

Validation Record

Part 1: General Information

Validation details	
Validation led by	Chemène Sinson (Blackwater Projects)
Validation date and times	Friday, 14 August 2015, 1:30 – 3:30pm
Validation approach	Webinar
Purpose and focus of the Validation	
Purpose	Validate an assessment tool
Relevant unit/s	All TAE40115 units, including 8 core units, plus the following electives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAEDEL301 Provide work skill instruction • BSBCMM401 Make a presentation
Resources needed (emailed to validators prior to the validation webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This validation record • Copies of unit/s covered • Assessment requirements for each unit • RPL assessment tool documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RPL Information handout—for people considering RPL – RPL Application kit—option 1 (TAE40110 model—holistic assessment) – RPL Application kit—option 2 (stand-alone units).
Participants	
Name	Organisation / RTO
Karey de Bakker	Eurobodalla Adult Education (by email)
Wayne Tracey	York College (by email)
Monica Watt	Elmo Learning
Jillian Pennisi	TAFE Western
Kim Stapleton	Verto

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
<p>1 For TAE40110 I offered two kits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For people with TAA40104 2. For people without TAA40104 <p>For TAE40115 I plan to offer only one kit—based on model for people without TAA40104. Do you agree?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes: If they hold TAA they have been out of the game too long or wilfully ignored the need to upgrade 2. Yes: One, they either have the current skills or they do not. 3. Yes. <p>Webinar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to give some choice otherwise we do not show flexibility • All participants agree that we'll produce only one RPL kit from this point forward—choice will be offered by suggesting different examples of evidence. <p>Outcome We'll go with one kit</p>
<p>2 I thought I'd include only 2 elective units in the assessment kit, rather than giving a choice of electives, so the kit doesn't look so 'huge'.</p> <p>Do you agree (say 'no' if you want me to include a few elective units in the kit).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No: The 2 electives you have included are the most common but limiting it to 2 kind-of defeats the purpose of RPL. The offer of assistance from you and RTO helps them a bit. 2. No: This is restrictive to what the majority of those coming from industry have. Consider Group B, as these are predominantly applied for, and then key ones from Group A. 3. Yes. <p>Webinar</p> <p>Provide a kit with wider choices of electives and RTOs delete electives not needed by candidates</p> <p>Guidance is what they need--ultimately I think it comes down to the volume of what evidence is required</p> <p>We have to be careful that we are collecting the existing knowledge of the learner, not telling them what we need.</p> <p>Outcome Chemene will include more than 2 electives in the</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			kit. Exact ones TBC, but will likely consider mainly popular TAE electives and some from Group B (BSB electives).
<p>3 RPL docs are set up as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Info handout for people considering RPL—gets sent to people considering RPL, before enrolment 2. RPL Application Kit <p>Do you agree with this approach? Do you use the Info Handout?</p>	☑	☐	<p>Email comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes: Definite value in handout esp self-assessment. Though if one is going for TAE RPL you'd like to think they'd know how it works and what evidence is necessary. 2. Yes: Should have a self-assessment checklist, in the info handout to ensure they know what they are getting into and can meet RPL requirements. It saves the assessor and their own time. 3. Yes. <p>Webinar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All agreed with this approach. Comments made that the self-assessment in the handout is valuable. • Comments about the first document: The self-assessment checklist needs to highlight specifics of unit requirements i.e. LLN with ACSF/ CSfW or TAEASS402 require RPL • Is there a mapping document to map the evidence to the elements and critical aspects for each unit? Answer: not in current RPL kit. If we go with Option 1 for the kit's structure (see Q5 below) then a map may be needed, but if we go with Option 2 a map likely won't be needed. <p>Outcome Agree with approach of two documents as in the current draft.</p>
<p>4 Currently I list two possible approaches for submitting portfolios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written portfolio, or • RPL interview <p>Do this again for TAE40115?</p>	☑	☑	<p>Email comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes: Usually a combo of the two 2. No: Evidence should be gathered by way of portfolio, it can be strongly supported by RPL interview, but both are required. 3. This is not an area of option that we would offer, written portfolios only. But the option may be useful in the future as technology reliability is improving though security of information can not be assured. <p>Comments in webinar</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Webinar participants agree that they all do some variation of both written and interview-style portfolios. Not all RTOs do interview. All RTOs start with written.</p> <p>Consensus was that rather than listing these as two DIFFERENT approaches, we describe the written plus interview as two parts of the same RPL process.</p> <p>Outcome Change flow chart of RPL process in Information document to show process as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 - Prepare written portfolio • 4 – Submit written portfolio • 5 – Assessor reviews portfolio then contacts candidate for interview if needed <p>etc.</p>
<p>5 Format / structure of the RPL Application Template—which structure should I go with?</p> <p>Option 1—Holistic (TAE40110 model)—includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional history 2. Knowledge (knowledge for all units assessed in one place) 3. Unit by unit (practical assessment requirements for all units presented unit by unit) 4. Third party at end. <p>Option 2—Unit by unit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Introduce yourself' – professional history 2. Unit 1 (all requirements) Unit 2, etc. <p>Advantage of option 1: Less repetition between units</p> <p>Advantage of option 2: Easier to isolate requirements for individual units.</p>			<p>Email comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P.4 Typo: 8 → 2 electives 2. Option 2. RPL tends to be a unit by unit approach even though in industry work is clustered. <p>Anyone needing to complete TAE as a RPL should know how to pull apart the unit requirements. Given that in ASS402 it requires them to have conducted a RPL assessment it is essential that they do this well.</p> <p>It's cleaner to assess and audit. It still allows use of same evidence across units.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Both have merit, however option one (less repetition) is more user friendly and meets all due vigor. <p>Webinar discussion</p> <p>All webinar participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported option 2 • "Unit by unit is much better evidence when you are sitting with the auditor trying to explain how you reached your decision." • Post webinar reflection by Chemène: I'm confident that we can address issues of user-friendliness with instructions that invite candidates to cross reference knowledge evidence where applicable (e.g. if they provided the knowledge evidence being asked for, in another unit, they may cross-reference that unit).

