

# Validation Record

## Part 1: General Information

Validation details		
Validation led by	Chemène Sinson (Blackwater Projects)	
Validation date and times	Thursday, 19 May 2016, 1:00 – 3:00pm	
Validation approach	Webinar	
Purpose and focus of the Validation		
Purpose	Validate the approach to be used in the assessment tool	
Relevant unit/s	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAEASS401 Plan assessment activities and processes</li> <li>• TAEASS402 Assess competence</li> <li>• TAEASS403 Participate in assessment validation</li> <li>• TAEASS502 Design and develop assessment tools</li> </ul>	
Resources needed (emailed to validators prior to the validation webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This validation questionnaire</li> <li>• Version 1, draft 1 of the assessment tool to be validated</li> <li>• Copies of unit/s covered and their assessment requirements</li> </ul>	
Participants		
Name	Organisation / RTO	Position
<b>Webinar attendees</b>		
Jenny McFarlane	Keeping It Simple Solutions and Training P/L	RTO Compliance Manager
Helen Devlin	TAFE NSW Riverina Institute	Trainer / assessor
Melanie Carter	Australian Breastfeeding Association	Senior Manager Training and Education
Jeanette Cheney	Site Skills Training	Operations Support, Compliance & Quality Mgr
John Lund	Creative Intension	CEO
Juliana Bengard	Management Consultancy International	Program Manager
Jeremy Trott	Training Services Australia	RTO Quality Manager
<b>Participants by email</b>		
Jeremy Trott	Training Services Australia	RTO Quality Manager
Madeleine Hopkins	St. George & Sutherland Community College	TAE trainer and assessor
Wayne Tracy	York College	Managing Director
John Lund	Creative Intension	CEO

## Part 2: Code of conduct

Participants in this validation acknowledge and agree that:		
1.	<b>Be honest, respectful and open-minded</b> With Chemène and with each other	
2.	<b>Equal 'air time'</b> Allow everyone to have their say without interruption	
3.	<b>Share diverse opinions—aim for consensus, time permitting</b> With these assessment tools, Chemène is 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.	<b>Chemène will listen—she'll decide the response to mixed feedback</b> 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.	<b>Copyright</b> Please respect copyright of the materials and templates we'll use in the validation. We 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.	<b>Confidentiality</b> Chemène will produce a documented validation record for the validation, and will post the validation record on the Blackwater Projects website. Anyone who visits my website will be able to access and download this validation record.  Unless you request otherwise, Chemène will list you (name and RTO) as a participant on the validation record. Please email Chemène to advise if you prefer that you are not listed as a participant (in this case you would be listed as 'anonymous' on the validation record). If Chemène does not hear from you, we'll assume you are willing to be named on the validation record.	
7.	<b>Mute mic when not speaking</b> Just protocol, to reduce background noise during the webinar.	
<b>Did all participants agree to these terms:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>verbally at the start of the validation meeting</li> <li>or by email beforehand?</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (details below)

### Key

Throughout the validation questionnaire (starts on next page), in the **Comments** column:

- Black text** indicates comments made by validation participants
- Purple text** indicates comments added by the moderator (Chemène Sinson) and conclusions reached for each validation criterion.

### Part 3: Questionnaire

Question	Comments
<b>General comments</b>	
<p>1 What immediate, general comments do you have, if any?</p>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A</b> The tool is well written. Requirements are clear in most areas and good guidance is provided for assessors. There is the potential for some double up of evidence between tasks because of the way the tool is structured. Our preference would be to structure the tasks to cover the full assessment cycle (i.e., plan, develop tool, validate then trial / conduct and review). The assessment is BIG and quite complex, although this is a function of the assessment requirements of the units. There may be some parts of the units which are not adequately covered – I have highlighted these areas in the mapping document.</p> <p><b>Participant B</b> On reading through the Draft Workplace Assessment cluster, I found the notes clear and comprehensive. The Assessment tools for Trainers, assessors &amp; RTO were very useful, again clear and comprehensive</p> <p><b>Participant C</b> Re the comment: “To the candidate: replace this text with your response” Chemene, this was on page 26 of assessment 3. I wonder instead of ‘To the candidate: replace this text with your response’ you add ‘i.e. state where in your portfolio your assessor will find these documents’ – this maybe could go in other spaces where documents are to be provided too? I’m only suggesting as my students sometimes simply don’t ‘get’ what they’re reading!!</p> <p><b>Participant D</b> Very thorough, robust tools. Plenty of guidance and direction for Assessor and participant My preference is for Plan A, but I can live with Plan B I wonder if we have done enough testing of Knowledge Evidence? Assessment marking guide will be critical to ASQA’s audit.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Webinar participants felt – leave section for candidate to complete as is Other comments made by email participants—e.g. Participant D’s suggestion of whether or not all Knowledge Evidence (KE) is covered and Participant A’s comment that some tasks are ‘doubling up’—are discussed in other parts of this checklist.</p> <p><b>Conclusions reached</b> Chemène will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Participant A’s comment about duplicated assessment – there is some duplication between Task 3 (trial and review assessment tools) and Task 4 (validate 3 assessment tools). See detailed discussion on this topic in items 3 and 13 of this record, below.</li> <li>• Add more knowledge questions to address identified gaps. See items 6-10 of this checklist for specific notes.</li> </ul>

