Validation Record

Part 1: General Information

Validation details	
Validation led by	Chemène Sinson (Blackwater Projects)
Validation date and times	Friday, 07 August, 1:30 – 3:30pm
Validation approach	Webinar
Purpose and focus of the Validation	
Purpose	Validate an assessment tool
Relevant unit/s	TAEASS401 Plan assessment activities and processes TAEASS402 Assess competence TAEASS403 Participate in assessment validation
Resources needed (emailed to validators prior to the validation webinar)	- This validation record - Units of competency covered in this assessment tool - Assessment requirements for each unit covered in this assessment tool - Assessment booklet for the unit/s covered - Assessment tools: Instructions for use and marking guide - Competency matrix (map) (for possible discussion) A pdf assessment summary handout showing an alternative way to set up practical tasks (projects) where more tasks are completed during training time.
Participants	

Name	Organisation / RTO
Alison Webb	Macarthur Community College
Lisa Bale	North Coast TAFE (NSW)
David Wurth	Ctrain
Maggie Griffin	Federation Training
Marianne Harling	TAFE Queensland: East Coast
Judy Drane	TAFE Western

Part 2: Code of conduct

Participants in this validation acknowledge and agree that:

1. **Be honest, respectful and open-minded**
   With me and with each other

2. **Equal 'air time'**
   Allow everyone to have their say without interruption

3. **Share diverse opinions—aim for consensus, time permitting**
   With these assessment tools, I'm trying to produce a 'one-size-fits-all' product that suits as many RTOs as possible and that is flexible enough for RTOs to adapt to suit their needs. Please share what you need in your RTO, and I'll do my best to accommodate this in the final product.

4. **Chemène will listen—she'll decide response to mixed feedback**
   Further to above: I'll do my best to meet everyone's needs, knowing that fully meeting such diverse needs with one product is impossible. But I'll try to get as close as possible!!

5. **Copyright**
   Please respect copyright of the materials and templates we'll use in the validation. I realise that your RTO may or may not end up purchasing the licence to use them. Do not distribute them to others.

6. **Confidentiality**
   I will produce documented validation record for each assessment tool validated. I will distribute this record to all RTOs who purchase the TAE40115 resource suite. I may also post the record on my website (still undecided)

   Unless you request otherwise, I will list you (name and RTO) as a participant on the validation record. Please let me know if you prefer that I not list you as a participant (in this case I would list you as 'anonymous' on the validation record). If I don't hear from you I'll assume you are willing for me to name you as a validation participant.

7. **Mute mic when not speaking**
   Just protocol, to reduce background noise during the webinar.

Did all participants agree to these terms:		
● verbally at the start of the validation meeting ● or by email beforehand?	☑ Yes	☐ No (details below)

Key

Throughout the rest of this document, text typed using:

- **Black** or coloured font—notes items discussed and validator feedback

- **Purple** font—notes Chemène's response to feedback and conclusions drawn about that feedback.

Part 3: General questions about this particular assessment tool

	Question	Yes	No	Comments
1	**Should we keep all introductory information in the assessment booklet?**	☑	☐	**Email comment:** Instructions to the assessor are included in the student facing Assessment Booklet. Suggest having a student copy with student only instructions, and assessor copy which includes assessor instructions **Webinar comments:** Keep as-is. Chemène to review feedback from other validations and make a final decision after validation series concludes.
2	**Should we keep assessment guide** as part of the main booklet or present as a stand-alone document?			Stand alone 2 Keep it in same doc 2 **Consensus:** during validation, consensus was keep it as same document, but with email respondents, consensus is 50:50. Chemène to compare these findings with those of other validator groups and make a final decision.
3	**From participant manuals:** Should we remove blank templates from appendices to reduce bulk?	☑	☐	**Email comment** Provide as separate file. Less printing for student if they prefer hard copy of manual (which many students do) **Webinar consensus:** remove (unanimous) Chemène to compare these findings with others' and make final decision based on general consensus.
4	**From templates:** Should we remove non-essential templates (e.g. client consultation plan in DES)	☑	☑	**Email comment** Only include templates essential for assessment. Less confusing for student. Those who want other docs to collate/report further information they can create that themselves. **Webinar:** Keep all templates for this module, as candidates must choose which templates are most suitable for the assessments they complete.
5	**Change term 'project' to 'task'** Should I change the term 'project' (e.g. Project 1) to Task (e.g. Task 1?)	☑	☐	Validator opinions (total of webinar and email contributions): ● One person: Tasks for things done in class, but project for post-training tasks 1 ● Change to task (3 people) ● Keep project (1 person). **This validator group seems to prefer 'task'. Chemene to compare with opinions of other validator groups.**

