



# Validation Report

Outcomes for validation of assessment tool to address  
TAEASS502A Design and develop assessment tools

---

- The validation focus and process ●
- Validation participants ●
- Feedback from validators ●
- Responses and outcomes from developer ●

**Presented:**

26 October 2010

# Contents

<b>About the assessment validation.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Purpose and process.....	3
Participants.....	4
<b>Validation Report: Summary of feedback from all validators with responses from developer.....</b>	<b>5</b>

# About the assessment validation

## Purpose and process

<b>Purpose of the validation</b>	To review and validate the assessment tool developed by Chemène Sinson of Blackwater Projects to support TAEASS502A Design and develop assessment tools
<b>Participants</b>	See list starting on next page. Participants included representatives from 7 different RTOs throughout Australia.
<b>Validation approach and process</b>	<p><b>Validation approach</b> included a mix of face-to-face meetings and email correspondence, as follows:</p> <p><b>8 – 14 September 2010:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chemène Sinson of Blackwater Projects emailed RTOs currently using the Blackwater Projects TAE40110 resources and invited them to participate in the assessment validation. In return RTOs would be offered the finalised version of the assessment tool free of charge.</li> <li>● 7 RTOs accepted this invitation.</li> </ul> <p><b>15 September 2010:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chemène emailed all participating RTOs the resources needed for the validation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Draft 1 of the assessment booklet to be validated</li> <li>– Instructions for use</li> <li>– Competency matrix</li> <li>– A validation checklist.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>15 – 24 September 2010:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Each participating RTO had at least two RTO representatives meet and validate the draft of the assessment tool, using the validation checklist provided.</li> <li>● Participating RTOs documented the validation process and outcomes by completing the validation checklist. When validation was complete, participating RTOs emailed the completed validation checklists to Chemène.</li> </ul> <p><b>04 October 2010:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chemène consolidated all feedback into draft 1 of this report, and produced a list of recommended changes to the draft of the assessment tool.</li> <li>● Chemène emailed draft 1 of this report to all validators and sought approval for the recommended changes to the tool.</li> </ul> <p><b>26 October 2010</b></p> <p>Chemène modified the assessment tool according to feedback from validators. Version 1 (final) of the assessment tool was produced.</p>

# Participants

Participant Name		RTO	State
1	Tracey Kearney	<b>Prestige Service Training</b>	QLD
2	Claire Azzopardi		
3	Ros Shapcott	<b>Benchmark College</b>	NSW
4	Peter Adamow		
5	Dean McDonald, CEO	<b>Workplace Skills Australia</b>	NSW
6	Jo-Anne Taylor, Deputy Principal		
7	Carla Jakobsen, Assistant Principal		
8	Michael Chappell	<b>Southern Queensland Institute of TAFE</b>	QLD
9	Mark James	<b>Department of Justice, Victoria</b>	VIC
10	Ryan Batt		
11	Laura Else		
12	Joanne Stefan		
13	Jessica Conte		
14	Michelle Israel		
15	Alison Webb	<b>Macarthur Community College</b>	NSW
16	Roslyn Townsend		
17	Jeremy Trott	<b>Training Services Australia</b>	WA
18	Merinda Smith		

# Validation Report: Summary of feedback from all validators with responses from developer

Below is a copy of the validation checklist that validators completed, with comments from all validators merged into this one record. Chemène's responses are also noted using **red** font.

## Key:

- Items in **blue font** are the comments from the validators
- Items in **red font** are Chemène's responses with a summary of modifications made to the tool, where applicable.

