



HEALTH
PROFESSIONS
ACCREDITATION
COLLABORATIVE
FORUM

Australia's accreditation authorities
for regulated health professionals

HPACF online cultural safety training for Accreditation teams Addendum #1 – 12 November 2021

The following questions and answers are provided as clarification to issues raised about the RFP. This addendum does not change the original RFP content.

It would be good to clarify the difference between the cultural safety training commissioned by AHPRA (~2.5 to 3 years ago now) and what the HPACF are seeking now specifically in relation to assessors as accreditation team members. For example, does the statement “*Each accreditation authority is also working to deliver cultural safety training within their authority. The implementation of this will be varied across each accreditation authority*” refer to the 2018 AHPRA commissioned cultural safety training, which we believe was awarded in 2019.

Answer: This is training specific to assessors on accreditation teams. Most teams will have undertaken some cultural safety training, some may have undertaken the Ahpra Moong-moong-gak training you refer to. Accreditation authorities were out of scope for the Moong-moong-gak training which is why many of us have delivered our own training within our Councils.

While the nursing and midwifery, and osteopathy professions are out of scope of this project, will there be any request or hope that there will be liaison with the providers who are working with these professions?

Answer: These professions are delivering their own training for their assessors.

Although it is possible that people who take on an assessor role in an accreditation team may have undertaken formal cultural safety training through another role or context, are you looking to provide assessors with core cultural safety training as well as applied training to address the three points listed in Section 3.1 of the RFP?

Answer: The focus is specific to the role of assessors. Some refresh regarding principles of core components of cultural safety may be helpful, but we are seeking role specific training. We are open to the expertise of the successful vendor regarding this.



HEALTH
PROFESSIONS
ACCREDITATION
COLLABORATIVE
FORUM

Australia's accreditation authorities
for regulated health professionals

If we identify that another collaborator could work with us to meet the full scope of the brief (such as some of the technical aspects), are you comfortable for us to do this and, if so, would you like us to seek permission first?

Answer: A consortium response is welcomed.

Expectation of the learning approach. We note that the primary task for the vendor is described as *“develop and design training materials”*. There is no clear statement about the vendor delivering, although it is stated that *“content is to be delivered online, with the option for the vendor to host the content and track completions”*. Could you clarify if the Forum have only self-directed learning in mind or were also interested in trainer-facilitated learning?

Answer: We have a preference for this training to be self-directed as our assessors are drawn from across the country, the learner number is quite high and we are conscious of costs, however if you would like to comment on the validity of this delivery method in your response you are welcome to.

Is the training expected to be accredited or non-accredited training delivered?

Answer: Given the specific learner group it is unlikely to be accredited against any particular standards.

End of Addendum