

## OpsPilot

# Competency Assessment — User Manual

Observable, Defensible Competence · AI Engineering Co-Pilot



### AI-GENERATED CONTENT · INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION REQUIRED



This manual was produced with AI assistance and is only as good as the information it was given. Every statement, figure, standard reference and conclusion must be independently verified by a competent, suitably qualified person before it is relied upon. It is a draft aid to your judgement — not a finished, authoritative, or certifying document. Professional and legal responsibility for any reliance rests with you and your organisation. See the full Engineering Disclaimer at [opsinnovatech.com/engineering-disclaimer](https://opsinnovatech.com/engineering-disclaimer).

**What this guide covers** — what a competency assessment framework is, how the OpsPilot module builds one, what to have ready, and the document you receive.

## 1. What is a competency assessment?

A competency assessment establishes whether a person can actually perform a task safely and correctly — not whether they've sat through training or can answer a quiz. The distinction is everything: knowing the theory of isolating a pump is not the same as competently isolating one. A good framework defines observable performance criteria, matches the assessment method to the consequence of getting it wrong, and uses a rating scale that draws a clear line between competent and not-yet-competent without weasel words.

## 2. What the OpsPilot module does

Role	Responsibility
 AI Coach (OpsPilot)	Builds a rigorous framework — defining observable performance criteria (not just knowledge), selecting the right assessment method per competency, establishing an unambiguous rating scale, and designing a sustainable reassessment schedule.
 HR / Technical Lead (you)	Know the role, the regulatory requirements, and the consequences of someone performing a task they are not actually competent to perform. You validate the criteria against real job performance.

## 3. How it works — the process

#	Stage
1	Role and assessment purpose
2	Competency framework — Technical, Safety, Regulatory, Behavioural
3	Observable assessment criteria — behaviour, not knowledge
4	Assessment methods — rigour matched to consequence
5	Rating scale — Not-Yet-Competent / Supervised / Independent / Can Teach
6	Reassessment schedule

#	Stage
7	Word report

## 4. What you will be asked — have this ready

---

- The role and why you're assessing competency (regulatory, safety-critical, development).
- The competencies that matter — technical, safety, regulatory, behavioural.
- What “good” looks like in observable terms for each.
- The consequence of incompetence in each area, so the assessment rigour can match it.

## 5. What you receive — the output

---

A Competency Assessment Framework document (Word): the competency framework across technical/safety/regulatory/behavioural domains, observable assessment criteria, the assessment method per competency, the rating scale (Not-Yet-Competent / Supervised / Independent / Can Teach) and the reassessment schedule.

## 6. Worked example (illustrative)

---

Assessing competence to perform isolations. The weak version tests knowledge — “name the steps of LOTO.” The framework instead defines observable criteria: the person correctly identifies every energy source on a real piece of equipment, applies isolation in the right sequence, proves zero energy, and applies locks and tags correctly — observed, not recited. Because the consequence of getting isolation wrong is a fatality, the assessment method is high-rigour: direct observation of an actual isolation, not a written test. The rating scale is unambiguous — “Independent” means they can do it unsupervised; “Supervised” means not yet. And because skills decay, a reassessment interval is set. That framework defensibly answers “is this person actually competent to isolate?” — which a training certificate never does.

## 7. Getting the best result

---

- **Assess performance, not knowledge.** Can they do it, observed — not can they describe it.
- **Match rigour to consequence.** A safety-critical task warrants direct observation, not a quiz.
- **Make the rating unambiguous.** “Independent vs Supervised” beats “mostly competent.”
- **Reassess on a schedule.** Competence decays — a one-off sign-off isn't forever.

---

OpsPilot — AI Engineering Co-Pilot. Learn more at [opsinnovatech.com](https://opsinnovatech.com)