Validation Criteria Checklist	
VALID	
Criteria—Does/is the assessment tool:	Results (Yes or No) and Comments, were applicable
1	<p><b>Clearly identify units</b> assessed by code and title?</p> <p>RTO 1: Yes.            RTO 2: Yes. Clear.            RTO 3: Yes. Very clearly labelled.            RTO 4: Yes.            RTO 5: Yes. TAEASS502A Develop assessment tools            RTO 6: Yes.            RTO 7: Yes.  <b>Thank-you. No changes in this regard.</b></p>
2	<p><b>Address all aspects of the competency standard/s</b> assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elements and performance criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>Elements &amp; Performance Criteria:</b>            RTO 1: Response not recorded.            RTO 2: Yes. Covered.            RTO 3: No. One of the assessment tools being developed should be specifically for an assessment only pathway—to address PC 2.2. <b>Have added requirement that candidates should either develop recognition tool or be prepared to discuss how at least one tool may support recognition assessment. Have added an item 6 to the 'evidence to submit' section that asks candidates to explain how one of the tools submitted may be used or modified for recognition assessment. This question is only to be answered if a tool that was specifically designed for recognition assessment wasn't submitted.</b>            RTO 4: Yes.            RTO 5: ?. Not sure whether the following have been adequately addressed: PC 1.3, 1.4, 3.3, 4.5. See further comments in 'Other Notes' section at the end of this document. <b>See Chemène's responses in 'other notes'</b></p>

		<p>section.</p> <p>RTO 6: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 7: Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical aspects of evidence and evidence required</li> </ul>	<p><b>Critical aspects of evidence and evidence required</b></p> <p>RTO 1: Response not recorded.</p> <p>RTO 2: Yes. Covered.</p> <p>RTO 3: No:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the project, point 7 should ask them to clearly identify how they have contextualised an assessment tool, in order to meet critical aspects of assessment. <b>Have added a question to the 'evidence to submit' section in which they are asked to select one assessment tool and discuss how this has been contextualised.</b></li> <li>In order to meet the evidence guide, you might consider changing the wording on page 11 in the project overview to "Develop assessment tools to address 3 different units of competency" instead of "develop 3 competency based assessment tools". <b>Wording changed as per suggestion.</b></li> <li>You will need to change the wording of bullet point 1 in project overview to address Critical aspects of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop assessment tools that support different assessment methods and address at least three units of competency packaged at different AQF levels. <b>Done.</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>RTO 4: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 5: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 6: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 7: Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required knowledge and skills?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Required knowledge and skills</b></p> <p>RTO 1: Response not recorded.</p> <p>RTO 2: Yes. Covered.</p> <p>RTO 3: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 4: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 5: ? Not sure whether the following Req'd knowledge points have been adequately addressed: 3, 5, 6, 7, 10. See further comments in 'Other Notes' section at the end of this document. <b>See Chemène's responses in 'other notes' section.</b></p> <p>RTO 6: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 7: Yes.</p>
3	<p><b>Reflect the dimensions of competence (i.e. reflect realistic working conditions):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Task skills</li> <li>Task management skills</li> <li>Contingency management skills</li> <li>Job / role environment skills</li> </ul>	<p>RTO 1: Yes. Due to the fact of creating 3 tools from a training package of choice to reflect their working environment. Opportunity to document if they were part of a team in developing the tools was good. <b>Thanks!</b></p> <p>RTO 2: Yes. Knowledge questions. Note. In my opinion, transfer skills should also be included in Dimensions of Competency, although I realise it is generally omitted. <b>Point noted. I'm with you. During training I usually mention transfer skills as 'also' being important.</b></p> <p>RTO 3: Yes for all except contingency management skills.</p>

