



**BLACKWATER
PROJECTS**

Validation Record

**Validation of draft assessment tool covering
TAEASS502 Design and develop assessment tools**

Validation date

28 June 2018

Finalised assessment tool first published

20 July 2018

Contents

Validation Questionnaire	3
Appendix – Follow-up discussions	28

Validation Questionnaire

Part 1: General Information

Validation details			
Validation led by	Chemène Sinson (Blackwater Projects)		
Validation date and times	Thursday, 28 June 2018, 10:00am – 12:00noon		
Validation approach	Webinar		
Purpose and focus of the Validation			
Purpose	Validate the approach to be used in the assessment tool		
Relevant unit/s	TAEASS502 Design and develop assessment tools		
Resources needed (emailed to validators prior to the validation webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This validation questionnaire • Version 1, draft 1 of the assessment tool to be validated • Copies of unit/s covered and their assessment requirements 		
Participants			
	Name	Organisation / RTO	Position
Webinar attendees			
1	Narelle Robson	The Gordon Institute of TAFE	Teacher – Training and Assessment
2	Deb Sytema	The Gordon Institute of TAFE	Teacher – Training and Assessment
3	Marlene Medley	The Gordon Institute of TAFE	Course designer
4	Jenny McFarlane	Kiss Training	Training Manager
5	Sandie McCoy	TAFE Queensland	Product Lead, Educator Support Services
6	Jo Bowman	TAFE Queensland	Leading Vocational Teacher, Professional Services
7	Rachael Allen	State Emergency Services	Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement Coordinator
8	Aaron McGifford	State Emergency Services	Project Team Leader, Training Directorate
9	Maureen Cooper	Swinburne University of Technology	Teacher Education
10	Suellen Loki	Go TAFE	Training and Assessment – Educational Development Services
11	FLTLT Susan Stone	Australian Defence Force, Training Systems School	Training Support and Governance
12	LEUT Nicole Grundy	Australian Defence Force, Training Systems School	Training Support and Governance

Continued over

Validation record
TAEASS502 Design and develop assessment tools

	Participants by email		
13	David Wurth	CTrain	Principal
14	Madeleine Hopkins	Salve Training and Consulting	Director
15	Peter Murphy	RMIT University	Facilitator, Diploma TDD
16	Su Montgomery	Kiama Community College	TAE Coordinator/Trainer and Assessor
17	Maria Wiley	Kiama Community College	TAE trainer and assessor
18	Maggie Griffin	Federation Training	TAE trainer

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'**
 - Speak up – everyone's input is important
 - Let others speak – give others time to speak, 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 your RTO needs from this assessment tool, 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 meeting such diverse needs with one product can be tricky. 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 not end up purchasing the licence to use them. All validation materials are provided commercially, in confidence. Do not distribute them to others.
- 6. Confidentiality**
I will produce a documented validation record for the validation and will post the validation record on the Blackwater Projects website: <http://blackwaterprojects.com.au/tae-resources/download-materials.html>.
Anyone who visits the website will be able to access and download this validation record.
Unless you request otherwise, on the validation record, I will name you as a participant. Please email me to advise if you prefer that I not list you by name (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 to be named.
- 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)

Part 3: Questionnaire

Key

In the comments column below:

- **Charcoal grey** text shows validators' comments
- **Purple** text shows Chemène's responses to comments and/or summaries of what validators agreed on, following discussion.

Question	Comments
SECTION 1 – the 'do you like it' section	
General comments	
<p>1 What immediate, general comments do you have, if any?</p>	<p style="background-color: #d4edda; margin: 0;">Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Really like the instructions and FAQ section particularly – helped me clarify some Qs I had about the ass reqs for this unit! 2. This is comprehensive – there are a lot of instructions – good! The Competency Map is thorough and useful except for references to F and G. Is there an Assessment Results sheet for Tasks 2 and 3? We find the numbering of the assessment tasks a little confusing – Task 1 says there are three tools to be created. So, what are tasks 2 and 3 (we assume you mean the two done in the workplace)? Good point. This confusion was caused by a typo on the assessment results page (see comment No1 in the 'typo' section, below). In draft 1 of this tool, there was only one practical task—this task required development of 3 tools. 3. Re use of colour fonts; is there an accessibility issue here? Can the use of colour be replaced by a combination of italics, underlining, bold etc? Another good point. Since any changes to the colour scheme would require a change to the global template (and affect other documents in the product suite), the decision was taken to revisit this feedback when the global template is next being reviewed and updated. 4. Consider replacing bullet points, dashes etc with 1.1.1, 1.1.2 or some other such numbering system to make referencing easier. Same response as comment 3 above. 5. very early in each document (as applicable) I'd make a clear distinction between assessment tools /methods/tasks/instruments as, in my experience, when I say "tool" many VE practitioners start talking about "instruments" e.g. one assessment method is observation i.e. watch candidates perform a task, while an associated instrument you might use for this method might be an observation checklist (in order to gather/record the evidence on which you base your competent/not yet competent judgement) pg 22 - 1 - would it be helpful here to spell out in more detail the nature of the documentation and material that makes up a tool eg student instructions, assessor instructions, assessment/competency mapping, etc. This was briefly discussed in the webinar, in a general sense. The point was made that this is not the learning resource, it is the summative assessment task, and therefore it is appropriate to ask 'up front' for assessment tools. 6. Apropos the last point, in a couple of places you state something like "assessment instruments support 2-3 different assessment methods" which I think is putting the cart before the horse i.e. I think you should first

