).

Authenticity is foundational in this programme. Every major activity is tied to participants' real SATS training contexts. The Apron Incident case study depicts a realistic

operational scenario that resonates with participants' experience. In Session 2, participants redesign actual modules they currently deliver, rather than hypothetical sessions. In Session 3, micro-teaching involves facilitating segments of training that participants could plausibly conduct in their workplace. This continuous use of authentic context deliberately reduces the transfer gap between classroom learning and apron practice.

The Learning Design Canvas is a central tool for integrating knowing, doing, thinking and feeling, as it prompts participants to bring content, learner engagement, feedback design and future-oriented capabilities into a single coherent plan forming the Holistic Design of the programme. By externalising design thinking, the canvas supports metacognitive awareness of how different elements of a session connect (Merriam & Bierema, 2014).

Feedback and Judgement are embedded systematically. In Session 2's triadic peer review, participants practise giving and receiving feedback structured around explicit 6PoLD criteria, which helps them develop the ability to make informed judgements about training quality. In Session 3, micro-teaching debriefs and the observation checklist promote dialogic feedback where presenters compare their self-assessment with peer perspectives. These repeated opportunities to interpret evidence against criteria support the development of evaluative judgement, a key future-oriented capability for trainers responsible for maintaining safety standards.

Future-orientation is cultivated by encouraging participants to see themselves as ongoing learners in their training role using activities that build metacognitive and evaluative capacities beyond the specific content of the programme. These include participants examining assumptions, applying criteria to designs, and writing the final reflection. By learning to interrogate own designs critically, aligning assessments with outcomes and adjusting

facilitation to tailor to their learners' needs, Training Officers are better prepared to respond to evolving operational demands, regulatory changes and new safety risks in the future.

The choice of activities and resources is defensible in relation to the learning need, creating an integrated experience in which participants encounter theory, apply it to authentic tasks, receive feedback and reflect on implications for their own practice, rather than treating theory and practice as separate domains.

Assessment Strategies

The programme's assessment strategy is intentionally designed to be fit for purpose, valid, and reliable, moving beyond mere compliance to align with contemporary pedagogical principles. Rather than viewing assessment as a final audit, this design treats it as an essential driver of the Training Officer's professional evolution.

Assessment purposes are clearly differentiated to support different stages of growth. Diagnostic and formative tasks – such as case discussions, reflective journals, and micro-teaching feedback – generate real-time data for instructional adjustment. In contrast, the summative critical reflection provides the evidence required to judge the achievement of higher-order outcomes. By matching task design to specific intent, the programme avoids the common pitfall of using a single assessment artefact for conflicting purposes (Newton, 2010).

Formative assessments operate as a continuous dialogue throughout the three sessions. Group analysis of “The Apron Incident” reveals participants' current thinking and misconceptions without grading pressure. This is followed by peer review in Session 2 and micro-teaching debriefs in Session 3, providing timely, specific feedback that participants can act upon before submitting their summative reflections. Feedback as top-down critique is now transformed into collaborative inquiry, building the participants' capacity to use professional

critique productively, a skill essential for maintaining safety standards in a complex environment like SATS (Bound & Chia, 2020).

The choice of a written, narrative-style summative reflection over a standard MCQ or knowledge test is a deliberate pedagogical decision. A checklist can verify a procedure, but only a reflection can capture the "Becoming" of a trainer. Reflections allow participants to bridge the gap between abstract theoretical concepts, like Cognitive Load Theory, and the specific, high-stakes realities of their ground operations. This assessment specifically targets the unintended learning outcomes identified earlier: the realisation that technical mastery is distinct from the ability to facilitate learning. By requiring Training Officers to critique their own facilitation, we assess their internal reasoning and their shift in identity from a technical expert to a reflective practitioner.

Every assessment task is linked directly to a specific learning outcome, strengthening the validity of assessments through constructive alignment (Biggs, 2003, as cited in Bound & Chia, 2020). Higher-order outcomes, such as the ability to design for transfer, are matched with corresponding opportunities for critical analysis. Criterion-referenced rubric is used to assess the summative reflections, reducing idiosyncratic judgements and providing clear performance benchmarks. This maintains the reliability of assessment. All participants are assessed against the same standards while allowing them to draw from their unique operational contexts within SATS. This ensures assessments remain equitable, authentic and fair, regardless of the participants' functions in SATS.

By integrating assessment into the heart of the learning design, it becomes a catalyst for deep, transferable learning. In a safety-critical environment, the goal is not just for the trainer to "know" the material, but to possess the professional judgment and pedagogical

identity to ensure that safety knowledge is effectively passed on to the next generation of ground staff (Bound & Chia, 2020).

Conclusion

This paper has outlined an innovative learning solution that responds directly to the pedagogical design gap faced by SATS Training Officers, integrating adult learning theory, 6PoLD and constructive alignment principles. Through authentic, dialogic activities and carefully staged formative and summative assessments, the programme fosters deep understanding, evaluative judgement and metacognitive awareness that extend beyond individual sessions. By positioning Training Officers as reflective, evidence-informed learning designers, the programme strengthens both training quality and operational safety, and builds the capacity of SATS to meet evolving regulatory, technological and workplace demands in aviation ground operations.