		<p>Consider including a question or a scenario to address a particular problem in designing and developing assessment tools: "After conducting a trial of your assessment tool, you find that one of your assessment methods does not adequately address a performance criteria... What could you do to fix this?" <b>Didn't do this, but I hope that the question added about how a training and assessment pathway tool may be used / modified for recognition assessment addresses contingency. I also feel that the review process should identify recommendations for improvement that should then be made, and I feel that this addresses contingency management skills.</b></p> <p><b>RTO 4:</b> Yes for all except contingency management skills. Contingency is included in the questions but would reflect this dimension more appropriately by including a task in the project of identifying one special need the tool could be adjusted to include and how this could be adjusted. <b>See comments above.</b></p> <p><b>RTO 5:</b> Yes for all except contingency management skills (? Was the response here):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the assessment reflects realistic working conditions</li> <li>• We could not identify contingency management skills for this unit. However we don't believe there is a shortfall in the tool in relation to this. <b>See comments above.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 6:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>RTO 7:</b> Yes.</p>
4	<p><b>Address employability skills:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication</li> <li>• Teamwork</li> <li>• Problem-solving</li> <li>• Initiative and enterprise</li> <li>• Planning and organising</li> <li>• Self-management</li> <li>• Learning</li> <li>• Technology.</li> </ul>	<p><b>RTO 1:</b> Yes. This was all covered within the assessment of this unit.</p> <p><b>RTO 2:</b> Yes. Employability skills evidence throughout assessment tasks.</p> <p><b>RTO 3:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>RTO 4:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>RTO 5:</b> Yes, except a ? for Learning. Comments: We believe that the employability skills are adequately addressed. <b>Thanks.</b></p> <p>It would help if the mapping document provided a brief description of how the tool addresses employability skills, rather than using the 'X'. Same applies with dimensions of competency. <b>Think this is a good idea. Done.</b></p> <p>[re employability skill of Learning] We think it is implied that the assessment tools need to be developed electronically (i.e. not hand written), but maybe this should be made explicit in the instructions or Guidance information. <b>Good point. I made this explicit and added this requirement to the guidance notes in item 2 of the Evidence to submit section of project 1.</b></p> <p><b>RTO 6:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>RTO 7:</b> Yes.</p>
5	<p><b>Reflect the Rules of Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valid</li> <li>• Sufficient</li> <li>• Current</li> </ul>	<p><b>RTO 1:</b> Yes. The workplace referee covers this [authenticity] nicely.</p> <p><b>RTO 2:</b> Yes. Knowledge questions.</p> <p><b>RTO 3:</b> Yes.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authentic?</li> </ul>	<p><b>RTO 4:</b> Yes for all except Valid. Comments re valid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asks the candidate to 'develop a process to review'. Outside competency as this only requires them to apply a review and trial process. <b>Removed this. Thanks!</b></li> <li>• Competency matrix not a requirement of U of C. Have left this requirement in. <b>While a competency matrix is not explicitly listed as a requirement of the unit, the requirement that the tools fully address the requirements of the unit is explicit, and I haven't yet seen another way this is expected to be shown than with a competency matrix. Therefore I have left it in as a requirement. Without this, if assessing a candidate in this unit, I would have a hard job to work out whether or not all parts of the unit were addressed.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 5:</b> Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [re valid] Directly addresses unit</li> <li>• [re sufficient] 3 tools at different levels</li> <li>• [re current] assuming that candidates will develop new tools or use recently developed tools</li> <li>• [re authentic] 3<sup>rd</sup> party report.</li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 6:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 7:</b> Yes.</p>
6	<p><b>Free of unnecessary assessment tasks?</b></p>	<p><b>RTO 1:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 2:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 3:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 4:</b> No. See comment above re validity. <b>RTO 5:</b> Yes. Perhaps project item 5a could apply to all three tools unless they use a different review methodology for each one. <b>Good point. See how I have modified this task to show the option of producing one report for all three tools, or three separate reports.</b> <b>RTO 6:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 7:</b> Yes.</p>
<b>FLEXIBILITY and CLIENT FOCUS</b>		
<b>Criteria—Does/is the assessment tool:</b>		<b>Results (Yes or No) and Comments, were applicable</b>
7	<p>In their current wording, <b>offer candidates flexibility</b> in terms of how each task may be approached?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• can the tool be used in various contexts?</li> <li>• can the tool be adjusted to meet client needs?</li> </ul>	<p><b>RTO 1:</b> Yes. Within this competency candidate[s] have opportunity to use this in a number of work environments which suits most people. <b>RTO 2:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 3:</b> Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options for questions to be answered verbally and/or written</li> <li>• Candidates select their own units of competency to develop assessment tools for, which accommodates flexibility.</li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 4:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 5:</b> Yes. Lots of flexibility – candidates can select any unit from any Training Package and apply it in any context. <b>RTO 6:</b> Yes. <b>RTO 7:</b> Yes. <b>Thank-you. No changes made in this regard.</b></p>