Question	Comments
	<p>talk of the methods being used then talk about the instruments used to capture evidence relevant for that method. See response to comment 5 above.</p> <p>7. Familiar format, plain English. Everything provided for effective tool for both candidate and assessor.</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Liked the simplicity.</p> <p>Question discussed—should Task 1 (which requires development of 3 assessment tools) be divided into three separate tasks, requiring development of one tool, each? Discussion points made included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> probably easier to split it into 3 tasks to enable submission of individual tasks that can have progressive feedback I think split into 3 tasks, so feedback is per task and not as overwhelming if they need to correct anything. They can also take on lessons learnt from task 1 into task 2. Rationale: We need feedback on one tool first. We want them to validate the tool first, then submit the first tool. More than one validator commented on this. <p>Question raised: How do we define 'trial' (and therefore, what evidence of trialling the assessment tool should be accepted)? Draft 1 of the tool required a dry run as a trial, but more than one auditor asked if a peer assessment would also be suitable. Options discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option A – keep as is – require a 'dry run' assessment with someone Option B – allow a peer review (e.g. validation) to be the trial Option C – something else. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trial – there was a lack of consensus among validators in terms of what constitutes a trial and what we should require in terms of a trial for TAEASS502 candidates. Comment 1: There could be WHS issues in trialling practical tasks in industry without a qualified assessor present Comment 2: The unit doesn't require validation, we believe our 'validation' process is more than a 'trial' ... Comment 3: The reality is that dry runs with students would be very unlikely due to many constraints. Validation and peer review is realistic and useful to all learners. Question: Why can't a 'current student' be involved in option A? Question: If we are trialling it, has the person been deemed competent previously, or have they been trained to be able to trial the assessment? Even though trialling doesn't want an assessment outcome, you still need someone to be competent or have been trained prior to assessment. WHS aspects as well. <p>Agreed actions Validators agreed that Chemène will: <i>Re how 'trial' will be treated</i></p>

Question	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the TAEASS502 assessment instructions, instruct candidates to conduct a trial which is a dry run. Leave as-is and let different RTOs decide how to do this. • Choose one consistent term for 'trial' (currently multiple terms are used, including trial, dry run, and pilot – choose one and stick with it throughout all assessment tool documentation) • Add new FAQ about this task, listing options on what could constitute a suitable trial. Reference PwC Interpretation guide in this response. Add a note that context is very important when considering best way to trial (e.g. WHS considerations). <p>Re assessment tasks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divide Task 1 into three separate tasks. • Add to the new Task 3, the current questions asked about how candidates developed the assessment tool. • Revisit repetition between knowledge questions and questions about Task 3. • Consider including WHS questions into the 'background info' • Chemène to look into fewer tables in the assessment tool • (Go back and review) Emphasise tools, not instruments in the assessment task FAQs and in the marking criteria
2	<p>List any typos you notice (page number references are for the assessment booklet, unless otherwise noted)</p> <p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See point 2 of item 1: Assessment Results sheet – Task 1 should read, "Design and develop three (3) assessment tools" (not one tool). Already fixed, but note that we will now divide Task 1 into three separate tasks. 2. None noticed so far 3. pg 8 - "Requirements for a competent result" still refers to units (plural) in a cluster not a single unit Actioned. 4. pg 10 - "Instructions 1" - delete ", then" Actioned 5. pg 11 - I'd have "5 Training packages and their use" start on pg 12 Not actioned – when participants enter responses, pagination will change; entering a page break will cause formatting issues when participants start typing responses. 6. pg 13 - 3rd dot point - why not use "trial" straight away rather than introduce the terms "pilot" and "dry run"? If this is agreed to then you'll need to do a "Find and replace" on this and other documents (as I notice pilot is used elsewhere through the whole package) Actioned 7. pg 18 - "What to do"; 1 - add "of" after "stages"; 2 - 1st dot point should be "yourself" not "you" Actioned 8. pg 23 - "How to get started", first sentence - add "to" after "how" Actioned 9. pg 26 - top of page, second dot point, delete "were" from "were used in the trial" Actioned <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - point 5, first dot point c. first dash, reword Actioned - point 5, final dot point put "contain" as first word (for consistent use of a verb at the start of each dot point) Actioned

Question	Comments
	<p>10. Marking guide: insert the word how: Question 2 PART B: Give an example of HOW you incorporate reasonable adjustment into the design and development of an assessment tool. Actioned</p> <p>11. Assessment cover sheet: Capitalise T in 'This portfolio contains...' Not actioned – word 'this' is the continuation of a sentence that started above, so T should not be capitalised.</p> <p>12. Assessment cover sheet: Rto Name (change to RTO) Not actioned = Rto is a deliberate insertion; when an RTO purchases the materials, they do a 'find and replace all' for Rto Name and then replace this phrase with the full name of the RTO. It is purposely capitalised as in this example, to distinguish between time when the term RTO is referred to in the materials, and from instances when the RTO must name their RTO.</p> <p>13. p.6 – In explanation of 2 sections change "space provided in..." to "spaces provided in..." Actioned</p> <p>14. p. 7 Change space to spaces Actioned</p> <p>15. p.7 Point 3 under 'organise your portfolio' – Replace term "position" with "Place" (position is listed twice, and both times should be replaced with placed) AND... Change "supporting documents you refer to" to "supporting documents that you refer to..." Actioned</p> <p>16. Instructions for knowledge questions: Change item 2 to: "Answer the questions on pp. 11-12." Not done – too dangerous to refer to specific page numbers, in case RTOs using this tool re-arrange how they present assessment tasks – in this case page numbers referenced would be incorrect. Furthermore, since this assessment tool is designed for participants to complete, by the time questions have been answered, the page number reference will be incorrect (i.e. questions may start on page 11, but likely would finish much later – e.g. around page 15).</p> <p>17. All sections reading, "To the candidate replace your text with this response" Change to reference the question – e.g. "To the candidate: replace this text with your response to question 1." Apply the same strategy to the evidence items for the task. Not applied to this tool, but listed as an item for future consideration – if I make this change, I will need to apply it across the entire suite of materials. I am concerned that this increases the chance of errors. Will revisit this in the next major review.</p> <p>18. Question 4: Change wording from Part A above to 'a)' above. Actioned</p> <p>19. Task 1, item 7 – Change to, "Name the assessment tool you selected" (add 'ed' to end of select) Actioned</p> <p>20. P.17 (Instructions for foundation skill checklist) – sentence: "... may complete the checklist on each occasion" to "... checklist for each assessment tool." Actioned</p> <p>21. P.17 "your trainer will complete..." change to "your trainer may..." Actioned</p> <p>22. P.17 – add full stops to end of points 1, 2 and 3 at bottom of page. Actioned</p> <p>23. Typo! P.18 – Change (whose work are asking you to...) to whose work you are being asked to..." Actioned</p> <p>24. P.18 Change providing to provide (in your role is not to judge section) Actioned</p>