References

- Biggs, J. (2003). *Aligning teaching for constructing learning*. The Higher Education Academy.
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/resources/id477_aligning_teaching_f_or_constructing_learning.pdf
- Bound, H., & Chia, A. (2020). *The six principles of learning design: Designing learning for performance – A practice note*. Institute for Adult Learning, Singapore University of Social Sciences.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315816951>
- Merriam, S. B., & Bierema, L. L. (2014). *Adult learning: Linking theory and practice*. Jossey-Bass.
- Newton, P. E. (2010). The multiple purposes of assessment. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (3rd ed., pp. 392–396). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00355-9>
- SATS Ltd. (2025, October). *Training Officer [Joining bonus of \$5000 for Singaporeans and PRs]* [Job advertisement]. SATS Careers. https://careers.sats.com.sg/job/Training-Officer-Joining-bonus-of-%245000-for-Singaporeans-and-PRs/599-en_GB
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Appendix A

The Apron Incident Case Study

CASE STUDY: THE APRON INCIDENT

Background

SATS ground handler Rajan has worked in cargo operations for three months. Two weeks ago, he completed a mandatory GSE pre-departure check training module. His trainer, an experienced senior handler, conducted the session using a slide presentation followed by a live demonstration on a baggage tractor. At the end, Rajan completed a written knowledge check and scored 18 out of 20. He was certified as “competent”.

The Incident

Yesterday, during a busy turnaround with three flights departing within 40 minutes of one another, Rajan was assigned to operate a baggage tractor independently for the first time. Under time pressure and distracted by a miscommunication from a colleague via radio, Rajan conducted a partial pre-departure check – he completed the items he could recall quickly and skipped several that he found less memorable from the training session. A low brake fluid level that would have been caught by a complete check was missed. The tractor was involved in a minor collision near the aircraft stand.

Fortunately, no personnel were injured, and the aircraft was not damaged. However, the incident has been logged and an investigation is underway.

Discussion Questions (small groups of 3–4)

1. What do you think caused Rajan's failure to complete the full pre-departure check?
2. In what ways might the design of the original training session have contributed to this outcome?
3. Rajan passed the knowledge check with a score of 90%. What does this tell us, and not tell us, about his learning?
4. If you were redesigning this training session, what is the one most important change you would make, and why?

Appendix B

Learning Theory Reference Card

LEARNING THEORY QUICK REFERENCE For Use During Session 1 Mapping Activity			
<i>Source: Adapted from Merriam (2014)</i>			
Theory	Core Idea	What this looks like in SATS training	Strength / Limitation
Behaviourism	Learning = observable behaviour changes through stimulus-response. Trainer controls conditions.	Drill-and-practice checklists; pass/fail competency checks; reward for correct procedure.	Effective for simple procedural tasks. Limited for complex, non-standard situations.
Cognitivism	Learning = internal mental processing. Focus on memory structures, schemas, attention.	Using worked examples, mnemonics, structured content flow to aid retention.	Supports knowledge retention. Less attention to social context or application under pressure.
Humanism	Learning = self-actualisation, becoming autonomous. Learner's growth is central.	Personalised learning paths; respecting learner dignity and experience.	Affirms the whole person. Can be difficult to operationalise in high-compliance contexts.
Social Cognitivism	Learning = observation, modelling, social interaction. Self-efficacy is key.	Peer demonstrations; mentoring new staff; reflective discussion after a task.	Recognises learning as social Builds confidence; requires skilled modelling.
Constructivism	Learning = active construction of meaning through experience and dialogue.	Complex scenario-based tasks; dialogic debrief; learner-designed solutions to real problems.	Produces deep, transferable understanding Requires more time and skilled facilitation.

Appendix C

Session 1 Reflective Journal Prompt

REFLECTIVE JOURNAL – Session 1: Examining My Assumptions

Instructions: Complete this journal individually. There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose is to surface and examine your own thinking. This entry will form part of your learning portfolio and will inform your final written reflection.

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

1. Describe a training session you have delivered that you felt went well. What made it successful, in your view?
2. Now think about a training session where learners did not perform as expected after training. What do you think happened?
3. From today's case study discussion, identify **ONE** assumption about your learners that you have been making (e.g., about their motivation, their prior knowledge, or how they learn).
4. Where do you think this assumption comes from?
5. What might the consequences of this assumption be for your learners' performance on the apron?
6. What is one question today's session has opened for you that you want to explore further?

Appendix D

6PoLD Gallery Walk Posters

The following six poster templates are to be printed in A3 format and displayed around the training room. Participants annotate them in pairs using sticky notes or markers during the gallery walk in Session 2.

6PoLD PRINCIPLE 1. AUTHENTICITY

Use of real work practices and settings; embodies complexity of work; enables engagement

Reflection Questions for your SATS Training Context:

How often does your training present learners with the actual pressures, ambiguities and decision points they face on the apron?

What would it look like if your pre-departure check training took place in the actual GSE yard rather than a classroom?

My observations and connections to my own practice:

6PoLD PRINCIPLE 2. ALIGNMENT

Design involves every aspect of learning working together for a common purpose

Reflection Questions for your SATS Training Context:

Does your assessment task match what you want learners to be able to do?

If your outcome is 'correctly perform a pre-departure check under time pressure', does your assessment measure that, or does it only measure whether learners can recall the steps?

My observations and connections to my own practice:

6PoLD PRINCIPLE 3. HOLISTIC

Integrates knowing, doing, thinking and feeling; theory and practice; technical and generic skills

Reflection Questions for your SATS Training Context:

Does your training treat safety procedures as isolated technical steps, or does it integrate the judgment, situational awareness and communication skills that real performance requires?