RELIABILITY	
Criteria—Does/is the assessment tool:	Results (Yes or No) and Comments, were applicable
<p>8</p> <p><b>Clear:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear &amp; complete instructions for assessors</li> <li>• Clear &amp; complete instructions for candidates</li> <li>• Plain English</li> <li>• Version control clearly shown?</li> </ul>	<p><b>RTO 1:</b> Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [re instructions for assessors] Great directions – clear.</li> <li>• [re instructions for candidates] Excellent – all spelt out from [sic] them.</li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 2:</b> Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [re instructions for assessors] Quite clear.</li> <li>• [re instructions for candidates] In the instructions, even though it says 3 units need to be designed at the start, in the evidence it refers to a unit of competence. I understand what is meant, but maybe a student might be a little confused. This can be rectified by having “units of competency” in the evidence box. <b>See changes I have made in the ‘evidence to submit’ section to try and clarify this. Good point.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 3:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>RTO 4:</b> Yes. Very clear, easy to read and interpret, plain language.</p> <p><b>RTO 5:</b> Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [re instructions for assessors] Useful Guidance provided in evidence checklist.</li> <li>• [re instructions for candidates]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assessment tool page 11 – third dot point appears to be repeat of second dot point in coloured box? <b>Yes. Please see how I have re-worked this section to incorporate this comment plus other comments relating to this section.</b></li> <li>○ Consider adding requirement that each assessment tool must be prepared electronically / typed (i.e. hand written tools are not acceptable). <b>Done. Requirement added to Project 1, Evidence Required section, item 2.</b></li> <li>○ Consider adding requirement that candidate only develops a tool for a unit for which they have the appropriate technical knowledge (or that they work with a subject matter expert). <b>Done. Added to project introduction, ‘additional info about this project’ section.</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• [re version control]: Version 1.0 in footer.</li> </ul> <p><b>RTO 6:</b> Yes: See changes as indicated in document (Chemène’s addition—this RTO submitted the assessment tool with recommended changes... these changes are proposed in the next section of this report). <b>Changes made as per combination of these suggestions and others noted in this report.</b></p> <p><b>RTO 7:</b> Yes.</p>

## Validation Criteria Checklist

Criteria—Does/is the assessment tool:		Results (Yes or No) and Comments, were applicable
9	<b>Address administrative requirements?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Have space to document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Name of assessor/s &amp; candidate/s</li> <li>– assessment date/s and location/s</li> <li>– candidate's written consent to be assessed</li> <li>– quality of evidence gathered</li> <li>– assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Code &amp; title of the unit/s clearly displayed?</li> <li>● Enable easy administration?</li> </ul>	<p>RTO 1: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 2: Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [re have space to document...] Very clear.</li> <li>● [re enable easy administration] Very straightforward.</li> </ul> <p>RTO 3: Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [re have space to document...] Functional, with lots of room for text and comments.</li> </ul> <p>RTO 4: Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [re have space to document...] Well presented and layout easy to use follow.</li> </ul> <p>RTO 5: Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [re have space to document...] Consider including space in the project checklist to record details of the three units of competency for which candidate developed their tools, and type of assessment instruments provided in each tool.</li> <li>● [re enable easy administration] Consider whether 3 project checklists need to be provided (1 for each tool) or 3 boxes for each evidence item within the project checklist. <b>Good idea. Original TAA versions of these tools did have 3 project checklists, and feedback was that formatting was onerous, and it made the projects seem 'too huge'. Agree that this may be an issue. Hopefully the way the tasks have been re-worded will help clarify requirements. See also checklist at end of document which hopefully spells out exactly what has to be submitted.</b></li> </ul> <p>RTO 6: Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [re have space to document...] See changes as indicated in document. <b>Thanks! Let me know what you think.</b></li> </ul> <p>RTO 7: Yes.</p>
10	<b>Suitable and streamlined:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Contain holistic activities</li> <li>● Enable efficient evidence-gathering activities</li> </ul>	<p>RTO 1: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 2: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 3: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 4: Yes. Clearly.</p> <p>RTO 5: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 6: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 7: Yes.</p>
<b>FAIRNESS</b>		
Criteria—Does/is the assessment tool:		Results (Yes or No) and Comments, were applicable
11	<b>'Friendly'</b> in its structure and wording?	RTO 1: Yes.
12	<b>Contain objective</b> , bias-free language?	<p>RTO 2: Yes. Cert IV level. Very user friendly.</p> <p>RTO 3: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 4: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 5: Yes.</p> <p>RTO 6: Yes. See changes in document marked in red. <b>Thank-you. Changes have been made. Let me know what you think.</b></p>