Question	Comments
	<p>25. Typo! P. 18 Change throughout all stage this process to 'throughout all stages of this process' Actioned</p> <p>26. P.18 – Change provide information about you to provide information about yourself. Actioned</p> <p>27. p.21 Assessment Guide: This guide is written for you (not this guide is directed at you) Actioned</p> <p>28. p.21 Assessment Guide: Add 'that' so last sentence first paragraph reads, "contains the same criteria that you'll find here." Actioned</p> <p>29. P.22 FAQ 3 – First sentence: remove second 'each' (it's repeated). Also remove final sentence in brackets. Actioned</p> <p>30. P.22 FAQ 4 – Last sentence, add 'it' so it reads, "... discussing it with your TAE Trainer..." Actioned</p> <p>31. P. 23 FAQ 7 – Add 'the' to top sentence so it reads, "... read the information below..." Actioned</p> <p>32. P.26 – Item 4, second last line – add 'that' so it reads, "... documents that you used..." Actioned</p> <p>33. Marking guide P.6 Instructions for questions (also assessment booklet): Remove 'you' from bullet points 2 and 4. Actioned</p> <p>34. Marking guide p.10 – Part B heading change incorporate to 'incorporating' Not actioned – disagreed with this suggestion</p> <p>35. Marking guide p.11 – Under Authentic explanation, change 'perform a task' to 'performing a task' Actioned</p> <p>36. Marking guide p.12 – place etc outside of brackets. Actioned</p> <p>37. Marking guide p.18 – First paragraph, last sentence: Add 'as' so it reads, "... contains the same criteria as you'll..." Actioned</p> <p>38. Instructions for use of assessment tools p.8 – add 'to' to sentence in first bullet – so it reads ... "must complete to demonstrate competence" Actioned</p> <p>39. Instructions for use of asst tools p.11 – bottom bullet – add 'more' so it reads, "one or more assessment tasks..." Actioned</p> <p>40. Instructions for use of asst tools p.12 – add 'of' to second bullet under 'TAE Trainers should' heading so it reads, "... unsure of what is expected..." Actioned</p> <p>41. Instructions for use of asst tools P.19 Change bullet 2 (bold section) – add 'of' so it reads, "versions of any..." Actioned</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Chemène will deal with all typos. What else did webinar participants identify?</p> <p>42. More user-friendly example of attachment on page 7 - Clearly label the document as, "Attachment 01 Task 2 Learning Plan." Rewrite) Actioned – follow organisational naming convention. Not actioned – I feel that this additional detail may confuse some participants – suggest TAE Trainers discuss with participants, if applicable.</p> <p>Agreed actions: Chemène actioned most suggestions listed above. Where a suggestion was not actioned, she added comments to explain why.</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
General questions about the assessment booklet			
<p>3 Do we still need a Third-Party Verification page at the beginning of the assessment booklet?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No: I don't think they're worth that much any more. 2. YES: Do you mean p 9 Third party authentication? If so, we think it's useful. If so, we'd tick yes. 3. YES: I think this is a very useful addition. Particularly so because of the number of advertisers stating how they can 'do' assignments! I've seen dozens of them recently. Although it might not actually stop plagiarising or cheating from happening - it does at least provide RTOs with evidence that they've attempted verification of students' own work (authentication) 4. Yes and no: The intent of the Third party verification is valid, however the authenticity of this paper is questionable when completed by students. The trainer/assessor should be able to verify the students' work when attending face to face classes. Consider using if running delivery via a distance mode. Authenticity is covered in Coversheet. Maybe a workplace referee for the entire TAE40116 at the beginning of the course or combining the TPA and foundation skills to be become one. <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Feedback received in webinar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No - not sure what it adds to the process - surely the authenticity can be assured by the assessor. Why add complexity and more questions about the authenticity of the 3rd party? • Yes – I think it's useful. • Only if the candidate has provided evidence from their workplace and verification is required that the work is their own (i.e. not plagiarised) • If it's optional, can be included as an appendix – i.e. moved from the front of the document. <p>Suggest keeping the 'foundation skills' tasks but only gather evidence of oral communication and interacting with others. All of the other foundation skills are evidenced in other parts of the task.</p> <p>Agreed actions</p> <p>Chemène to keep third party authentication form in the tool, but add information for RTOs that they should consider the circumstances of how they will assess their RTO candidates, then decide whether to keep it, or remove it – they should remove it if they are confident that they can guarantee authenticity of the evidence without this form.</p> <p>Chemène has applied these changes to the READ First – How to prepare the materials for use in your RTO document, downloadable from the Blackwater Projects website: http://blackwaterprojects.com.au/tae-resources/free-downloads/</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<p>4 Are you happy with the content of the Assessment Guide (appendix of the assessment booklet)? If so, what changes, deletions or additions do you recommend?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Identified by Chemène before the webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified a typo on last page – reference to TAEASS401 removed from assessment criteria for evidence item 7. <p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Yes 3. Yes and No: The FAQs are useful. P 27 – evidence area 7 dot point 1: suggest alteration to sentence structure for clarity of understanding: In your responses, directly address all parts of all questions asked. <i>Chemène: good point. The final version of the tool no longer contains item 7, so this suggestion was not actioned.</i> 4. P.27 – not sure how this adds to the tool. This is the last page of the assessment booklet. <i>Unsure if this person is commenting on this entire section or just something on this page. No action taken.</i> 5. No: With the assessment guide FAQ 2. “May I base the assessment tools I develop on performance benchmarks from my own workplace?” I could be way off base here – wondered though if you could say “No. etc” but perhaps add something about contextualisation with their workplace? <i>Good idea. I have modified the response to invite people to contextualise a unit for their workplace.</i> 6. Yes. That said: Page 27, Question 7 – remove reference to TAEASS401. <i>Note from Chemène: got it, already actioned!</i> 7. In regards to the Foundation skills checklist, we are questioning the three copies to be provided and would like one to be provided overarching the three assessment tools. <i>Discussed in webinar (see below)</i> 8. Excellent instruction for use of Blackwater templates or workplace documents. <i>Thank you!</i> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p><i>Discussed whether we must ask for three foundation skills questionnaires to be completed – i.e. one for each assessment tool developed</i></p> <p>Summary of discussion: Validators from two RTOs noted that ASQA auditors told them the same evidence should be provided for all three tools developed, but common sense says one FS checklist should be sufficient, especially if completed by the TAE trainer.</p> <p>Consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validators preferred one FS checklist if this would be deemed compliant. • Validators from one RTO suggested that the FS checklist – which currently covers all relevant foundation skills—should address only oral communication and interact with others. <p>Agreed actions</p>