Question		Comments
2	List any <b>typos</b> you notice	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A</b></p> <p>Q7a</p> <p>ASS Task 2 - Typo in ! Box - should refer to ASS Task 3</p> <p>ASS Task 4 - You may participate in 'a validation sessions' (typo)</p> <p>ASS Task 4 - Information and responses to questions posedw (typo)</p> <p>ASS Task 5 - Task overview and title requires 4 assessments. ! Box refers to 5 assessments.</p> <p>ASS Task 5 Questions and reflection refers to 5 assessments</p> <p>Assessment log sheet (p29) still refers to 5 assessments</p> <p>Assessment log sheet (p30) Need 'Indirect' in top row, third line</p> <p>P34 - Q4 - Remove 'No' as the answer to the first question is 'Yes' and the answer to the second question is 'No'.</p> <p>P35 - Background info should refer to assessment instrument instead of tools</p> <p>P38 - Q2 - No. Your assessment plan and tools must cover an entire UOC.</p> <p>P41 - Submit the completed validation record as you report (typo)</p> <p>P43 - Is point 6 supposed to be there (looks like a carry over from another task)?</p> <p>P46 - Point 4 - A chance (to) have your assessments supervised</p> <p>P48 - Number in LHS column should be 3 instead of 6</p> <p>P49 - Verification of supervision by qualified assessment (typo)</p> <p>Assessment Tools - Instructions for Use, P19 shows 2 Task handouts. Is this correct, or is there only 1?</p> <p><b>Participant D</b></p> <p>Still some references to TAE40110 when you mean TAE40116. A hunt and replace will fix those</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>No additional comments.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>Chemène to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• correct all typos listed above</li> <li>• list current version of assessment tasks on Assessment Results page.</li> </ul>

<p>3</p>	<p><b>What are your thoughts about the Plan B assessment approach?</b> i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One Task (Assess competence) to be completed during training (I actually recommend completing loads more, but for audit purposes, we seemed to be lacking if we didn't mandate this one)</li> <li>• Other tasks for completion during or after training—RTOs choose. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Knowledge questions</li> <li>– Tasks 2 – 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>This will mean more work for RTOS up front as they decide which tasks to complete during training, but will also offer more flexibility.</p>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A</b></p> <p>I think we should try to build in the planning of the assessment (as well as conducting it) to cover off TAEASS401 as well as TAEASS402.</p> <p>Is there scope to plan and conduct 2 assessments during the course (perhaps with a validation as well), then for post course do 3 x</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Plan</li> <li>– Develop tools</li> <li>– Validate</li> <li>– Trial / conduct</li> </ul> <p>(I know this will result in one more validation than the minimum needed)</p> <p><b>Participant B</b></p> <p>While (RTO NAME REMOVED) does occasionally conduct TAE F2F, the vast majority are online. This requires minor adjustment to the student notes which Chemene has addressed 'modify to suit training mode' For the F2F classes this seems a minimum of desirable outcome.</p> <p>The student notes are clear that the portfolio needs contain all completed knowledge questions and tasks 1-5, I see no issue here. The student problems arise when they do not read the directions.</p> <p><b>Participant C</b></p> <p>I agree that the more assessment that can be achieved during the 'training time' is effective. This concretises the learning – I'm doing this currently and the penny drops faster with the participants. However with time and \$\$\$'s a big issue it's not always easy to do this. The shame of it is the slower learners benefit so much from classroom assessment but can hold the whole group up. Then you have the dilemma of the slow learners actually reaching the standard!!</p> <p>Agree that more flexibility for RTO's may be useful. I think that it may mean they hike up prices to cover the flexibility. So be it?!!</p> <p><b>Participant D</b></p> <p>I prefer to start and complete summative assessment pieces of evidence in class. It gives the participants a sense of, 'I've got some of this finished' before they go out to the workplace to undertake the others.</p> <p>I liked the Project 1 that was included in the TAE40110 tools. It acted as a workbook as well as getting some of the assessment finished.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Nothing more to add.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>Chemène to complete assessment tool based on the proposed option in this first draft—i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 1 – Assess competence (complete during training)</li> <li>• Other tasks – listed in assessment booklet (RTOs to decide whether to complete during or after training)</li> <li>• Plus provide a series of case studies as learning materials that may be used to cover some assessment items</li> </ul> <p>Note from Chemène: I agree with validators' comments that more assessment tasks should be completed during training, as learning can more easily be promoted, and participant performance directly observed, by the TAE trainer.</p>
----------	---	--

Question		Comments
		<p>However we remain concerned that the focus of TAEASS402 in particular, seems to be on conducting assessments in the workplace.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the short term we will keep the assessment tool as it is, but</li> <li>• (time permitting, or in the future) reflect on this draft and revise to include additional case study based tasks that cover planning, developing and validating assessments, for completion during training.</li> </ul>
4	What suggestions do you have to make this assessment look less overwhelming – yet make it through an ASQA audit?	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A</b> Consider structuring the tasks to cover the full assessment cycle (i.e., plan, develop tool, validate then trial / conduct and review) – although I think it will still feel overwhelming.</p> <p><b>Participant B</b> I like it just how it is, protecting students from ASQA standards and requirements is counter-productive to life in the VET industry. It assists them to qualify themselves.</p> <p><b>Participant C</b> I guess the bottom line here, Chemene, is that the whole assessment process <i>is</i> overwhelming. I believe what you've done on very PLAIN ENGLISH makes it already less overwhelming.</p> <p><b>Participant D</b> Maybe use the .ppt in the assessment overview as a 'You are here!' map and highlight where each Task/handout fits into the detail of the Assessment book</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Nothing to add</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>Will retain assessment approach reflected in this tool as it is for now and re-visit in the future.</p> <p>Will ensure that the PowerPoint (learning material) for this program includes some 'you are here' slides to help participants understand where they are in the bigger picture of the program.</p>
5	Oops... this was blank	