	RTO 7: Yes.
<b>TYPOS??</b>	
<b>Please use space provided to identify typos you noticed, or email/fax a copy of the assessment tool with typos highlighted</b>	
<p>RTO 1: We tried but couldn't find any!!</p> <p>RTO 2: No response.</p> <p>RTO 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 11 dot point 2 under additional information, replace the word 'both' with 'all' or 'your' <b>This section removed completely as part of improvements made.</b></li> <li>Page 8 Replace Certificate IV with Diploma under Requirements for satisfactory completion. <b>Done. Thanks!</b></li> </ul> <p>RTO 4: No response.</p> <p>RTO 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment Tool page 6 – Should the information in coloured box be written in singular? ('a complete copy') <b>Yes it should. Fixed.</b></li> <li>Assessment Tool page 7 – Should it read 'Competency map' instead of 'Competency gap'? <b>Yes. You are the first validators to notice this. This typo applies to all the Cert IV assessment tools. Thank-you!!!</b></li> <li>Assessment Tool page 8 – Makes reference to 'Certificate IV level' but this unit is written at Diploma level. <b>Noted. See comments re RTO 3 above. Fixed.</b></li> <li>Assessment Tool page 11 – Third dot point refers to 'both' assessment tools, implying two tools instead of three. <b>Good point. This entire section has been re-worked.</b></li> <li>Mapping document – Last column should have #3 at top instead of #4. <b>Very well spotted. Thank-you!</b></li> </ul> <p>RTO 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copy of the assessment tool has been emailed with this document, the proposed changes are indicated in red, these are suggestions only. <b>Good suggestions. Please see changes made to the assessment tool. As far as your comments concerning removal of the 'resubmit' key removed, I removed these when moving from TAA to TAE tools. I wasn't sure if this was just 'my' thing or if other RTOS used it as well. Will keep it out for now, but have added this feedback to the 'continuous improvement register' for consideration when the tools are next updated.</b></li> <li>We have found this assessment tool to be a very professional document and to a high standard, and would be proud to give to our students to assist with their learning pathways. <b>Thank-you!</b></li> <li>The small changes indicated are to address any confusion of the number of assessment tools required and the number of units these are required to address.</li> <li>No key for resubmit. <b>See comments above.</b></li> <li>Small confusion for final, version of assessment tool, can be report of the final version as per unit or actual final version of tool. <b>Hopefully this is clarified in the new version of the tool. I interpreted requirements as being to submit the 'finalised' version of the tool, along with report discussing how the first draft was trialed and reviewed.</b></li> <li>Thank you for allowing us to be part of this process, we look forward to a long association with Blackwater resources. <b>You're welcome!</b></li> </ul> <p>RTO 7: None located.</p>	
<b>Additional comment shared by email</b>	
<b>Re Element 4.4. Make amendments to final tool based on analysis of feedback.</b>	
Your task asks for "proposed changes"	
This covers it but probably they could go the step further and make the changes. <b>Yes, this was the intent. Hopefully this requirement is now clear.</b>	
<b>Summary of feedback/results</b>	
RTO 1: Overall the tool is very user friendly and can be easily integrated into the other assessment tool if required.	
RTO 2: This assessment directly maps across to the competency standard TAEASS502A fulfilling the rules and	

principles of assessment.