Question		Yes	No	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemène will seek advice from people with ASQA audit experience, to ask if one FS checklist to cover all three tools developed for this assessment, is acceptable. Chemène will revisit criteria on the FS checklist and decide whether or not to retain only those criteria that relate to oral communication and interact with others. <p>Actions taken after further consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After seeking further advice from audit specialists, I (Chemène) have <u>retained the requirement that the foundation skills checklist is completed three times</u> in total, once for each tool. We have been told that we must ask for the same evidence for each assessment tool developed. I reviewed the foundation skills checklist and <u>removed criteria that covers foundation skills other than oral communication, interact with others and navigate the world of work (on advice)</u>. I will create a case study handout for optional use during training, which will give participants an opportunity to design and develop an assessment tool during training time, and under supervision of the TAE trainer – in this case study handout, there is a foundation skills checklist – I will retain criteria relating to all foundation skills, as the TAE trainer will have opportunity to directly observe use of most foundation skills, not just oral communication and interact with others.
Knowledge questions				
5	Are you happy with the Knowledge Questions ? If not, what changes, deletions or additions do you recommend?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes: Really well-worded and certainly cover the knowledge evidence of the assessment guidelines. It took us a while to work out that a number of the Knowledge Evidence points were not covered in your list of Knowledge Questions - - but we eventually realised they are covered when the participant deals with point 7 on p 15 (“select one of the assessment tools - - -”) <u>This is now resolved with our new organisation of assessment tasks.</u> No: The dimensions of competency are important. I’d suggest a question which asks what the dimensions of competency actually are and then an explanation for each one. I think this is important because assessment tasks must be looked at holistically. An understanding of the dimensions of competency may help participants to grasp this concept. <u>The dimensions were asked about in the first version of this assessment tool, but I have enhanced the question in the new Task 4 - see new TAEASS502 Task 4, Q3.</u> Wondering Removal of point 2 in 4d. Do not think we need to justify why PPE is not required? <u>Fair point. Done, and will apply this change to the clustered tool, also.</u> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Discussed WHS at length. General consensus was that WHS is very important and should be questioned with every tool developed, rather than in the knowledge questions segment.</p> <p>Dimensions of competency not explicitly discussed in the webinar.</p> <p>One validator commented that ASQA had questioned the use of 'briefly' in the knowledge questions. Suggested 'briefly' should not be part of the question.</p> <p>Agreed actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHS: Moved WHS knowledge question from the knowledge questions to the background info (actioned). Remove WHS-related questions from the questions about how the assessment tool was developed (not actioned – see Appendix for details) • Dimensions of competence: Chemène to revisit how participants are asked about the dimensions of competence, to ensure they are adequately covered (actions taken: added new TAEASS502 Task 4, Q3) • Remove the term, 'briefly' from all questions (actioned).
Task 1: Design and develop three (3) assessment tools			
6	Are you happy with the Task Instructions ? If not, what changes, deletions or additions do you recommend?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes and no: Do you mean p 7? Or task overview on p 13? Both have clear instructions but we are not sure how participants will interpret Task 1 – design and develop three tools and then Task 2, Task 3 (as these latter two are actually part of Task 1). <i>This feedback addressed when we divided Task 1 into three separate tasks.</i> 3. No: Just a suggestion regarding any answers participants give. To make entirely sure they answer all parts of knowledge questions OR all parts of a task add this instruction <i>Note: In your answers below, please reproduce (copy and paste) each heading and write your answers under each heading.</i> My experience has been that if participants/candidates don't copy and paste questions they will frequently miss answering sections. This then requires a lot of to-ing and fro-ing between assessor and participant (candidate). <i>Valid point – Chemène will revisit this and explore possibilities for this – concerned that the 'tip' will become lost in detail. After further reflection, added 'tip' to the marking guide, suggested that TAE trainers share this tip with participants when explaining assessment. Chemène to revisit the template and see if a separate response box should be given for each part of each question in future assessment tools.</i> 4. No: It is not clear that example 1 (page 14, assessment booklet) needs to be replicated three times. Instructions in