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Task by task feedback</b>			
<b>Knowledge questions</b>			
6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b> I think the new question is good, but am not sure whether it adequately reflects the requirements of the units. I think some of the unit requirements are a bit overboard on the WHS aspects.</p> <p><b>Participant B - no</b> This is sufficient</p> <p><b>Participant C - yes</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Maybe either make a separate question OR simply add “include WHS requirements in your answer’. Because it’s such an overarching piece of legislation clearly stating the ‘bleeding’ obvious maybe the way to go?</p> <p><b>Participant D – not answered</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>100% of validators said keep WHS question.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Keep new WHS question.</p>
7	<p>Do I need to add a question about cultural sensitivity &amp; equity (perhaps add a part D to Q6 about adjustments and support)? This is to cover:</p> <p><b>TAEASS402 KE 3:</b> Knowledge of “Cultural sensitivity and equity considerations in assessment activities”</p> <p>Or is this already covered?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b> I think something needs to be added, but am not sure what...</p> <p><b>Participant B - no</b> There is a limit to the need to spell out the minute, the mention has been made.</p> <p><b>Participant C - yes</b> Maybe “what does reasonable adjustment have to do with ‘cultural sensitivity and equity’? OR “How does reasonable adjustment impact cultural sensitivity and equity?”..... Again because it’s often in the forefront of people’s minds....best to state the obvious?</p> <p><b>Participant D - yes</b> Yep, add it to reasonable adjustment considerations.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Robust discussion.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Chemene to add Part D re access and equity to question about reasonable adjustments.</p> <p>Consider also a scenario-based learning activity that may be used as the response to this question, or add info about inclusivity to the scenario-based assessment tasks. Attach it a realistic scenario rather than making it a pie in the sky thing.</p>
8	<p>Do I need to add new questions to cover <b>TAEASS502 KE 6-8?</b></p> <p>These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>KE6:</b> the components of training packages relevant to the development of assessment tools</li> <li>● <b>KE7:</b> different assessment methods, their purposes and uses</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b> Could possibly argue that KE6 is adequately addressed by the fact that they are using units of competency as the basis for tool development. Depends whether we also want to pick up other aspects of Training Packages such as Implementation Guides</p> <p><b>Participant B - no</b> I do consider these are addressed in the material but have no objection to these being added. This is already a huge certificate IV course and anything that has no significant value is well left out. However I am well aware that it depends on achieving ASQA approval.</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes and no</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>KE8:</b> Evaluation methods appropriate to the trial and review of assessment tools</li> </ul> <p>Or are these items indirectly covered elsewhere?</p>			<p>KE6: (NO) This is covered elsewhere in the practical assessment. It will/should be demonstrated when they develop the tools</p> <p>KE7: (YES) Maybe a question “name at least two different assessment methods. State why and how you would use them.</p> <p>KE7: (YES) Maybe a question. Perhaps an easy one ‘list at least 3 methods to evaluate assessment tools’</p> <p><b>Participant D – yes</b></p> <p>Yes. I think we need a question for KE6-8. I don't think they are covered adequately elsewhere</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Webinar feedback suggestion that something should be done to explicitly cover these items.</p> <p>Chemene to work out how to ask a practical question/s to cover these. Suggestions:</p> <p>Q about endorsed components of a training package</p> <p>Pick one of the three tools and add to questions.</p> <p>Mixed feedback on where to put questions.</p> <p>Chemene to work out, but definitely I'll add a question or two.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Chemène will consider how to best cover these items, but validators agreed they should be covered, either though:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge questions, or</li> <li>Questions about how a particular practical task was completed.</li> </ul>
<p>9 <b>Do I need a question about RPL processes?</b> Ref: TAEASS402 KE2: Knowledge of “RPL policies and procedures established by the organisation”</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant B - yes</b></p> <p>RPL is a very confusing issue for many students, this may be an advantage.</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b></p> <p>Yes the (RTO name removed) has a handbook clearly outlining the RPL processes, policies and procedures. So <i>maybe</i> an easy question such as:</p> <p>“Where will you find your organisational policies and procedures?”</p> <p><b>Participant D – No (I think – box not ticked)</b></p> <p>I think this would come up in my customisation of the tools to fit my client. Also, the participant should consider it as part of their customised instrument</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Validators said ‘yes’, add a question.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Add a question about RPL pathways and processes.</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b> There are a few other KE requirements that I believe should be addressed more explicitly in the questions. I have noted these in the mapping document.</p> <p><b>Participant B - no</b> None</p> <p><b>Participant C – no</b> Actually I was impressed about their clarity!!!</p> <p><b>Participant D – yes</b> I'm not sure we've covered enough on Dimensions of Competency.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>No more comments other than what is already there.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Chemène to review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competency map emailed by one participant, listing some gaps identified</li> <li>How Dimensions of competence are covered in other tasks</li> </ul> <p>And determine additional questions based on the above.</p>
<b>Task 1: Assess competence (case study)</b>			