**RTO 3:**

- Easy to read, step by step and well structured assessment.
- Consider doing one set of assessment tools for one unit of competency in class, and ensure that one of the assessment tools is written for an assessment only pathway. Yes, if training this unit, I would do this, too. The assessment booklet summarises what needs to be done. If training this, I would set up a case study in which learners design and develop an assessment tool during training, then they may finish off the tool after the conclusion of training and submit as one of the assessment tools for their project. I didn't mandate this, as some RTOs may not have time to do this in their learning and assessment strategy.

**RTO 4:** The validation participants were both impressed with the clarity of the tool and its instructions. It could easily be used as an assessment tool in a learning context or as an assessment only pathway. The directions used simple plain English and the mapping document indicated how the assessment evidence would be gathered. The simple flow chart provides a simple visual explanation of what the assessment contains.

Presentation of tool good.

- On page 12, step 5 requires the candidate to create a competency matrix. I fully agree this should be part of the tool but cannot see where it is a requirement in this unit. (I know it falls part of TAEASS401A). Did IBSA stuff up and not put it in? Even though the validation participants feel it is not part of the competency requirement, they both wanted to retain this task in the assessment. I agree that it should be retained. Please see my comments earlier in this report for my reasons for retaining this requirement.
- On page 12, step 6 includes details of 'Develop a process to review' this implies the candidate must 'create' the process where as the competency infers they are just able to use a standard or workplace criteria. I would change the wording just to 'Conduct a review' with the dot points changed also to say 'select the review process' 'select a criteria' rather than determine. We may be just playing with words but Develop and determine indicate. Good point. I have removed step 6 for the reasons you outline here.
- the candidate is responsible for creating these processes.
- Add into the steps on page 12 the need to incorporate 2 – 3 assessment methods into their tools. This is a requirement of the competency and I did find it on page 13 in the 'evidence to be submitted' but if a candidate does not use this checklist till the end they may have overlooked a critical component of their assessment tools. I have added this on the first page where the project is first explained, and included examples. Hopefully this will help make the important points more clear up front.
- The UOC does not specify 3 assessment tools it could be done in 2 (1 tool covering 2 UOC's at different levels) maybe that could also be included in the instructions so long as is does not become unclear. I am assuming that is why the tool just specifies 3 tools for 3 levels? Lots of history here. In the end, I used a couple of different interpretations of this requirement: for some TAA clients I required 2 tools, with one tool covering 2 units and the second tool covering a third unit at a different AQF level. I feel that this does address the requirements. Another variation I had at one point was for 3 tools to be developed, each addressing one unit, and that the units had to come from at least 2 different levels (i.e. two tools pitched at one level were okay, so long as the third tool was pitched at a different level). I had a call from one RTO that used a tool which showed these requirements, and an auditor had found them non-compliant, saying that 3 different levels were required for the units addressed in each of the 3 tools (even though three different levels weren't specified in the unit). So the bottom line... I have taken the safe road here: three tools based on 3 units at 3 different levels. Hope all this makes sense!
- Overall a really good tool that provides clear instruction and covers the competency requirement.

**RTO 5:**

- We discussed whether the critical aspects of evidence must be interpreted as '3 different units at 3 different AQF levels' or whether it could be interpreted as '3 different units covering at least 2 AQF levels between them'. Yes, I think you can, but have played it safe. See detailed comments above.
- We suspect that the first interpretation reflects the intent of the unit, but note that the second interpretation has been adopted by some RTOs and provides greater flexibility for candidates. Agree! Makes this unit more applicable to people like, say, us, who specialise in Cert IV-level quals.