	Question	Yes	No	Comments
				<p>the ‘what to do’ need to be more prominent and that it needs to be completed three times. This was addressed with the decision to separate Task 1 into three tasks.</p> <p>5. 1d: Not sure of the purpose here? What is the purpose, to assess? We have students always unsure of what this means. Q1c asks about the purpose of the assessment tool and explicitly covers PC 1.1, so suggest keeping it—I have added examples to this question, to help with clarity. Maybe consolidate b and d? Not actioned: Item 1b asks for a description of target candidates (PC 1.1) and item 1d was added to cover PC 1.4 after two audits identified that PC 1.4 was not covered strongly enough. I have kept the two parts separate to guarantee compliance, but have reworded Part D to give more clear instructions.</p> <p>6. 1e – list stakeholders involved in initial process. Assume this refers to Q1d Describe how and with whom you researched and identified information provided in your responses to questions a-c above. No changes made. Felt the suggestion was vague, and may have led to a list of other TAE participants.</p> <p>7. 1f – change of wording to “list all documents including RTO/industry requirements used” Updated 1e to reflect this feedback. There was no 1f in draft 1 of this assessment tool.</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Agreed actions</p> <p>In addition to what has already been agreed (e.g. to split Task 1 into three separate tasks), Chemène will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Re comment 3 above) Consider if there is an appropriate place to note a ‘tip’ to copy and paste (added to the marking guide, in the additional info for TAE trainers). • (re comment 5) Revisit questions 1b and d and decide if merging is a possibility, or re-word item d to clarify – need to retain it for compliance purposes. (see comments above for details of actions taken) • (re comments 6 & 7) Change instruction to ‘list’ (Actioned). <p>Additional action taken</p> <p>Removed the original Question 1d (explain how and with whom you worked to identify info in responses to Questions a-c) – this question was to cover foundation skills: since we have now added a query about WHS I had another look at this question and decided that FS are explicitly covered in the foundation skills checklist, so I removed the question (one small step to reduce workload).</p>
7	Are you happy with the evidence to be submitted? If not, what changes, deletions or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. No: I’m unclear as to whether a qualified assessor needs to be involved or not in the “testing” of each assessment tool— Assessment Guide, assessment criteria for item 4 (report on the trial of the assessment tool) was updated to clarify this.</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<p>additions do you recommend?</p>			<p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, but: As mentioned in 4, one copy of Foundation skills checklist to cover all three tasks. Not actioned following consultation with audit experts.</p> <p>5. Page 14, No 2, could we add 'marked/overwritten'. We have students who are confused by the wording 'marked' but seem to understand 'overwritten'. Actioned.</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Additional feedback received:</p> <p>I think you might need to require one tool be based on an RPL pathway to ensure PC2.2 is addressed and the intent of the unit as described in the unit application.</p> <p>Actions taken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified who may be involved in the trial of each assessment tool (see comment 1 above) Modified instructions for evidence item 2 of TAEASS502 Tasks 1-3 to read, "overwritten with comments..." as per comment 5 above. Created new TAEASS502 Task 2 which requires development of an RPL tool.
Templates document			
<p>8 Are you happy with the Templates? If not, what changes, deletions or additions do you recommend?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes: The instructions about non-compulsory use are clear and we like the idea that participants can use workplace docs. Not wasting time having to make a template is sensible. For ease of marking, it's great to have consistent templates.</p> <p>3. The intent/use of Templates for Assessment Instrument - <i>Observation Checklist</i> and the Assessment Instrument - <i>Practical Task</i> will need to be clearly explained to assessors. The former is for a practical task that is being observed in real-time while the latter is a practical task that was not observed by the assessor but is assessed against submitted evidence. Distinction between them is not clear. Question from Chemène – change title of the 'practical task' instrument?</p> <p>4. These are very usable. They don't actually lock the candidate in to just using them and can be altered to suit the assessments the candidates design</p> <p>5. Yes and... Remove the name box from template and replace with 'how to use templates to create assessment tools' or 'select the template/s that you require and delete all other pages for the purpose of your assessment'. Add wording about 'customise the 'templates' for your own use and remove the word template and students to include version control.</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>6. Templates are formatted beautifully and satisfies all assessment requirements and if students don't have workplace documents, these are fabulous, and excellent example of industry benchmark.</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Discussed varied comments and findings from different RTO audits. Two participants said that auditors had questioned offering templates at Diploma level at all. However, validators agreed that using provided templates reflects current work practices, where assessment tool designers are often asked to use organisational templates when developing assessment tools and instruments. Specific comments made about this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment 1: RTOs have set templates, and aren't we reflecting current workplace practice by offering templates? • Comment 2: Assessment marking time may multiply if templates are not offered. <p>Agreed actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep templates • Add more instructions on how to use templates, as per comment 5 above (actioned) • Re-name the Practical Task template to clarify that this template is most useful when assigning a set assessment task or project (see comment 3 above).
Competency map			
<p>9 Are you happy with the Competency Map? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it accurately reflect the assessment tasks? • Does the mapping document suggest that all requirements are sufficiently covered? <p>If not, what changes do you recommend?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes: matrix looks very solid and gives a great visual representation that all PCs are covered by the assessment tasks 2. We have made an assumption that we know what F and G stand for. Could this be added to Marking Guide p 7, "Additional information for assessors". <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – yes, it accurately reflects the assessment tasks. – yes, all requirements covered <p>Could the Competency Map columns be further labelled? eg first five columns are Knowledge Questions; next six columns are documents the participants create. Comment from Chemene – I'm unsure what your suggestion means. Happy to do what I can to make it clearer. Competency map has now been updated to reflect newly-organised tasks – I feel this is clear. We can revisit when we review this tool.</p> 3. General comments: several items (elements, performance criteria etc) are only addressed by a single assessment task when usually good practice is to have every item covered by at least 2 tasks (new version of competency map shows how each element and PC is addressed at least twice or three times). 4. Yes

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>5. Yes: Consistency of wording for Trial or Pilot (trial/pilot) in both assessment documentation and competency mapping. UOC refers to Trial. (Student confusion again) Changed to 'trial' and in the map, called required evidence the 'report on trial'</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Additional comment: Some items that are mapped to the 'draft' step should be mapped to the 'final' step, e.g. PC3.1, 3.2, 3.3 only because in the draft step, they are often not fully demonstrating the skill yet.</p> <p>Agreed actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave map as is, knowing that there will be some changes to account for repositioning of questions. • In final map, Chemène revisited this and made some adjustments – to be reviewed again when this assessment tool is reviewed on the next occasion.
Marking guide			
<p>10 Are you happy with the Marking Guide? If not, what changes, deletions or additions do you recommend?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chemène: Identified a typo on last page – reference to TAEASS401 removed from assessment criteria for evidence item 7. 2. Yes: Very in-depth 3. No: Marking Guide: p 24 – in the “templates available” row it says NB Find this form in this assessment booklet, not in the Templates document” which is confusing for the assessor. Recommend changing it to the assessment booklet. Good point. Actioned in both the marking guide and in the assessment booklet. 4. General comment: The guide seems to require that someone actually do the assessment tasks but couldn't a panel of subject matter & industry experts also constitute a valid trial of the tool? Thanks – see notes about discussion in webinar below 5. pg 6 - "Instructions 1" - delete ", then" (actioned) 6. pg 10 - "PART B" add "how" after "of" - second-to-last dot point, delete commas after "organisation" and "candidates" (edited when I re-worked the marking guide for the revised version of this question) 7. pg 20 - "How to get started on this task", "Not sure how get started" should read "Not sure how to get started" (actioned) 8. I could work with this marking guide. The information for an assessor is clear and to the point with enough flexibility to allow for differences in students' styles, answers and work place requirements. 9. Yes: TAE assessor instruction on page 24 (a reminder) needs to be at beginning. Good point but no longer applicable in the revised version of the tool. 10. Remove reference to TAEASS401 (actioned)