11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate planning in the task to address TAEASS401, or otherwise, include a copy of a completed assessment plan with the task</li> <li>Include the evidence from Kelly's first presentation. Assessors should view all of the evidence in order to make a decision.</li> <li>If we try to address TAEASS401, could modify the scenario so that Kelly is an RPL candidate, but give them an example of an assessment plan and tools developed for a training and assessment pathway, then get them to modify them.</li> </ol> <p>Also, consider itemising the different parts of the task in ASS Task 1 of the Assessment Booklet.</p> <p><b>Participant B – no</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – no</b> Not at this stage, Chemene. Maybe when it's actually run there may be some things that would need to be adapted (as always with these things). This looks exceptionally thorough,</p> <p><b>Participant D – no</b> No. Works effectively to model the RPL process.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Assessment booklet task 1 – itemise main sections of the Task 1 handout.</p> <p>In Task 1 handout: Add a simple plan. Not add evidence from first presentation.</p> <p>Concern raised that this is their first assessment and they are not seeing all the evidence. Participants can decide – should Kelly be NYC because assessors haven't seen the evidence from example 1?</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Task 1 handout: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment plan and</li> <li>(TBC) examples of evidence from first presentation delivered</li> </ul> </li> <li>Add to main assessment booklet—where participants are asked to submit the Task 1 Handout—itemise the key parts of this handout and this task.</li> </ol>
<b>Task 2: Plan assessment (x2) – includes 1 RPL</b>			
12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b></p> <p>Given that we would be likely to print in black and white, recommend changing orange font to highlighted font in this and other tasks.</p> <p>Refer to previous comments about combining assessment planning with Task 1.</p> <p>If they modify an instrument developed by someone else, get them to describe how they modified it?</p> <p>Make it clear that the assessment instrument they provide, while it doesn't have to address the entire unit, needs to address a significant component of the unit (e.g., multiple performance criteria?)</p> <p><b>Participant B – No</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – Yes</b></p> <p>a. <u>How</u> and <u>with whom</u> did you check and confirm that the draft assessment instruments met the required standards?</p> <p>Chemene, I suggest 2 questions. Reason being the number of times I've got to go back to students to answer ALL the question. They get on a bit of a roll and miss parts of the question in their answers!!</p> <p>E.g.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How did you check and confirm that the draft assessment instruments met the required standards?</li> <li>a) State who else you checked with to confirm that the draft assessment instruments met the required standards?</li> <li>b) why did you choose this (these) person(s)?</li> </ol> <p><b>Participant D – No response, just a comment</b></p> <p>I assume there will be a handbook for each Task as per Task 1?</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Response from Chemène: No, but I intend to produce some 'Case Study' tasks (i.e. learning materials that may be used to demonstrate some of these assessment requirements). This way RTOs choose whether to use them or not. But these would be branded as learning activities, not assessment instruments.</p> <p>This decision was taken to ensure flexibility, and also to ensure that for TAEASS402, ASQA would approve the assessment tools, given that assessments are meant to be conducted with 'real' candidates.</p> <p><b>An option for discussion:</b></p> <p>The current task 2 requires 2 assessment plans. I could set these up as 'tasks' (rather than case study handouts), as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task 2—Plan assessment (RPL) (this is the current case study 1b—it extends from case study 1, and was originally intended to be an assessment task)</li> <li>• Task 3—Plan assessment (training-based) (this is the current case study 2)</li> </ul> <p>However by mandating these case studies as 'tasks' the assessment becomes less flexible.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Robust discussions.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Break up question into two parts as suggested by email Participant C above</li> <li>• No further changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Task 3: Plan and develop assessment tools (x3) – includes 1 RPL</b>			
13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes (blended)</b> I recommend blending the validation.</p> <p><b>Participant B – no (not blended)</b> Separate</p> <p><b>Participant C – Yes and no</b> I think there's a case for both!! I've found students overwhelmed with the whole task of developing assessment tools. Validation comes at the end of the development and when all the 'assessments' are over. It would be great to include validation before doing one of the assessments so that they could get the 'gist' of what it is and why they have to do it!!</p> <p><b>Participant D – Yes (blended)</b> It should be included as that is the natural work block. Task needs to specify that the tools must use different methods.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Votes to keep tasks separate: 2            Votes to merge: 2            Other participants did not vote.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Keep tasks separate but encourage merging where appropriate for the circumstances.            And sleep on it! May still change minds!</p>
14 Do you recommend any changes to this task?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b>            For example 1 (RPL) consider using term RPL assessment plan and RPL assessment tool in 3.3 and 3.4.            Consider also asking for a summary of changes made between the draft and final versions of the tool (makes it clearer for the assessor what was changed). If we do this, perhaps we could consider removing the requirement to provide the draft tool???</p> <p>P38 - Q5 - Thee three plans and tools must support different assessment methods. Does this mean different methods from one another, or just that each must contain multiple methods? Chemene's suggestion: a 'tool' by definition contains all instruments needed to fully assess a unit and therefore must incorporate different methods. No need to make more explicit, but perhaps clarify definition of a 'tool'</p> <p>P39 – Option 2 – if they trial the tool by using it to conduct a trail assessment, can this count towards TAEASS402? Not discussed in webinar. Chemène response: Yes, I'm sure they could if the entire unit was assessed.</p> <p><b>Participant B – No</b>  <b>Participant C – Yes</b>            Maybe as above  <b>Participant D – Yes</b>            The instructions on the first page of the Task say “One of the two plans/tools must support an RPL assessment pathway” They should say ‘one of the three’            It's probably implied elsewhere, but there is no instruction about ‘each tool should use a different assessment method’</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Chemene to read email correspondence but essentially keep the two tasks separate and not stress about different validation activities.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep two separate tasks – develop tools and validate</li> <li>• Fix instructions as noted by Participant D above</li> <li>• In Assessment Guide make sure there is a clear definition of an assessment tool so participants realise that they can't just develop one 'instrument' as a tool.</li> </ul>