How does your training develop 'the whole person' as a ground operations professional?

My observations and connections to my own practice:

6PoLD PRINCIPLE 4. FEEDBACK

Giving and receiving feedback from multiple sources; opportunities to act on feedback

Reflection Questions for your SATS Training Context:

In your current training, who gives feedback to learners, and when?

Do learners have the opportunity to act on feedback before they are assessed?

My observations and connections to my own practice:

6PoLD PRINCIPLE 5. JUDGEMENT

Enabling learners to make judgements about their own and others' performance

Reflection Questions for your SATS Training Context:

Do your learners ever assess each other's work? Do they self-assess?

How do you help learners develop the ability to evaluate the quality of their own performance against the required standard?

My observations and connections to my own practice:

6PoLD PRINCIPLE 6. FUTURE-ORIENTATION

Learning to learn; deep understanding; consideration of multiple perspectives; inquiry

Reflection Questions for your SATS Training Context:

Does your training help learners understand why a procedure exists, so they can adapt when the situation is non-standard?

If a learner encounters a GSE problem they have never seen before, does your training equip them to reason through it?

My observations and connections to my own practice:

Appendix E

Learning Design Canvas

Instructions: Select one training session or module from your current SATS practice. Use this canvas to redesign it, ensuring that all components are aligned and that the design reflects at least three of the 6PoLD principles. Complete each section thoughtfully. This canvas will be shared with two peers for feedback.

LEARNING DESIGN CANVAS – SATS Training Redesign Workshop	
Trainer Name:	Training Module / Procedure:
1. LEARNING NEED What gap in performance or understanding does this training address? Where is the evidence for this gap?	2. LEARNING OUTCOME By the end of this session, learners will be able to... (Use an observable, measurable verb)
3. AUTHENTIC CONTEXT Where and under what conditions is this procedure actually performed? What pressures, ambiguities and decision points are present in real work?	4. LEARNING ACTIVITIES What will learners DO in this session? (Not just watch/listen) How does each activity connect to the authentic context?
5. FEEDBACK & JUDGEMENT How will learners receive feedback during the session? How will learners be asked to evaluate their own or peers' performance?	6. ASSESSMENT How will you know that the learning outcome has been achieved? What evidence will you collect, and how?
7. ALIGNMENT CHECK Do your activities directly prepare learners for your assessment task? Do your activities and assessment task together achieve your learning outcome? (If not, revise.)	8. 6PoLD PRINCIPLES APPLIED Tick the principles most evident in your design: ☐ Authenticity ☐ Alignment ☐ Holistic ☐ Feedback ☐ Judgement ☐ Future-orientation

Appendix F

Triadic Peer Review Protocol

TRIADIC PEER REVIEW Session 2: Structured Feedback on Learning Design Canvas	
Instructions: You will review the Learning Design Canvas of two colleagues. For each, spend approximately 10 minutes reading the design carefully, then complete this protocol. Feedback should be specific, evidence-based, and forward-looking. Avoid vague praise or criticism. The goal is to help your colleague strengthen their design before micro-teaching in Session 3.	
Designer's Name: _____	Reviewer's Name: _____

SECTION A: STRENGTHS – What is working well in this design?	
Which 6PoLD principle(s) are most clearly present? What specific evidence in the design shows this?	How authentic is the learning activity to the real work context? Describe what makes it authentic (or not).

SECTION B: DEVELOPMENT AREAS – What could be strengthened?
Alignment: Does the assessment task directly assess the stated learning outcome? If not, how might it be revised?
Learner Engagement: How actively engaged are learners during the session? What one change would increase this?
Feedback & Judgement: Are there sufficient opportunities for learners to receive feedback and self-assess? What could be added?
Future-Orientation: Does the design develop deep understanding that would help learners handle non-standard situations? What is missing?

SECTION C: ONE PRIORITISED RECOMMENDATION – If this designer could only make one change, what should it be, and why?

Appendix G

Micro-Teaching Observation Checklist

Instructions: Complete this checklist while observing your colleague's micro-teaching segment. Focus on facilitation approach and learner engagement, not on technical content accuracy. After the teaching segment, your observations will contribute to the structured five-minute debrief.

Observation Item	Clearly Present	Partially Present	Not Yet Present
AUTHENTICITY: The activity or task reflects the real work context of ground operations.	☐	☐	☐
ALIGNMENT: There is a clear connection between what learners do and the stated learning outcome.	☐	☐	☐
HOLISTIC: Learners are engaged at multiple levels (thinking, doing, possibly feeling); not just passive listeners.	☐	☐	☐
FEEDBACK: Learners receive or give feedback during the segment (not just at the end).	☐	☐	☐
JUDGEMENT: Learners are asked to evaluate something – their own work, a peer's work, or a scenario.	☐	☐	☐
FUTURE-ORIENTATION: The facilitator asks questions that push learners to reason beyond the specific procedure (e.g., 'What would you do if...?').	☐	☐	☐
DIALOGIC FACILITATION: The facilitator uses open questions, pauses for thinking, and responds to learner contributions.	☐	☐	☐
LEARNER ENGAGEMENT: Learners are visibly active – not just listening – for a substantial portion of the segment.	☐	☐	☐
Your most important observation (to share in the debrief):			

Appendix H

Critical Reflection Template

Instructions: This written reflection is the summative assessment for the programme. Submit it within one week of Session 3. It should be 600 to 800 words. Write in the first person. Draw on specific experiences from across all three sessions and connect your reflections to at least two theoretical sources covered in the programme. Refer to the rubric (Appendix I) before submitting.