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Go with option 2 Check out and correct typo on page 4 (see comment 1 above) Ensure instructions for candidates state that information doesn't need to be duplicated.
<p>6 IF you want to continue with the current model (option 1)...</p> <p>What suggestions for changes to the TAE40115 version?</p>			<p>NA—option 2 selected</p> <p>One email comment:</p> <p>RPL is often requested, but when the full aspects are viewed most of our participants opt to fully complete the course work. The benefits of fully embracing the course work is at worst an excellent up date of skills and knowledge.</p> <p>Chemène's response: agree, I find this also.</p>
<p>7 IF you want to go with option 2 (unit by unit)...what do you think of the template for the application kit provided?</p> <p>What changes do you suggest to the draft tool—</p> <p>a. Introduce yourself section—things to add/remove?</p> <p>b. Unit template`</p>			<p>a. Introduce yourself section (changes)</p> <p>Email feedback</p> <p>1. Add PD to certified copies of quals. If training they must meet requirements of the Standards or ask how they demonstrate currency/competency.</p> <p>We need to define what type of training/assessing and how often it occurs. Accredited is different to non-accredited. 100 hours per year, is different to 10 hours per week, to one weekend per month.</p> <p>Delivery is different to training, as it is to assessment and should give more of an information on what they do for each.</p> <p>Discussion in validation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to explain CV must reflect training and assessment. and any professional development To part 1 introduce yourself, add item 4 to require description plus support evidence of recent professional development Re-name this section Professional History and professional history and your numbering down the left side there are two number 3s Agreed with emailed comment #1, to add to the 'introduce yourself' section, a fifth requirement that candidates submit evidence of recent professional development. <p>b. Unit template (changes)</p> <p>Email feedback</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit template is good. • We need clear instruction in front of some units—i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clear information on LLN unit RPL, as many think because they contextualise to suit a learner that they are skilled in LLN. In the LLN unit there is a clear need of understanding and applying the ACSF and CSfW. This must be clearly explained that to apply for LLN RPL that they must be utilising these strategies. – Clear information on applying for TAEASS402 has a requirement that the candidate has conducted RPL assessment. If they have not then they should not apply. <p>Discussion in validation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I really like the example” [of a completed portfolio] • “Yes great example easy to follow and will provide the right evidence.” • “Should the section of carried out workplace performance clearly outline what it looks like when it is simulated. Chemène response: Not sure what is meant here. Chemène to seek clarification from validator <p>Discussion of third party template – in webinar Chemène presented proposal to simply have candidates list a third party referee for each unit (rather than having the referee submit reference letter or complete a checklist). The following comments were made in light of this (all in chat box, so these are direct quotes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We call the third party; alternatively we email asking them to verify pc requirements. • third party is really a supplement so i think it is sufficient . we do actually call and clarify • In an online environment we do not trust anyone, so we always call. I would not accept the third party without verifying. • Yes I am a bit worried that the trainer would not call to verify (response to this from another validator: Maybe when you have assessors review the RPL you stated they need to call and clarify. This is embedded into our RPL procedure.)” <p>Suggestion made to add a global statement that says the assessor may (or will likely) contact the third party to verify competence. Responses to this were (direct quotes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “That would be good • Yes nice global statement