**Task 4: Participate in validation of assessment tools (x3)**

Question	Yes	No	Comments
15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b> Change first instruction from ‘You may validate...’ to ‘You may work with others to validate...’ The instructions state: Each validation activity must have at least 2 participants. Does this mean the student plus at least one other person? Consider also having a third party checklist completed by someone else involved in the validation confirming that the participant was organised and contributed appropriately, demonstrating an understanding of the rules of evidence, etc. Could also help cover some of the foundation skills.</p> <p><b>Participant B - no</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b> Only where you have ‘Background Information’...a bit pedantic I know, keep in the instructions A – E for each ‘Background information’ OR refer candidates to it. They tend to miss it otherwise!!</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b> Each validation requires a competency map, and a competency map should cover the Foundation skills. If a participant is only doing the Assessor skill set he/she will not have completed the LLN411 unit so presumably will not be able to validate that aspect of the tool? D of C (Dimensions of competence?) table needs to be included in the competency map/validation to ensure it is covered</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Discussed at length – see conclusions below for outcomes reached. Chemene to specify these requirements for validation tools used that come from the workplace (add to asst guide). Get the others in the validation to submit a third party report that confirms the candidate’s participation in the validation and the quality of the candidate’s contributions. Chemene to mull it.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> Chemène to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Participant A’s suggestions 1 and 2 above—clarify information where needed.</li> <li>Reflect on the suggestion to add a section at end of checklist to allow participants to confirm each other’s active participation in all activities—Chemène to make a final decision on this.</li> <li>Develop validation checklist that explicitly covers all PCs in TAEASS403 element 2, dimensions of competence (and more to model ‘best practice’ assessment validation).</li> </ul>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to the Assessment Guide for this task, the requirement that if workplace-based templates for the validation are used, they must reflect PCs of TAEASS403 Element 2 (Chemène will list these).</li> </ul>
<b>Task 5: Assess competence (x4) – includes 1 RPL</b>			
<p>16 <b>Task 5: Log sheet:</b> What changes do you recommend to this—e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can assessors not work for RTO?</li> <li>Can assessors ‘judge’ performance (S or NS) or is this the job of the RTO main assessor?</li> <li>Need space for comments? Or perhaps one full page per assessment?</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – Changes please</b></p> <p>Include space for the RTO assessor to verify that the supervising assessor has been approved?</p> <p>Include space for the supervising assessor to include their name and contact details, as well as their qualifications. Perhaps get them to attach a copy of their assessment credential?</p> <p>Yes, assessors can judge the candidate’s performance. Perhaps get the supervising assessor to complete something like the ‘Assessment feedback form’ for each assessment.</p> <p><b>Participant B – Comment</b></p> <p>Separate assessors are valid but they need to supply certified copies of qualifications and proof of current competency i.e. Statutory declaration or like.</p> <p>RTO needs to be able to ultimately complete the certification and should therefore determine performance. This requires strong external assessor evidence to be endorsed by RTO.</p> <p><b>Participant C – Comment</b></p> <p>Many of my students do not work for an RTO. However we have discussed that the assessments they develop for their staff be written and assessed in such a way that if their staff go for RPL it would be easy to grant.</p> <p>Q: can assessors ‘judge’? I think this is one of those horrible ‘it depends’ questions!!</p> <p>Q: space for comments? Again ‘it depends’!!!!</p> <p><b>Participant D - Change and comment</b></p> <p>Task 5 assess book says ‘Assess Competence on 4 occasions’, the PE says 5 <i>Chemène response: the first assessment is conducted in Task 1, so total is 5. We will have to argue point to ASQA that this ‘case study’ assessment is necessary so that we can control the situation to ensure all PCs are met.</i></p> <p>Assessors can be TAE qualified and work in industry, not an RTO. Authority of assessor and validity of evidence not changed</p> <p>Anyone competent to perform a task can judge someone as S/NS. That’s how apprenticeships work. They need to be qualified to determine C/NYC.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Discussed at length, with no firm conclusions reached.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>After reflecting on the validation discussion and outcomes, Chemène will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance the current assessment feedback template for the qualified assessor to use for each assessment, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Add a section for the qualified assessor to note name, relationship with RTO, contact details and qualifications held—will keep it simple on the feedback template and will leave it to each RTO to vet and approve ‘qualified assessors’ as they see fit</li> <li>– Add the assessment feedback template to the assessment booklet and specify that it must be completed by the supervising assessor for each of the assessments observed</li> <li>– Allow the qualified assessor who supervises each assessment to comment on the performance and offer an opinion on whether performance was S or NYS, but leave it to the assessor who assesses the entire portfolio to make the final assessment decision for this task.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Remove the log sheet from the assessment booklet.</li> </ul>