WRITTEN CRITICAL REFLECTION	
Examining My Learning Journey as a Training Officer	
Name: _____	Date: _____
Module at SATS: _____	
SECTION 1: MY STARTING ASSUMPTIONS (approx. 150 words) <i>Before the programme began, what did you assume about how adult learners in SATS learn best? Where did these assumptions come from? (Draw on your Session 1 journal entry.)</i>	
SECTION 2: WHAT SHIFTED? AND WHY (approx. 200 words) <i>Identify one significant shift in your thinking or practice across the three sessions. What prompted this shift? Connect your experience to at least one theoretical concept (e.g., constructivism, 6PoLD, andragogy, dialogic facilitation). Be specific: what did you do, observe, or hear that produced this shift?</i>	
SECTION 3: EVALUATING MY OWN FACILITATION (approx. 200 words) <i>Reflect on your micro-teaching in Session 3. What worked well, and what would you do differently? Use the feedback you received from peers and the observation checklist to support your evaluation. Reference at least one 6PoLD principle.</i>	
SECTION 4: IMPLICATIONS FOR MY SATS TRAINING PRACTICE (approx. 200 words) <i>What will you do differently the next time you design or facilitate a training session at SATS? Be specific: identify at least two concrete changes, explain why you are making them, and connect them to theory or evidence. What questions remain open for your future learning?</i>	

Appendix I

Critical Reflection Rubric

This rubric is used to assess the Written Critical Reflection (Appendix H). Assessors award a mark out of 100 by weighting the four criteria equally (25 marks each). The rubric is shared with participants prior to submission.

Criterion	Distinction (22–25)	Merit (18–21)	Pass (15–17)	Fail (<15)
1. Critical Depth (LO 2, 4) /25	Sophisticated critical analysis; assumptions are identified, named theoretically, and traced to consequences with nuance and originality.	Clear critical analysis; assumptions and their consequences are identified and connected to theory with reasonable depth.	Some critical reflection; identifies assumptions but analysis is superficial or inconsistently supported by theory.	Descriptive rather than analytical; assumptions not clearly identified or consequences not explored.
2. Theory Integration (LO 1, 2) /25	Seamlessly integrates two or more theoretical concepts; theory and experience are mutually illuminating throughout.	Integrates at least two theoretical concepts with mostly accurate application; connections are clear and relevant.	References theory but application is partial, superficial, or contains minor inaccuracies.	Little or no theoretical engagement; theory is mentioned but not applied to personal experience.
3. Evaluation of Own Practice (LO 4, 5) /25	Rigorous, specific self-evaluation using peer feedback and rubric evidence; shows real willingness to challenge own assumptions.	Clear self-evaluation drawing on feedback; identifies strengths and limitations with specific examples.	Some self-evaluation but relies on general impressions rather than specific evidence or feedback.	Self-evaluation is absent, vague, or purely positive without critical engagement.
4. Implications for Practice (LO 3, 4, 5) /25	Identifies two or more specific, theoretically grounded changes to practice; future learning questions are sophisticated and genuine.	Identifies two specific changes grounded in theory or evidence; implications are realistic and relevant to SATS context.	Identifies changes but they are generic or weakly connected to theory; limited specificity to SATS context.	Implications are absent, vague, or not connected to the learning experience or theory.

Note: Assessors should award the mark that best reflects the overall quality of the reflection within each criterion band. Where a reflection sits between two bands, the assessor should write a brief justification note.

Appendix J

On-the-Job Training Blueprints

The following set of three On-the-Job (OJT) Training Blueprints is developed using the National Centre of Excellence for Workplace Learning (NACE) template. These OJT Training Blueprints establish a structured and systematic framework for workplace learning, ensuring that the proposed learning solution can be effectively implemented, regardless of who the facilitators may be. This approach promotes consistency and clarity in delivering workplace learning, supporting facilitators in achieving the intended learning outcomes.



ON-THE-JOB-TRAINING (OJT) BLUEPRINT

Programme Title Crafting Innovative Learning Programmes Using 6PoLD
Module (1) Why Training Isn't Working – Examining Our Assumptions
Organisation Name & UEN SATS Ltd.
Department Apron Services
Job Title Senior Training Officer / Training Officer

Version Control Record

Version	Effective Date	Changes	Author
1.0	02/03/2026	Initial Version	Melvin Ho

OJT CURRICULUM

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer		Department: Apron Services	
Module: (1) Why Training Isn't Working - Examining Our Assumptions		Total Tasks: 2	Total OJT Hours: 3 hours
S/N	Main Tasks	OJT Hours	
1	Examine pedagogical assumptions	1.5	
2	Map learning theories to operations	1.5	
3			
4			
5			
6			

Notes:

1. Main Tasks: Describe the main activities of the job using the Task Analysis.
2. OJT Hours: Provides the estimated time needed for training each task.