Question		Yes	No	Comments
				<p>11. Beautifully designed document for assessors and all information is provided clearly for them.</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>12. Additional comment: Need much more info in the marking guide for the 'questions re task' (Valid point; not actioned because this task has now been removed in the final version of the assessment tool and replace with TAEASS502 Task 4 – Questions). Will apply this feedback in the next review of the clustered assessment tool that includes this unit.</p> <p>Agreed actions Actioned suggestions made throughout comments 1-12 above.</p>
Performance evidence				
Does the assessment tool cover all performance evidence requirements?				
11	Developing at least three assessment tools that support different assessment methods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes: Do you state that one tool has to be based on a training pathway, one an assessment only pathway (RPL) and the 3rd one can be either?</p> <p>2. Yes, but: Although we are not certain the numbering of Tasks 1, 2, 3 is an accurate reflection of what the tool is asking for. The diagram on p 20 of the Instructions for Use (Office Use doc) is the best overview but, again, Task 1 incorporates task 2 and 3 and this diagram does not show that. We suggested renaming of tasks to be discussed during the webinar. Note from Chemène: this confusion comes from the fact that the Instructions for use doc is for the TAE40116 qualification – this is confusing – suggest adding a note to page 20 of the Instructions for Use doc to clarify that diagram with example relates to the TAE40116 assessment cluster, not the stand-alone TAEASS502 assessment tool. OR... create stand-alone instructions for use of the TAEASS502 assessment tool? Thoughts?</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes: As per above, clear instructions that three assessments tools are to be provided.</p> <p>5. Previously an RPL was required, is this still a requirement? Not seeing in UOC or assessment requirements. From Chemène: I can't find requirement for RPL tool, either, so have removed this requirement. However... (see comment below)</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Additional comments received:</p> <p>One group of validators note that, to ensure PC 2.2 is met, one of the three assessment tools to be developed should be an RPL tool.</p> <p>Always like the links for clarification on Q&A.</p> <p>Agreed actions</p>

	Question	Yes	No	Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemène will make one of the three tools to be developed, an RPL tool. Chemène will amend the Instructions for use the assessment tools document to clarify that the example on page 20 relates to the clustered TAE40116 tool, not the stand-alone TAEASS502 tool. (actioned)
12	Each tool addresses at least one unit of competency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Yes No: Not sure about this question. I'm assuming that we're only looking at one UOC? I think this reviewer misunderstood this item – this is a PE requirement that each assessment tool developed must address at least one unit of competency, each – the question was, is this requirement clear, in the assessment tool instructions?) Yes: Clear instructions contained in assessment tools <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
13	Each tool: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes the instruments for collecting evidence, reflecting the principles of assessment and the rules of evidence, and related instructions to the assessor/s and candidates 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes No: This is the crux of our confusion! Task 2 and 3 checklists (submitted to Blackwater Projects/RTO) will not need the TAEASS502 Knowledge Questions. Where are the checklists for Task 2 and Task 3 (we are assuming they will be copies of Task 1) but this isn't clear! There is no task 2 or 3. Task 1 requires completion of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tool 1 (referred to as 'example 1') Tool 2 (referred to as 'example 2') Tool 3 (referred to as 'example 3') Questions about how they developed one of the three tools. I think the confusion came from the typo on the assessment results page, which wrongly stated that Task 1 required one tool. Having now corrected the name of Task 1 on the results page... is it now clear, or can I do more to clarify? Yes. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> show how the contextual needs of different environments are addressed 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Yes: Blackwater has contextualised for their own environment – we assume this would be further discussed with participants during the training theory sessions, ie how participants will need to contextualise to their workplaces.

Question		Yes	No	Comments
				3. Yes 4. Yes Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar Yes. No changes in this regard.
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> includes reporting on the trial and review of each assessment tool, including proposed changes. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Email feedback received before webinar 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes: Refer above to instructions that trial/pilot Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar Yes. No changes in this regard.
Knowledge evidence				
Does the assessment tool cover knowledge evidence requirements?				
16	Does the assessment tool cover all knowledge evidence requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Email feedback received before webinar 1. Yes 2. No: We are satisfied that all Knowledge Evidence from the unit IS covered in your questioning – but we can't find the "F and G" listed in the mapping matrix last column. 3. No: As stated previously, dimensions of competency need to be addressed. 4. Yes. Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar Additional comments received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, but over-assessing in some instances Will remove WHS question and place with background info (not actioned – see Appendix for details) Mixed opinion about whether or not to remove the questions relating to the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence. Decision. Keep explicit question in the new TAEASS502 Task 4 – and remove questions about the task from the draft tool. This way we only assess each item once. Agreed actions Chemène to re-work all knowledge questions and merge with the questions about development of the assessment tool. WHS question to be incorporated into the background information required for each of the three assessment tools. Actioned. WHS question retained in TAEASS502 Task 4, also. See Appendix for details.