<p>Do you recommend any changes to this task?</p> <p>This question was added by participant A – good pick-up! 😊</p>			<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - yes</b></p> <p>ASS Task 5.4 - Written feedback from the candidate <u>or</u> from the qualified assessor who supervised you. Why not both?</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>This item was discussed in conjunction with item 16. See conclusions above.</p>
<b>Practical tasks – general questions</b>			
<p>17 <b>Do I need to add word counts</b> for all questions that are asked about tasks completed—e.g. self-reflections (currently some Qs have word counts &amp; others don't)</p>	☑	☑	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – An unsure no</b></p> <p>Not sure. Perhaps leave as it is at this stage then review after use.</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p>Always helps to be able to visualise the reply.</p> <p><b>Participant C – no response given</b></p> <p><b>Participant D – no</b></p> <p>Not required</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Mixed feedback about word counts.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Chemène to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• keep word counts out of it for now, and revisit when we next revisit this assessment tool</li> <li>• to the Assessment Guide, add explanatory notes about the number of words required for a satisfactory</li> </ul>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			response—i.e. no 'word count' given but must cover all parts of question and explain in sufficient detail, and that for most questions at least a paragraph of information is required.
18	Do we still need a <b>Third party verification</b> page at start of booklet?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – no Y/N response given – comment offered</b></p> <p>Not sure. I think it is particularly important that someone verifies that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tools were developed by the candidate; and</li> <li>The assessments were actually conducted by the candidate</li> </ol> <p>However, it may be possible to do this within the tasks themselves.</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p>An excellent tool to have an endorsement. This is not at all difficult to complete.</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b></p> <p>If it's at the start it is less likely to be missed. Maybe a reminder at the END of the booklet too?</p> <p><b>Participant D – yes</b></p> <p>I think so</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Only discussed briefly.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Based on email feedback, will leave third party verification page as is for now. Perhaps revisit on the next review of this assessment tool.</p>
<b>Templates document</b>			
19	<p><b>Does draft template doc look okay?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Everything is still in one doc but I have organised templates into distinct sections which will hopefully clarify which templates go with which task.</li> <li>Other options—create different Word documents for each template, for example so that assessment template is a stand alone doc. I wondered if this would get</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b></p> <p>We would probably provide both options – a single document containing all templates, as well as separate documents for each template. If creating separate documents, the confusion can be reduced by having a good numbering system.</p> <p>Like the idea of having a single assessment plan template for RPL and training &amp; assessment pathway.</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p>Templates are just fine.</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b></p> <p>Prefer it as one document. Less likely to get lost!! (This happened to me recently when all docs weren't printed out for me)</p> <p><b>Participant D – yes</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
confusing and hard to juggle so many docs?			<p>Yep. Customisation may replace all of these templates if the client is using the Standards as its own P&amp;P even if it is not an RTO. My experience is that big companies have better P&amp;P than some RTOs I know.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Participants agreed keeping all templates as one document is okay.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Leave template document in current format.</p>
<b>Competency map</b>			
20 Do you recommend any changes to this document?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b> See comments and suggested changes in mapping document itself. Also consider numbering the performance evidence and knowledge evidence.</p> <p><b>Participant B – no</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b> As I've suggested above</p> <p><b>Participant D – no response</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Leave the mapping template as it is and update after revising the assessment tool, to reflect updated alignment of the tool with the units.</p>
<b>Performance evidence</b>			
Does the assessment tool cover all performance evidence requirements?			
<b>TAEASS401 Plan assessment activities and processes</b>			
21 5 assessments planned and organised, 2 of which must be RPL plans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p>Participant A – yes Participant B – yes Participant C – yes Participant D – yes</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>All agree.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
22 Each plan covers one full unit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p>Participant A – yes Participant B – yes (added comment: "good") Participant C – yes Participant D – yes</p>