OJT TASK ANALYSIS

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer	Department: Apron Services
Module: (1) Why Training Isn't Working - Examining Our Assumptions	Total Main Tasks: 2

Main Task	Task Elements	Key Points	Task Standards	Knowledge, Skills & Attitude	Training / Trainer Guidelines	OJT Hours
Examine pedagogical assumptions Use "The Apron Incident" case study to diagnose training gaps and surface implicit beliefs about safety training.	- Analyse "The Apron Incident" case study. - Surface implicit beliefs regarding learner motivation and knowledge. - Identify origins of current assumptions.	Operational Risk: Surface-level procedural recall does not equal deep transferable competence. Mental Models: Understanding how personal assumptions about learners (motivation/prior knowledge) impact training effectiveness.	- Identifies at least ONE specific assumption and its potential consequences for apron safety. [K] - Analysis is supported by theoretical naming (e.g., Behaviourism vs. Constructivism). [S] - Shows real willingness to challenge own assumptions and current design habits. [A]	Knowledge: Understanding how implicit mental models and assumptions impact training outcomes. Skills: Identifying and tracing the consequences of assumptions on learner performance on the apron. Attitude: Openness to self-critique and willingness to challenge long-held beliefs about training.	Contextualization: Ensure all tasks are conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. Facilitation: When guiding the "Examine Assumptions" task, the trainer should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model Dialogic Facilitation.	1.5

OJT TASK ANALYSIS

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer	Department: Apron Services
Module: (1) Why Training Isn't Working - Examining Our Assumptions	Total Main Tasks: 2

Main Task	Task Elements	Key Points	Task Standards	Knowledge, Skills & Attitude	Training / Trainer Guidelines	OJT Hours
Map learning theories to operations Identify how behaviourism, constructivism, and social learning theory apply to specific SATS ground operations scenarios.	Categorize SATS training scenarios into five theoretical orientations (Behaviourism, Cognitivism, Humanism, Social Cognitivism, Constructivism)	Theories in Action: Distinguishing between Behaviourism (drill-and-practice) and Constructivism (scenario-based problem solving) in ground ops. Andragogy: Recognizing adult learners as self-directed and motivated by immediate professional relevance.	- Correctly identifies the "Core Idea" and "Strengths/Limitations" of each theory in a ground ops context. [K] - Demonstrates accuracy in matching "drill-and-practice" to Behaviourism. [S] - Values the shift from compliance-oriented instruction to future-ready competence. [A]	Knowledge: Knowledge of five orientations – Behaviourism, Cognitivism, Humanism, Social Cognitivism, and Constructivism. Skills: Categorising operational training scenarios into appropriate theoretical frameworks. Attitude: Valuing theoretical grounding as a practical tool for ground operations safety.	Contextualization: Ensure all tasks are conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. Facilitation: The trainer should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model Dialogic Facilitation.	1.5

OJT SET-UP & RESOURCES CHECKLIST

Module: (1) Why Training Isn't Working - Examining Our Assumptions		Training Date: DD/MM/YYYY	
Set-up Requirement			
A flexible training room or operational briefing area that allows for small group clusters (3–4 pax), "Gallery Walk" movement, and micro-teaching space.			
Resources	Quantity	Tick	Comments
Appendix A: "The Apron Incident" Case Study	1 per pax		
Appendix B: Learning Theory Reference Cards	1 set per group		
Appendix C: Session 1 Reflective Journal Prompts	1 per pax		
Markers and Post-it notes for poster annotations	1 set per group		
Mobile whiteboard or Flipchart for group brainstorming	2 units		
Laptop/Projector	1 unit		
Standard stationery (Pens, highlighters, tape for posters)	1 set		
Prepared by: OJT trainer's name		Signature: 	
Designation: OJT trainer's designation		Email/Tel No.: OJT trainer's contact information	

OJT LOGBOOK

LEARNER'S NAME		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
SECTION			
DIVISION		SIGNATURE	
OVERALL OJT HOURS		OVERALL PR*	

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
SECTION			
DIVISION		SIGNATURE	

APPROVED BY#		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
DATE		SIGNATURE	

*Performance rating (PR): C – Competent NYC – Not Yet Competent

#Approval must be made by a management representative of the Participating Company

OJT ASSESSMENT FORM

S/N	Main Tasks	Training Date	Training Time		Total Hours	PR*	Signature	
			From	To			Learner	Instructor
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
Comments:								

*Performance rating (PR): C – Competent NYC – Not Yet Competent



ON-THE-JOB-TRAINING (OJT) BLUEPRINT

Programme Title Crafting Innovative Learning Programmes Using 6PoLD
Module (2) Redesigning for Depth – Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training
Organisation Name & UEN SATS Ltd.
Department Apron Services
Job Title Senior Training Officer / Training Officer

Version Control Record

Version	Effective Date	Changes	Author
1.0	02/03/2026	Initial Version	Melvin Ho

OJT CURRICULUM

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer		Department: Apron Services	
Module: (2) Redesigning for Depth – Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training		Total Tasks: 2	Total OJT Hours: 3 hours
S/N	Main Tasks	OJT Hours	
1	Design training using 6PoLD	2.0	
2	Conduct triadic peer reviews	1.0	
3			
4			
5			
6			

Notes:

1. Main Tasks: Describe the main activities of the job using the Task Analysis.
2. OJT Hours: Provides the estimated time needed for training each task.