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is a good idea.” <p>Outcomes</p> <p>Make the following changes to part 1 of the template:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change name to “Professional History” • Add requirement to submit evidence of professional development. • Fix numbering typo (two number 3s). <p>Make the following changes to part 2 of the template (unit by unit):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add global statement to third party report section, to the effect that the assessor may (or will likely) contact the referee. <p>Repeat this template and set it up for all TAE40115 units.</p>
<p>8 IF we go with option 2, what do you think of idea that I only list some knowledge evidence items for each unit—e.g. if I am comfortable that the performance evidence they submit will show us an item of knowledge evidence, could I skip listing the knowledge evidence item separately, or do I list all knowledge evidence to be safe?</p> <p>I’m trying to assess robustly but not make the assessment ridiculously overwhelming for candidates.</p>			<p>Email comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We can infer knowledge from performance but not vice versa. List it (knowledge)—also gets underpinning knowledge whys/how 2. Consider clustering the knowledge evidence. Response from Chemène: given the approach that was decided (see comments above) I can only cluster knowledge within the unit. I will look into this, otherwise to be safe will copy all knowledge evidence and invite candidates to cross-reference other units where they have described the same knowledge. 3. If that is the selection, yes simple, clear, non repetition wherever appropriate. When the performance evidence already establishes this would be an appropriate design advantage to all aspects of the evidence of RPL process. <p>I fully endorse your desire to not be less than robust and also that repetition is counter productive and unnecessarily de-incentivising.</p>

Part 4: Validation Checklist

Important note

At the time of validation, the RPL tool was not complete. Responses to this questionnaire are based on what validators reviewed:

1. Document 1—RPL Information (completed draft)
2. Document 2—RPL Application Template (option 2)

Only one unit has been developed using this template—the intent of the validation was to get feedback on the template and make adjustments before multiplying it across all TAE40115 units. Responses below are based on the example provided for one unit (TAEDEL301).

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:	Yes	No	Comments	
VALIDITY				
1	Clearly identify units assessed by code and title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not yet: tool not yet developed.
2	Address all aspects of the competency standard/s assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elements and performance criteria • Foundation Skills to the level described in the unit • Performance evidence • Knowledge evidence • Conditions for assessment 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: We need to define what we need to see that support foundation skills. This should be defined that it is an assessment and that evidence provided must me the rules of evidence. Good point! Chemène to add this information to the general instructions for candidates. Introduce the Rules of Evidence.
3	Include realistic work tasks that are relevant to the unit/s assessed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4	Reflect realistic work conditions and requirements (dimensions of competence): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task skills • Task management skills • Contingency management skills • Job / role environment skills 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:		Yes	No	Comments
5	Reflect the Rules of Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valid • Sufficient • Current • Authentic 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6	Pitched at the correct AQF level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7	Free of unnecessary assessment tasks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
FLEXIBILITY AND FAIRNESS				
8	Offer a reasonable range of flexible options for how candidates complete and submit assessment tasks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9	Include information about available support and guidance if needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
RELIABILITY				
10	Clear and easy to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure and layout is logical and easy-to-follow • Plain English 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11	Include clear and complete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • instructions for assessors • instructions for candidates 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Instructions for assessors not yet developed at the time of the validation—Chemène will adapt the instructions for use of the TAE40110 RPL tool and modify to suit the new approach to be used for TAE40115
12	Clearly identify version control	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
13	Enable easy administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have space to document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Name of assessor/s & candidate/s – assessment date/s and location/s – candidate's written consent to be assessed 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:		Yes	No	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – comments about quality of evidence gathered – assessment results 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the above easily be located in the assessment documentation? 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Email comment</p> <p>I have experienced no difficulties previously and always email candidates specifically relating to any issue(s) that arise.</p>

Part 5: Validation outcomes

Summary of feedback and recommendations			
'Big picture' decisions			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will develop one RPL kit for all candidates The RPL tool will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> RPL Information—information for candidates considering RPL RPL Application Template—template candidates will use to organise and present RPL portfolio (two options for the format of this template were discussed; validators selected Option 2: Unit-by-Unit). Instructions for RPL assessors—not yet developed but will be based on existing TAE40110 instructions for assessors and adapted for the TAE40115 format. 			
Chemène will make the following changes to the drafts provided			
RPL Info document			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change flow chart to reflect RPL interview as a possible step in the RPL process (rather than being an alternative to a written portfolio) Review information and remove irrelevant info now that we hve decided to go with Option 2 for the template—e.g. sample reference letter no longer needed since we won't ask for reference letters. 			
RPL Application Template			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change name of first section from “Introduce yourself” to “Professional History” Fix numbering typo in Professional History section (two 3's; change second 3 to a 4) To Professional History section, add requirement: submit evidence of recent professional development Change the template for the unit-by-unit submission as follows—to section on third party evidence, add a global statement to say that the RPL assessor may contact the referee to verify evidence Include a choice of elective units—not just two. 			
Chemène will develop a draft of the TAE RPL Kit Instructions for assessors			
She will send validators for optional review.			
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?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (details below)

end of template