Question		Yes	No	Comments
				<p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Validators agree with findings of email participants.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
23	<p>A different unit covered each time</p> <p>NB Performance Evidence does not specify this—but we just know that this is what they mean!</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b></p> <p>I think the performance evidence does specify this (it says a different endorsed or accredited unit for each of the five occasions) <b>Response from Chemène: apologies, yes, you are correct, and this statement was meant to apply to item 22—unit does not specify one full unit covered in each assessment plan.</b></p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant D - yes</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
24	<p>A documented assessment plan each time</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D - yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
25	<p>Contextualisation of the unit(s) of competency and the selected assessment tools, where required</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D - yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
26	<p>Incorporation of reasonable adjustment strategies</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D - yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b> This requirement is covered.
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – yes</i> <i>Suitable implies a different method each time?</i> <b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b> This requirement is covered.
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – yes</i> <b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b> This requirement is covered.
<b>TAEASS402 Assess competence</b> (for some PE items, the Case Study Task – Task 1 covers it)			
29	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> Not 100% sure that on-course assessment is in 'a real assessment environment' <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> YIKES <i>Participant D – yes</i> 5 if Task 1 is added to the 4 assessments in Task 5. <b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Whether or not it is acceptable to assess competence as a case study activity during training was discussed at length in the validation. <b>Conclusion</b> This requirement is covered.
30	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the application of different assessment methods and instruments involving a range of activities and events</li> <li>using two-way communication and feedback with the candidate</li> <li>exercising judgement in making the assessment decision</li> <li>recording and reporting assessment outcomes in accordance with the assessment system and organisational, legal and ethical requirements</li> <li>reviewing the assessment process.</li> </ul>			<p><i>Participant D - yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
31 Reasonable adjustment made in at least one example	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D - yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
32 All assessments undertaken under the supervision of a qualified assessor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b> <b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p>The video, SKYPE et al option makes that tenable for online</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b> <b>Participant D - yes</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
<b>TAEASS403 Participate in assessment validation</b>			
33 Active participation in 3 validation activities (of assessment tools)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – no</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>Performance evidence states that validation activities must address ‘the critical aspects of validation’.</p> <p>What are the critical aspects of validation? TAAASS404B suggests these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The assessment processes</li> <li>– The methods and tools</li> <li>– The collected evidence leading to assessment decisions</li> <li>– Assessment decisions</li> </ul> <p>At the moment, we are only addressing the methods and tools. Perhaps pick up the others with an on-course case study</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b> <b>Participant C – yes</b> <b>Participant D - yes</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>In the webinar, validators discussed Participant A’s query of what the critical aspects validation are. Validators agreed that there is an awkward difference between the statement ‘the critical aspects of validation’ (which suggests that we should be exposing TAE candidates to different types of validation activities) and the strong emphasis in the unit on the validation of assessment tools (ref: E2).</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>As per recommendation by PwC, keep the draft tool written as-is (i.e. require validation of 3 assessment tools, rather than varied validation activities).</p> <p>Chemène notes that this does not promote quality learning or assessment of workplace assessors’ actual responsibilities in terms of assessment validation.</p>
<p>34 All activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clearly identifying the purpose for each validation, and the legal and ethical responsibilities of assessors</li> <li>• collating and presenting documentation for each validation in a logical manner</li> <li>• communicating and liaising with relevant people</li> <li>• providing feedback and interpreting</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – no</b></p> <p>May need a question to cover off legal and ethical responsibilities?</p> <p>Seems to be covered by the acknowledgement box in your template, but may not be covered in company specific forms.</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b> <b>Participant C – yes</b> <b>Participant D – yes</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to Participant A’s query: legal and ethical responsibilities of assessors is covered in question 1e.</li> <li>• No further changes to the tool in this regard—to be revisited again once the tool is in use.</li> </ul>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
	documentation in validation sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recording their contribution to validation findings.</li> </ul>	
<b>TAEASS502 Design and develop assessment tools</b>			
35	Developing at least three assessment tools that support different assessment methods	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – yes</i></p> <p><i>Need to specify different methods in instructions</i> <i>Chemène’s response: by definition, an assessment tool includes all instruments needed to assess-in-full an entire unit of competency (or more than one unit). Therefore, by definition, each tool will contain instruments to cover different assessment methods.</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p><i>Not explicitly discussed.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>This requirement is covered, but Chemène to review instructions for this task to ensure that they include: A clear definition of an assessment tool (vs an instrument) to ensure that participants develop tools—since an assessment tool by definition includes all instruments needed to fully assess a unit of competence, by definition, each tool will require different assessment methods.</i></p>
36	Each tool addresses at least one unit of competency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p><i>Not explicitly discussed.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><i>This requirement is covered.</i></p>
37	Each tool: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes the instruments for collecting evidence, reflecting the principles of assessment and the rules of evidence, and related instructions to</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – no Yes/No response given</i> <i>I think that validation = review but am not sure that validation fulfils the requirements of a trial??</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Straight forward</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
	<p>the assessor/s and candidates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>show how the contextual needs of different environments are addressed</li> <li>includes reporting on the trial and review of each assessment tool, including proposed changes.</li> </ul>		<p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
<b>Knowledge evidence</b>			
<b>Does the assessment tool cover knowledge evidence requirements?</b>			
38	<p>Does the assessment tool cover all knowledge evidence requirements for the four units?</p> <p><i>Refer to knowledge evidence competency map in the Options and Issues document.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A - no</b></p> <p>I think some KE requirements need to be covered more explicitly by questions. I have noted this in the mapping document.</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p>Reasonably so</p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant D – no</b></p> <p>Missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>how competency based assessment differs from other types of assessment;</li> <li>competency standards as the basis of qualifications;</li> <li>the training and assessment strategies, including policies and procedures established by the industry, organisation or training authority;</li> <li>the dimensions of competency and how they are incorporated in the development of assessment tools</li> <li>the components of training packages relevant to the development of assessment tools</li> <li>different assessment methods, their purposes and uses</li> <li>evaluation methods appropriate to the trial and</li> <li>review of assessment tools</li> </ul> <p>Thanks: will go back and revisit map.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback</b></p> <p>This item was discussed at length. See items 6-10 of this checklist.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Chemène to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review feedback from items 6-10 of this checklist</li> <li>review feedback from participants A and D above, and</li> <li>add questions to address gaps identified.</li> </ul>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<b>Questions about the suitability of this tool for the broad target audience</b>			
<b>Does the assessment tool:</b>			
39	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes (unit ID clear)</b> <b>Participant B – yes (unit ID clear)</b> Self-explanatory to me also but have no problem with these being added. <b>Participant C – Yes and No</b> In two minds about this. On one hand because the assessment has become so rigorous it may need to be put in. On the other hand I'm all for reducing bulk!!! <b>Participant D – No (should list the units covered)</b> I think it is good practice to list the (full and partial) coverage of the units</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes for now. To be re-visited on the next review of this assessment tool.</p>
40	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b> <b>Participant B – yes</b> <b>Participant C – yes</b> <b>Participant D – yes</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>
41	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b> I don't really understand some of the foundation skill descriptions and therefore can't be sure that they have all been covered by the tasks, but I think in general, the foundation skills have been well covered. <b>Participant B – yes</b> <b>Participant C – yes</b> <b>Participant D – no response</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>This requirement is covered.</p>