OJT TASK ANALYSIS

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer	Department: Apron Services
Module: (2) Redesigning for Depth – Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training	Total Main Tasks: 2

Main Task	Task Elements	Key Points	Task Standards	Knowledge, Skills & Attitude	Training / Trainer Guidelines	OJT Hours
Design training using 6PoLD Apply the "Six Principles of Learning Design" (6PoLD) to redesign an existing operational module (e.g., GSE checks or aircraft marshalling) using the Learning Design Canvas.	- Select an actual SATS module (e.g., GSE checks). - Complete the Learning Design Canvas sections: Learning Outcome, Authentic Context, Activities, and Alignment Check	Constructive Alignment: Ensuring learning outcomes, activities, and assessments work together for a common purpose. The 6 Principles: Focus on Authenticity, Alignment, Holistic Design, Feedback, Judgement, and Future-Orientation.	- Demonstrates a clear understanding of 6PoLD and Biggs' principle of constructive alignment. [K] - Applies at least THREE of the 6PoLD principles. [S] - Ensures learning outcomes use observable, measurable verbs. [S] - Design must reflect real-work pressures and ambiguities. [S] - Prioritises authenticity and decision points over passive slide-based instruction. [A]	Knowledge: Comprehensive understanding of the Six Principles of Learning Design (6PoLD) and Constructive Alignment. Skills: Constructing a Learning Design Canvas that aligns outcomes, activities, and assessments. Attitude: Commitment to authenticity and "future-orientedness" in safety-critical contexts.	Contextualization: Ensure all tasks are conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. Facilitation: The trainer should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model Dialogic Facilitation.	2.0

OJT TASK ANALYSIS

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer	Department: Apron Services
Module: (2) Redesigning for Depth – Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training	Total Main Tasks: 2

Main Task	Task Elements	Key Points	Task Standards	Knowledge, Skills & Attitude	Training / Trainer Guidelines	OJT Hours
Conduct triadic peer reviews Provide and receive structured oral and written feedback on training designs to develop evaluative judgement.	- Review two colleagues' Learning Design Canvases. - Complete Section A (Strengths) and Section B (Development Areas) of the review protocol.	Evaluative Judgement: Developing the ability to judge the quality of training designs against explicit 6PoLD criteria. Quality Feedback: Providing specific, evidence-based, and forward-looking comments rather than vague praise.	- Applies criteria for validity, reliability, and fairness in training evaluation. [K] - Feedback is specific, evidence-based, and forward-looking. [S] - Prioritizes ONE critical recommendation for improvement based on 6PoLD. [S] - Adopts an appreciative yet developmental tone during the triadic feedback process. [A]	Knowledge: Criteria for valid, reliable, and fair assessment and feedback. Skills: Exercising evaluative judgement to provide specific, evidence-based, and forward-looking feedback. Attitude: Appreciative yet developmental mindset; viewing feedback as a collaborative dialogue.	Contextualization: Ensure all tasks are conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. Facilitation: The trainer should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model Dialogic Facilitation.	1.0

OJT SET-UP & RESOURCES CHECKLIST

Module: (2) Redesigning for Depth – Applying 6PoLD to Ground Operations Training		Training Date: DD/MM/YYYY	
Set-up Requirement			
A flexible training room or operational briefing area that allows for small group clusters (3–4 pax), "Gallery Walk" movement, and micro-teaching space.			
Resources	Quantity	Tick	Comments
Appendix D: 6PoLD Gallery Walk Posters (A1/A3 size)	6 Posters		
Appendix E: Learning Design Canvas (A3 or Digital)	1 per pax		
Appendix F: Triadic Peer Review Protocol	1 per pax		
Markers and Post-it notes for poster annotations	1 set per group		
Mobile whiteboard or Flipchart for group brainstorming	2 units		
Laptop/Projector	1 unit		
Standard stationery (Pens, highlighters, tape for posters)	1 set		
Prepared by: OJT trainer's name		Signature:	
Designation: OJT trainer's designation		Email/Tel No.: OJT trainer's contact information	

OJT LOGBOOK

LEARNER'S NAME		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
SECTION			
DIVISION		SIGNATURE	
OVERALL OJT HOURS		OVERALL PR*	

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
SECTION			
DIVISION		SIGNATURE	

APPROVED BY#		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
DATE		SIGNATURE	

*Performance rating (PR): C – Competent NYC – Not Yet Competent

#Approval must be made by a management representative of the Participating Company

OJT ASSESSMENT FORM

S/N	Main Tasks	Training Date	Training Time		Total Hours	PR*	Signature	
			From	To			Learner	Instructor
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
Comments:								

*Performance rating (PR): C – Competent NYC – Not Yet Competent



ON-THE-JOB-TRAINING (OJT) BLUEPRINT

Programme Title Crafting Innovative Learning Programmes Using 6PoLD
Module (3) Teaching as We Say – Facilitating, Receiving Feedback and Reflecting
Organisation Name & UEN SATS Ltd.
Department Apron Services
Job Title Senior Training Officer / Training Officer

Version Control Record

Version	Effective Date	Changes	Author
1.0	02/03/2026	Initial Version	Melvin Ho

OJT CURRICULUM

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer		Department: Apron Services	
Module: (3) Teaching as We Say – Facilitating, Receiving Feedback and Reflecting		Total Tasks: 2	Total OJT Hours: 3 hours
S/N	Main Tasks	OJT Hours	
1	Facilitate learner-centred sessions	2.0	
2	Perform critical reflection	1.0	
3			
4			
5			
6			

Notes:

1. Main Tasks: Describe the main activities of the job using the Task Analysis.
2. OJT Hours: Provides the estimated time needed for training each task.