	Question	Yes	No	Comments
6	**Task 1 handout—completed during training** Change from Project 1 assessment booklet to Task 1 handout (to simplify and hopefully avoid confusion)	☑	☐	**Email:** All terminology should be consistent. **Webinar:** Validators agreed to call it Task 1 Handout (not assessment booklet). This way there is one assessment booklet for each module.
7	**Should we keep master record of assessment results for assessments completed during training?** Do people use this?	☑	☐	**Webinar:** 100% said not needed **Email comment:** Organisation processes used for records of assessment.
8	**ASS: Assessment plan template** Should we simplify assessment plan templates to stick with basically what will happen and when, and remove other logistical information such as list of documents required or people to be informed?	☐	☑	Validator comments: - Don't change (4 validators) Validators commented that assessment plan in current template gives a good roadmap and prompts particular unit requirements, such as the need to identify specialist support available - Yes, simplify (1 validator – email comment). **Chemène will leave the same.**
9	**ASS:** Should we break up Project 2 into two separate Projects? Or four?	☑	☐	**Loads of discussion during webinar—** consensus reached is summarised in 'other comments' below. **Email comment:** Leave as one. Instructions clearly state what needs to be done to successfully complete the task.
10	**ASS:** Should we introduce case studies (e.g. I have assess RPL and moderate decision, plan assessment and assess, and participate in assessment validation). This means post-training tasks are Plan and assess once (can we make this choice of RPL or training and assessment pathway?) See attached handout: 'alternative assessment approach'	☑	☐	**Email comments:** No handout provided. Case study for one of the two assessments may be ok, but still have projects for plan assessment and participate in assessment validation **Webinar discussion:** Outcomes in 'other comments' section below
11	**Other comments?**			**Email comment** **Re. Short answer questions** Suggest that the information provided in the Assessment Guide be included in the instructions – better to have it all in one place rather than referring to a separate document or section of the booklet. **Chemène response:** good point! Chemène to see what other validator groups say and adjust assessment based on wider consensus.

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			Webinar ● No other comments ● Maybe keep task 3 in two parts, per unit.

Final decision of validators (webinar):

Assessment tasks (practical) will be set up like this:

Part 4: Validation Checklist

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:		Yes	No	**Comments**
VALIDITY				
1	**Clearly identify units** assessed by code and title	☑	☐	
2	**Address all aspects of the competency standard/s assessed:**			
	● Elements and performance criteria	☐	☑	One validator identified that TAEASS402 P.C. 3.4 "Access required specialist support in accordance with the assessment plan" was not sufficiently addressed. After discussion, validators agreed that: **Chemène will modify Q5 to include reasonable adjustments and specialist support: Add part C to cover specialist support.**
	● Foundation Skills to the level described in the unit	☑	☐	
	● Performance evidence	☑	☐	
	● Knowledge evidence	☑	☐	TAEASS403 Knowledge evidence item: "relevant Workplace Health and Safety (WHS) legislation, codes of practice, standards and guidelines that impact on assessment" not sufficiently covered. After discussion, validators agreed that: Candidates could provide this information as part of response to existing short answer question 1e. To prompt this response, Chemène will: ● Add information about WHS to the section of the participant manual that covers roles and responsibilities of assessors (from which participants normally draw information to guide their response to this question) ● To the marking guide for this question, add requirement that WHS is part of the response.
	● Conditions for assessment	☑	☐	
3	**Include realistic work tasks** that are relevant to the unit/s assessed	☑	☐	
4	**Reflect realistic work conditions and requirements** (dimensions of competence):			