- Short answer questions 2, 3, 4 – We recommend that the candidate explicitly demonstrates how these concepts have been applied in the tools they develop for the project. Could modify the short answer questions to reflect this or have additional questions that the candidate needs to answer as part of the project. **Did not apply this. It is implied that the report on the review process and outcomes should incorporate this (e.g. a validation record). Happy to take additional feedback from others. Was mindful of not making this project bigger than Ben Hur.**
- Project 1, Item 1 – We recommend adding an additional point to the Guidance requesting the candidate to provide information about the ‘circumstances in which the tool will be used’. **Good idea. Done. New part d of item 1.**
- Project 1, Item 4 – We recommend that candidate also be asked to show the required skills and required knowledge in their mapping document. **Added, but also mindful of comments from two other validators that a competency map may not be required at all.**
- Mapping – We did not feel that Q3 addresses PC1.4. Agree. Not sure what I was thinking there!
- Mapping – We did not feel that Project Item 1 addresses PC1.3 and it could be hard for the assessor to judge whether Item 2 addresses it. **Yes, agree if the assessor is external to the candidate's organisation. I feel that item 1 does implicitly address it with the requirement that ‘any other additional information’ the assessment may need is provided. Also, I have now added requirement that the circumstances in which the tool will be used is described as part of item 1 (re suggestion above) and think that given this, PC 1.3 is addressed to the extent that it can be.**
- Mapping – We weren’t sure about whether PC2.2 has been addressed, perhaps because we were struggling to come up with a clear picture of what the PC is actually asking for. **I struggled with this one as well. Hopefully addition of Evidence to Submit item 6, question b will help.**
- Mapping – We felt that it could be hard for the assessor to judge whether PC3.3 and 4.5 are addressed by Item 2. Maybe get the candidate to explain? **Does addition of requirement that the candidate explain the circumstances in which the tool will be used work for you to address these PCs?**
- Mapping – Not sure that Q6 addresses 4.5. **I think it partially does, and that this, combined with the version control that is required to be shown on the tool would together address this requirement. If designing this for internal clients you could go further and be more specific with requirements, but I’ve tried to keep the context of this tool as being ‘external’ (i.e. public training participants). Other suggestions for future improvements welcome!**
- Mapping – Not sure that we would show Q2 and Q4 against critical aspects of evidence. **Okay. Reference to Qs 2 & 4 Removed from mapping document.**
- Mapping – Not sure that Q1 addresses Required knowledge #3 and #5. **Okay. Removed from knowledge #3 and 5. Added reference to item 6a in project which is a question that has been added about how the tool reflects the candidate's context.**
- Mapping – Not sure how Project Item 2 addresses Required knowledge #6. **Indirect reference here. Information in the Assessment Guidelines section of a training package typically contains info about Rules of Evidence, Principles of Ass’t, contextualisation, etc., and the requirements of the completed assessment tool (item #2) specifically states that the tool must reflect these things. No change made to mapping document.**
- Mapping – While Project Item 2 will provide evidence against Required knowledge #7, we feel that a separate question may be warranted in Task 1. **By task 1, do you mean the short answer questions? Happy to consider adding a question about different assessment methods. Alternatively, I wonder what you think of the addition of info in the introduction to Project 1, giving examples of different assessment methods that need to be incorporated into the tools. Would this be sufficient, or should we add another question? For now, no additional question asked. Happy to look at this for improvements down the track.**
- Mapping – We don’t feel that Q3 should be mapped against the Dimensions of competency (even though the question relates to the candidate’s understanding of the dimensions). **Okay. Removed.**

Overall, a well designed tool, clearly laid out tool which covers the unit reasonably well.

There were some aspects of the unit, identified above, that we would recommend the tool addresses more explicitly. **Please let me know what you think of the adjustments made.**

**RTO 6:** All comments made in the 'typos' section above.

**RTO 7:** The instructions and Mapping document, and Assessment Booklet are easy to navigate and provides a clear and unambiguous understanding of what is required by the RTO, Assessor and Candidate. **Thank-you.**

end of document