OJT TASK ANALYSIS

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer	Department: Apron Services
Module: (3) Teaching as We Say – Facilitating, Receiving Feedback and Reflecting	Total Main Tasks: 2

Main Task	Task Elements	Key Points	Task Standards	Knowledge, Skills & Attitude	Training / Trainer Guidelines	OJT Hours
Facilitate learner-centred sessions Deliver micro-teaching segments using dialogic approaches, moving away from monologic lecture-and-demonstration.	- Deliver a 15-minute micro-teaching segment. - Employ dialogic strategies: open questions, pausing for thinking, and responding to contributions.	Dialogic Stance: Moving from monologic "lecture-and-demonstration" to using open-ended questions and learner sense-making. Scaffolding: Acting as a facilitator who guides inquiry rather than a sole authority dispensing answers.	- Explains the shift from monologic content transmission to dialogic sense-making. [K] - Learners are "visibly active" for a substantial portion of the segment. [S] - Facilitator pushes learners to reason beyond the specific procedure (Future-orientation). [S] - Effectively transitions from a "sole authority" to a facilitator of inquiry. [A]	Knowledge: Principles of dialogic facilitation and scaffolding versus monologic instruction. Skills: Using open-ended questioning and managing learner-led sense-making during micro-teaching. Attitude: Empathy for the learner's experience and a shift from being an "authority" to a "facilitator".	Contextualization: Ensure all tasks are conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. Facilitation: The trainer should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model Dialogic Facilitation.	2.0

OJT TASK ANALYSIS

Job Designation: Senior Training Officer / Training Officer	Department: Apron Services
Module: (3) Teaching as We Say – Facilitating, Receiving Feedback and Reflecting	Total Main Tasks: 2

Main Task	Task Elements	Key Points	Task Standards	Knowledge, Skills & Attitude	Training / Trainer Guidelines	OJT Hours
Perform critical reflection Document shifts in thinking and plan specific changes to SATS training practice in a summative learning portfolio.	- Synthesise learning from three sessions into a 600 to 800-word narrative. - Evaluate own facilitation using peer feedback and observation checklists.	Theory-Practice Link: Connecting classroom experiences to theoretical concepts like Vygotsky's social constructivism or 6PoLD. Actionable Change: Identifying specific, concrete modifications to be made in future SATS training sessions.	- Integrates at least TWO theoretical concepts with accurate application. [K] - Identifies TWO or more concrete, theoretically grounded changes to future practice at SATS. [S] - Demonstrates a commitment to the identity of an ongoing learner in the training role. [A] Assessment: Use the Critical Reflection Rubric to provide a Distinction, Merit, or Pass grade for the final logbook entry	Knowledge: Understanding the role of metacognition and theory-practice integration in professional development. Skills: Synthesising classroom experiences and feedback to plan concrete changes for SATS operations. Attitude: Commitment to continuous learning and the identity of a "reflective practitioner".	Contextualization: Ensure all tasks are conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. Facilitation: The trainer should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model Dialogic Facilitation.	1.0

OJT SET-UP & RESOURCES CHECKLIST

Module: (3) Teaching as We Say – Facilitating, Receiving Feedback and Reflecting		Training Date: DD/MM/YYYY	
Set-up Requirement			
A flexible training room or operational briefing area that allows for small group clusters (3–4 pax), "Gallery Walk" movement, and micro-teaching space.			
Resources	Quantity	Tick	Comments
Appendix G: Micro-Teaching Observation Checklist	4 per pax		
Appendix H & I: Critical Reflection Template and Rubric	1 per pax		
Markers and Post-it notes for poster annotations	1 set per group		
Mobile whiteboard or Flipchart for group brainstorming	2 units		
Laptop/Projector	1 unit		
Standard stationery (Pens, highlighters, tape for posters)	1 set		
Prepared by: OJT trainer's name		Signature:	
Designation: OJT trainer's designation		Email/Tel No.: OJT trainer's contact information	

OJT LOGBOOK

LEARNER'S NAME		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
SECTION			
DIVISION		SIGNATURE	
OVERALL OJT HOURS		OVERALL PR*	

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
SECTION			
DIVISION		SIGNATURE	

APPROVED BY#		COMMENTS	
DESIGNATION			
DATE		SIGNATURE	

*Performance rating (PR): C – Competent NYC – Not Yet Competent

#Approval must be made by a management representative of the Participating Company

OJT ASSESSMENT FORM

S/N	Main Tasks	Training Date	Training Time		Total Hours	PR*	Signature	
			From	To			Learner	Instructor
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
Comments:								

*Performance rating (PR): C – Competent NYC – Not Yet Competent

Appendix K

Workplace Learning Assessment Plan

The Workplace Learning (WpL) Assessment Plan is developed using the National Centre of Excellence for Workplace Learning (NACE) template. The WpL Assessment Plan establishes a structured framework for assessments based on learners' acquisition of competencies at their workplaces. It is a document that provides information on how assessments are structured and conducted.

Competency-based assessments focus on the combined demonstration of knowledge, skills and attitudes beyond simple theoretical understanding. Competency-based assessments are administered under conditions closely resemble the actual work environment that learners are to perform in (authenticity). Assessment is criterion-based to identify if the learner is “competent” or “not yet competent”.