Question	Yes	No	Comments
SECTION 2– the ‘nitty gritty’			
Questions about the suitability of this tool for the broad target audience			
Does the assessment tool:			
17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes: Clearly stated and easy to find. 3. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes: I'm unclear as to what candidates need to do for this part of the assessment 2. Unsure: We have not undertaken a thorough review of your interpretation of how the participants demonstrate all the foundation skills, but a brief overview looked ok. When doing the week face-to-face, we think the trainers would get a good perception of the participants' abilities (at least enough to red-flag concerns). 3. Yes 4. Yes: request one foundation report is required. <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard, other than request for only one foundation skills checklist to be completed, rather than one for each assessment tool.</p> <p>Not actioned, after confirmation from audit expert that we must get the same evidence for each assessment tool.</p>
20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not really sure – workload is set at a high level, that's for sure! 2. Yes: Based simply on experience and Bloom's taxonomy 3. Yes: this was a thorough assessment which is simple yet challenging enough for a 5. <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>1. General comment: The tool accurately reflects the ass reqs of the unit. But therein lies the problem as we've discussed already...having to review all 3 tools is ridiculous!</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes, and... Condense background information</p> <p>4. 7e – not required, covered in trial process (7e reads: Explain why you chose to review/trial the draft tool as you did)</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Agreed actions</p> <p>Revisit question 7e to determine whether or not it is needed. Final action taken – all questions in part 7 re-worked into new TAEASS502 Task 4. 7e was not transferred to the new Task 4.</p>
22	Flexible without being so flexible that it is confusing—i.e. offer a reasonable range of flexible options for how RTOs and candidates may approach this assessment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes: Participants may choose their own UoC and operate within their own workplaces. The offer of Templates and processes/scenarios helps to provide consistency so it's not too flexible.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes have ability to use their own tools</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
23	Include information about available support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes: RTO contact details are provided for support – but no other specifics. Question from Chemene: should I add more specifics about available support, or do I leave this to different RTOs to decide how they want to do this? If I should add more specifics, what specifics should be added?</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes: Assessment Guide is a great starting point for support and RTO should provide more information regarding student support as per RTO's policies and procedures.</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
24	Include clear and complete instructions for candidates	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes: other than Task 1/2/3 possible confusion.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes, providing the candidate reads it thoroughly AND the instructions are covered by the assessor</p> <p>5. Yes: as per above regarding three times to be completed</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p>

	Question	Yes	No	Comments
				Yes. No changes in this regard.
25	Include clear and complete instructions (and marking guide) for assessors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Some sections could be clearer: F and G in the Competency Matrix; Task 1 states x3 and this is confused with Task 2 and 3. <i>From Chemene: I think we've worked out ideas to make the reference to one task with three tools clearer. My question: How can item 7, parts F and G be made clearer in the mapping doc?</i> 3. Yes, I found it easy to navigate. Again, providing it's read thoroughly 4. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard, other than what has already been agreed – to create three separate assessment tasks. <i>Actioned.</i></p>
26	Feature plain English information and instructions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
27	Follow a logical flow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes: I found the flow very logical 4. Yes: flow appears to be consistent <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
28	Enable easy administration with space to note details of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessor • Candidate • Assessment date/s locations, etc. • Candidate consent to be assessed • Assessment results and feedback. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes: We don't know how your RTO records and reports but assume your admin staff have this covered, as do we with our various processes and policy. <i>Response from Chemène: Blackwater Projects (which is just me) is not an RTO – this tool is used by different RTOs, so I've stayed away from too much information for assessors about where, in the RTO, they should store assessments.</i> 3. Yes all was covered more than adequately. 4. Yes, and: Provision for second or third submission regarding assessments – provision on assessment results <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>

Question		Yes	No	Comments
29	Clearly identify version control	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes: clearly completed 4. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
Principles of assessment				
Does the assessment tool support the Principles of Assessment?				
30	Validity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Unsure: We are about to find this out – not tested yet 3. Yes 4. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
31	Reliability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes: Templates, scenarios, Marking Guide all support this 3. Yes 4. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
32	Fairness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's over-assessed but not the fault of the tool, as previously mentioned 2. Yes 3. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
33	Flexibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
Rules of evidence				
Will the activities described in the assessment tool promote collection of evidence that is:				
34	Valid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes

Question		Yes	No	Comments
				<p>2. Yes: All these will depend on the assessors and participants' experience and integrity!</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes: If allowing candidates to use tools from within workplace, need to nominate a time frame for this. Tools to have been developed within ie 12 months, 2 years (relates to currency, perhaps, but good point)</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard. Rationale for not acting on comment 4 above – each RTO will need to decide timeframes, not the assessment tool developer.</p>
35	Sufficient	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes: But we can see that these rules have been considered</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
36	Current	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>
37	Authentic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email feedback received before webinar</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>Feedback and conclusions reached in webinar</p> <p>Yes. No changes in this regard.</p>

Part 4: Outcomes and recommendations

Summary of feedback and recommendations			
<p>Chemène created the final version of the TAEASS502 assessment tool by applying most 'agreed actions' listed in this font throughout the validation checklist. In circumstances where an action was not carried out, she added explanation about why. All changes were completed on 20 July 2018. Major changes included:</p>			
Assessment booklet			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-arranged assessment tasks as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task 1 – Develop one assessment tool to support a training and assessment pathway Task 2 – Develop one assessment tool to support an RPL assessment pathway Task 3 – Develop one assessment tool for an assessment pathway of choice Task 4 – Knowledge questions (knowledge evidence & Qs about assessment tool development) Carried out other suggestions made throughout this checklist. 			
Competency map			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated competency map to match the updated assessment tasks. 			
Assessment marking guide			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-formatted marking guide to match new assessment tasks. 			
Templates			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added more explicit instructions about how to use the templates, as suggested by validators Changed the title of the assessment instrument template for a Practical Assessment Task to 'Project', so that it is easier to distinguish between this template and the observation template. 			
Instructions for use of the assessment tools			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrected the typos identified Updated the graphic on page 20 to match the assessment tasks in the TAE40116 ASS cluster. Added a note underneath the illustration on page 20 to indicate that 'your RTO' may present tasks differently to how they are organised in the illustration. 			
Read first document – how to prepare the assessment tools for first time use			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the options for contextualisation, added the option to remove the Third-Party Authentication form, if the RTO can verify quality of evidence gathered by other means. 			
Case study handout			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created a case study handout for TAE trainers to use to guide participants through assessment tool development, during training time—the assessment tool developed in this case study may be used as evidence towards TAEASS502 Task 1, 2, or 3. 			
Recommended Actions			
Action required	By whom?	Date completed	
1	Finalise this report	Chemène	03 July 2018
2	Send this report to validators for review and approval	Chemène	03 July 2018
3	Make recommended improvements to the draft assessment tool	Chemène	20 July 2018
4	Upload final version of the assessment tool to the Blackwater Projects website	Chemène	20 July 2018
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?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (details below)

Appendix – Follow-up discussions

Information about this appendix

After the validation webinar, I (Chemène) updated the assessment tool according to the validator recommendations. Once I had done this, I had two remaining questions for validators.