Validation Criteria			
Does/is the assessment tool:	**Yes**	**No**	**Comments**
● Task skills	☑	☐	
● Task management skills	☑	☐	
● Contingency management skills	☑	☐	
● Job / role environment skills	☑	☐	
5 **Reflect the Rules of Evidence:**			
● Valid	☑	☐	
● Sufficient	☑	☐	
● Current	☑	☐	
● Authentic	☑	☐	
6 **Pitched at the correct AQF level**	☑	☐	
7 **Free of unnecessary assessment tasks**	☐	☑	**Question 6:** ● Keep and expand to include before, during and after 1 ● Remove 3 ● Keep 1 **Outcome: Remove question 6** **Projects 1 & 2:** Between these projects, participants must plan 3 assessments. Chemène to remove requirement to plan one assessment from the current Project 2. **Outcome**: New task breakdown—see page 5—we have reduced total number of assessment plans required to two.
FLEXIBILITY AND FAIRNESS			
8 **Offer a reasonable range of flexible options** for how candidates complete and submit assessment tasks	☑	☐	
9 **Include information about available support** and guidance if needed	☑	☐	**Email:** This information should be provided by the RTO assessor as part of the student orientation and introductory information. **Note from Chemène:** The assessment booklet templates prompt RTOs to add information about where people can go if they have questions.
RELIABILITY			
10 **Clear and easy to read:**			**Email comment:**

Validation Criteria			
Does/is the assessment tool:	**Yes**	**No**	**Comments**
● Structure and layout is logical and easy-to-follow	☐	☐	Lay-out is easy to follow once you become familiar with it. Can be a bit confusing flicking between two documents or sections of documents. E.g. assessment booklet refers students to the Assessment guidelines for further information.
			Possible solution – have all the information for each task together in one place. Have a separate section in the Assessment booklet for each assessment task which contains all information i.e. instructions, guidelines and FAQs.
			Sections of the Assessment booklet would be:
			Assessment 1
			Assessment 2
			Assessment 3
			Short Answer questions
			Chemène response: One other validator for a different assessment tool) suggested something like this also: the challenge is that we had feedback from many people to say that they wanted detail to go away altogether. So they like all detail in one place in Assessment Guide at back of document. Will discuss at remaining validations, and see what consensus is, but so far I'm hearing that current set-up is preferred by most. Will mull this.
● Plain English	☑	☐	
11	Include clear and complete:			
● **instructions for assessors**	☑	☐	Consider having a student copy of the Assessment booklet with student only instructions, and an assessor copy which included instructions to the assessor.
			Response: Will consider this. To date, no-one else has suggested. If I make changes, it will be to the global template.
● **instructions for candidates**	☑	☐	
12	**Clearly identify version control**	☐	☐	
13	**Enable easy administration:**			
● Have space to document: – Name of assessor/s & candidate/s – assessment date/s and location/s – candidate's written consent to be assessed	☑	☐	In another validation, the suggestion was made to add space to note USI number to cover sheet. Will do this.

Validation Criteria			
Does/is the assessment tool:	**Yes**	**No**	**Comments**
– comments about quality of evidence gathered – assessment results ● Can the above easily be located in the assessment documentation?	☑	☐	

Part 5: Validation outcomes

Summary of feedback and recommendations

Validators agreed that the following changes should be made:

Short answer questions:

- Modify question 5: add part c to ask about specialist support.
- Eliminate question 6 about assessment briefing.
- Adapt participant manual—section describing assessor roles and responsibilities—to include mention of WHS responsibilities (to prompt responses that include reference to WHS responsibilities and therefore address knowledge evidence covering assessors' WHS responsibilities).
- Adapt marking guide for short answer question 1e to include requirement that safety is mentioned.

Projects / tasks:

Re-align projects/tasks so they are as follows:

Global template:

Consider the following changes (pending discussion outcomes of other webinars):

- Place detailed assessment guidance for each project/task to be positioned at the end of the task, rather than having a separate second for all guidance.
- Add USI information to cover sheet
- Change terms: project to task
- Consider moving instructions for assessors to a different document
- Consider moving requirements to short answer questions to be part of instructions for short answer questions, rather than at the back, in the assessment guide.

Recommended Actions		
Action required	**By whom?**	**By when?**
1	Finalise this report	Chemène	Within 10 days
2	Prepare next draft and email to validators for optional review	Chemène	ASAP
3	Finalise assessment tool and make available to clients	Chemène	ASAP
Signatures of validators		

Did all participants agree—either verbally or by reply email—that this report represents an accurate reflection of discussions and their outcomes?	☑ Yes	☐ No (details below)

end of record