Workplace Learning Assessment Plan

Programme Title Crafting Innovative Learning Programmes Using 6PoLD
Organisation Name & UEN SATS Ltd.
Department Apron Services
Job Title Senior Training Officer / Training Officer
Competencies: 1. Examining Pedagogical Assumptions 2. Redesigning for Depth 3. Facilitating and Reflecting

Overall Summary of Assessment

Assessment Number / Competency	Assessment Method
1. Examining Pedagogical Assumptions	Case Study Analysis & Oral Questioning
2. Redesigning for Depth	Work Product Review (Learning Design Canvas)
3. Facilitating and Reflecting	Practical Performance (Micro-teaching) & Reflective Journal

Assessment 1 – Examining Pedagogical Assumptions

Specification	Description
1. Competency & KSAs Covered	Competency: Examining Pedagogical Assumptions Knowledge: Implicit mental models and theoretical naming (Behaviourism vs. Constructivism). Skills: Diagnosing training gaps in "The Apron Incident". Attitude: Openness to self-critique.
2. Assessment Method	Case Study Analysis and Socratic Oral Questioning.
3. Assessment Tools	Appendix A: "The Apron Incident" Case Study Appendix A: "Discussion Questions"
4. Assessment Venue	Operational briefing area or flexible training room.
5. Assessment Set-up & Preparation	Gallery Walk movement space with mobile whiteboards.
6. Duration of Assessment	1.5 Hours
7. Assessor : Candidate Ratio	1:4 (Group cluster size)
8. Conduct of Assessment	Candidate analyses the case study to surface implicit beliefs and traces consequences on apron safety.
9. Special Instructions	• Safety Trigger: The assessor must ensure that while discussing "The Apron Incident" case study, the candidate identifies how surface-level procedural recall can lead to operational risks. • Facilitation Style: The assessor should use Socratic questioning rather than providing "correct" answers to model the required Dialogic Facilitation. • Contextual Integrity: The candidate must relate theoretical naming (e.g., Behaviourism vs. Constructivism) specifically to ground ops scenarios to demonstrate practical understanding.
10. Recording Assessment Result	OJT Assessment Form Performance Rating (C/NYC)* *Competent / Not Yet Competent
11. Candidate Feedback	Immediate oral feedback focusing on the depth of theoretical application.

Assessment 2 – Redesigning for Depth

Specification	Description
1. Competency & KSAs Covered	Competency: Redesigning for Depth. Knowledge: 6PoLD and Constructive Alignment. Skills: Redesigning operational modules (e.g., GSE checks) using the Learning Design Canvas. Attitude: Commitment to future-orientedness.
2. Assessment Method	Work Product Review and Triadic Peer Review.
3. Assessment Tools	Appendix E: Learning Design Canvas Appendix F: Triadic Peer Review Protocol
4. Assessment Venue	SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or training room.
5. Assessment Set-up & Preparation	Display of 6PoLD posters for reference during design.
6. Duration of Assessment	3.0 Hours (Total for Module 2)
7. Assessor : Candidate Ratio	1:1 for Work Product Review 1:3 for Triadic feedback
8. Conduct of Assessment	Candidate completes a Canvas that aligns outcomes and activities, then reviews two colleagues' designs.
9. Special Instructions	• Authenticity Requirement: All redesign tasks must be conducted using real SATS Ground Service Equipment (GSE) yards or actual operational documents to maintain Principle 1: Authenticity. • Design Constraints: The Learning Design Canvas must reflect real-work pressures and ambiguities, avoiding passive, slide-based instruction. • Feedback Protocol: During the triadic peer review, instructions must mandate that feedback remains forward-looking and evidence-based, specifically prioritising one critical recommendation for improvement based on 6PoLD criteria.
10. Recording Assessment Result	Section A (Strengths) and Section B (Development Areas) of the Appendix F.
11. Candidate Feedback	Structured written feedback from peers and instructor based on 6PoLD criteria.

Assessment 3 – Facilitating and Reflecting

Specification	Description
1. Competency & KSAs Covered	Competency: Facilitating and Reflecting. Knowledge: Principles of dialogic facilitation. Skills: Delivering a 15-minute micro-teaching segment using open-ended questioning. Attitude: Empathy for the learner's experience.
2. Assessment Method	Practical Performance (Micro-teaching) and Summative Learning Portfolio.
3. Assessment Tools	Appendix G: Micro-Teaching Checklist Appendix H & I: Reflection Template/Rubric
4. Assessment Venue	Operational environment/GSE yards to maintain authenticity.
5. Assessment Set-up & Preparation	Micro-teaching space with real operational documents.
6. Duration of Assessment	3.0 Hours (2h Facilitation, 1h Reflection)
7. Assessor : Candidate Ratio	1:1 for final performance evaluation
8. Conduct of Assessment	Candidate facilitates an active segment and writes a 600 to 800-word narrative synthesising theory and practice.
9. Special Instructions	• Active Learning Metric: During the 15-minute micro-teaching segment, the candidate must ensure learners are "visibly active" for a substantial portion of the session. • Scaffolding Evaluation: The assessor must observe if the candidate successfully transitions from a "sole authority" to a facilitator of inquiry who pushes learners to reason beyond specific procedures. • Evidence of Reflection: The summative narrative (600–800 words) must explicitly integrate at least two theoretical concepts (e.g., Vygotsky's social constructivism or 6PoLD) with accurate application to their personal facilitation experience.
10. Recording Assessment Result	Appendix I: Critical Reflection Rubric
11. Candidate Feedback	Comprehensive summary in the OJT Logbook regarding the shift to "Reflective Practitioner".