I set up a Google Doc and emailed all validators, asking them to visit the Google Doc and respond to the two questions.

I closed the Google Doc at end of day on 17 July 2018.

This Appendix contains a copy of the Google doc. This includes:

- Questions I asked
- Validator responses (highlighted using pink font)
- Tally of responses and conclusions reached (added COB 17 July 2018).

Two last questions: TAEASS502 assessment tool

Dear validators,

I have almost completed the final version of the assessment tool for TAEASS502, following our recent validation. I have two questions and am seeking your input to advise the final version of the tool.

I'd be grateful if you could read the background info below, then answer the two questions that follow:

- A 'yes/no' response is all that is needed for both questions, but...
- If you have time to add comments you can add to explain your responses, I'd appreciate it.

In advance, thank you!
Chemène

Background info

I have now set up this assessment with the following tasks:

- Task 1 - Design and develop training-based assessment tool
- Task 2 - Design and develop RPL tool
- Task 3 - Design and develop another tool (pathway of choice)
- Task 4 - Knowledge questions (includes questions about tool)

Evidence to submit for all 3 tasks is essentially the same. Candidates must submit:

1. Background information about the tool
2. Copy of the unit and assessment requirements
3. First draft of tool
4. Report on the trial
5. Final version
6. Evidence of foundation skills (I confirmed that I must get this for all three tools).

With this background, here are my two questions...

Question 1 - Should a question about how participants considered WHS when developing the tool be added to background information for all three assessment tools (or is this over-assessing)?

As agreed in the validation, I have added a question about WHS to the **background information** required for each tool. The question reads: "Explain how you designed the tool to ensure healthy and safe assessment." Participants therefore answer this question three times in total, once for each tool.

But... I know that the above will not pass audit because I know (from experience) that I must explicitly ask about all aspects of WHS listed in the knowledge evidence for the unit. Therefore, I have also included the following question, in Task 4:

5	<p>Describe the workplace health and safety (WHS) responsibilities associated with assessing competence in your workplace or industry. To do this, answer the questions below:</p> <p>a. Describe circumstances and environments in which the assessment tool you developed will be administered.</p> <p>Answer remaining parts of this question based on the circumstances/environment described in your response to question 4a:</p> <p>b. How and to whom do (or could) you report safety hazards and incidents?</p> <p>c. Describe emergency procedures.</p> <p>d. What personal protective equipment (PPE) must those involved in the assessment wear, if any?</p> <p>e. List the sources of WHS information upon which you based your responses to parts b, c and d of this question.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
To the candidate: replace this text with your response			

Responding..

- Answer NO if you feel that WHS knowledge evidence is sufficiently covered with question 5 shown above and think that by also asking about WHS in the background info is over-assessing.
- Answer YES if you feel that WHS is important enough to be asked about for each assessment tool, and/or if you feel that question 5 above doesn't sufficiently cover the practical implications of this knowledge evidence.

Please type your responses below - I'll go with majority vote

NO - Q5 covers it sufficiently. Asking the same thing 3 times is over-assessment and just adds fuel to the argument that the "new" TAE is a dog of a course!

Hi Chemene, definitely YES. My reason being that it must always be at the forefront of a designers mind. I think a case in point is DREAMWORLD where there was no adherence to WHS at all and it is this that can ultimately lead to loss of life if it's not drummed into people.

YES; you can never overestimate how important WHS is

YES, ASQA are obsessed with WHS and won't take them long to complete

No - Q5 covers it sufficiently. I would consider it over accessing

My thoughts - leave Q5, it covers the KE beautifully, BUT consider asking "Explain how you designed the tool to ensure healthy and safe assessment." for one (1) of the Assessment Tools developed. This will satisfy the FSK Navigate the world of work. Response from Chemène: Good point re FSK. So if I understand this third option, you are suggesting that I add a new Part to Q5 to read as you suggest above.

Yes - they should be considering those induction processes in every assessment activity... we ask them to do a risk assessment and identify those concepts in every assessment plan for each unit.

Conclusion

(Entered by Chemène on 17 July 2018).

Tally of votes:

- NO: 2
- YES: 3
- ANOTHER option: Ask participants to explain how they designed the tool to ensure healthy and safe assessment for one tool, rather than for three.

Action

Majority wins. Leave the tool as-is, meaning that we:

1. Ask how participants ensured healthy and safe assessment for each tool (to be provided in the background information provided about each tool)
2. Keep Q5.

Question 2: Do I need Task 4 Question 8, or can I remove?

Background about this question

Performance Criterion 2.2 of TAEASS502 reads:

“Enable candidates to show or support their claim for recognition of current competency through selected assessment methods.” (this is part of element 2, Design the assessment tool)

In draft 1 of the assessment tool that we validated, I explicitly covered PC 2.2 with this question asked about one of the assessment tools that participants develop:

“Could this tool be suitable for candidates seeking recognition of current competence (RCC)?

- *If so, explain why*
- *If not, explain how you would adapt the tool to suit RCC candidates.”*

Now that I have created a new Task 2 which explicitly requires participants to develop an RPL tool, do I need to keep the above question, or is PC 2.2 covered with Task 2?

Responding...

Should I delete the question above?

- Answer NO if you feel that PC 2.2 is sufficiently covered with Task 2 and I can delete the question
- Answer YES if you feel that an auditor may claim that RPL is not necessarily the same as RCC, and the question should be retained.

Please type your responses below - I'll go with majority vote

NO - Task 2 is sufficient

I think yes as it's a level 5 and the auditor may want the detail

YES as I feel that there's significant enough difference between RPL & RCC to warrant erring on the side of caution

NO - Task 2 is sufficient

No - Task 2 is sufficient

YES - err on the side of explicit

No, remove the question, task two is sufficient... no other unit or concept asks students to differentiate between RCC and RPL, and how else would you change the tool to sui [sic]

Conclusion

(Entered by Chemène on 17 July 2018).

Tally of votes:

- NO: 4
- YES: 3

Action

Majority wins. Will remove this question.

end of appendix
end of document