Question		Yes	No	Comments
42	Pitched at AQF 4 (or Diploma in the case of TAEASS502)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i> I think so.</p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i> I think this Cert IV is at Diploma level.</p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – no response</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
43	Contain any unnecessary tasks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p>All email-based participants had this response</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
44	Flexible enough without being so flexible that it is confusing—Offer a reasonable range of flexible options for how RTOs and candidates may approach this assessment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i> Perhaps could have less flexibility. Consider linking planning, validation and conducting.</p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i> Flexibility is essential for an assessor but some students are confused by options</p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – yes</i> Needs to be flexible enough for corporate training where P&amp;P and templates are client specific. I think I could modify these tools to cater to any of my clients.</p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Participant A's suggestion above was discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>See item 13 of this checklist for details of discussion and conclusions reached.</p>
45	Include information about available support	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – no response</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			No changes in this regard.
46 Include clear and complete instructions for candidates	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p>Overall the instructions are excellent. I have noted above a few instructions that may require clarification.</p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – no response given</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Chemène to review earlier comments made by Participant A, and to action suggested revisions.</p>
47 Include clear and complete instructions for assessors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>NB Assessment marking guide not yet written</p> <p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p>The tasks are very clear for me as an assessor. I need to be able to explain what the tasks mean to the students where they are having difficulty and the instructions in the document so far make that easy.</p> <p><i>Participant D – no response</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
48 Feature plain English information and instructions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – no response</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
49 Follow a logical flow	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b> No changes in this regard.
<b>Administration</b>			
50	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – yes</i> <b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b> No changes in this regard.
51	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – no response</i> <b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b> No changes in this regard.
52	Item deleted. Duplicates item 38 (typo, apologies)		
<b>Principles of assessment</b>			
<b>Does the assessment tool support the Principles of assessment?</b>			
53	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistent feedback provided by email participants. Not explicitly discussed in the webinar.
54	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
55	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
56	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Rules of evidence</b>			
<b>Will the activities described in the assessment tool promote collection of evidence that is:</b>			
57	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email feedback before webinar</b> <i>Participant A – yes</i> <i>Participant B – yes</i> <i>Participant C – yes</i> <i>Participant D – no response</i> <b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b> Not explicitly discussed. <b>Conclusion</b>

Question		Yes	No	Comments
				No changes in this regard.
58	Sufficient	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – No</b> May be a few gaps that need to be addressed – refer to comments in the mapping document.</p> <p><b>Participant B – Yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – Yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant D)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KE needs to be added</li> <li>• Number of assessments need to be checked</li> </ul> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Sufficiency was discussed in earlier sections of this checklist. See:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Items 6-10 for comments about knowledge questions</li> <li>• Items 11-18 for comments about practical tasks</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
59	Current	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><i>Participant A – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant B – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant C – yes</i></p> <p><i>Participant D – yes</i></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>
60	Authentic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email feedback before webinar</b></p> <p><b>Participant A – yes</b> Difficult to cover with TAE. Adequately addressed.</p> <p><b>Participant B – yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant C – yes</b></p> <p><b>Participant D – yes</b></p> <p><b>Webinar feedback and discussion</b></p> <p>Not explicitly discussed.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>No changes in this regard.</p>

## Part 4: Outcomes and recommendations

Summary of feedback and recommendations			
<b>Now</b>			
Chemène to complete version 1 (final) of the assessment tool, ready for submission to ASQA. She will modify the draft tool by actioning all items listed in <b>purple font</b> throughout the validation checklist.			
<b>In the near future</b>			
Soon, but perhaps not before some RTOs will want a 'final' assessment tool for submission to ASQA: Consider opportunities to add the following assessment tasks to complete during training:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task – Plan assessment activities and processes (RPL)</li> <li>• Task – Plan assessment activities and processes (training-based)</li> <li>• Task – Plan, develop and validate one assessment tool.</li> </ul>			
Recommended Actions			
Action required		By whom?	By when?
1	Finalise this report	Chemène	21 May 2016
2	Send this report to validators for review and approval	Chemène	21 May 2016
3	Review and approve this report	Validators	COB 24 May 2016
4	Make recommended improvements to the draft assessment tool	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 document