VALIDATION POLICY

Revision 2.0 Jul 2018

PURPOSE

MiTraining is committed to delivering quality training and assessment that supports learners to develop relevant skills and knowledge.

The Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) require the implement of a plan for ongoing, systematic validation of assessment practices and judgments for each training package on MiTraining's scope of delivery.

The purpose of this policy is to guide MiTraining's approach to the validation of assessment practices and judgments.

SCOPE

Accredited qualifications and courses on MiTraining's scope of delivery.

POLICY STATEMENT

Validation is a quality review process. It involves checking assessment tools and techniques produce valid, reliable, sufficient, current and authentic evidence to enable reasonable judgements of competency to be made.

The validation process will review the assessment instruments and related documents to identify if any further changes are required to improve the quality and consistency of assessment outcomes.

Validation will be carried out in accordance with the guidelines stated in the Standards for RTOs 2015.

VALIDATION PROCEDURE

Validation is a programmed and documented process that is aligned to a rolling five-year plan. Each training product will be reviewed at least once in the five-year period. At least 50 per cent of the training products on scope will be validated in the first three years of the schedule. Additional unit/s of competency may be validated based on identified risk factors.

The validation plan is a schedule that includes:

- The code and title of each of the units of competency from the training product nominated for validation;
- A calendar indicating the month and year that validation of the nominated unit/s of competency will be undertaken;
- Specific dates for confirmed validation meetings;
- The individuals leading and participating in the validation meeting;
- The sample size for validation;
- The record keeping requirements and instructions; and

- The risk level associated with the unit/s of competency nominated to be validated.

The unit/s of competency nominated for validation includes a risk factors based on:

- The use of new assessment tools;
- Delivery of training products where safety is a concern;
- The level and experience of the assessor;
- Changes in technology, workplace processes, legislation, and licensing requirements.

CONDUCTING VALIDATION

Validation will be conducted by individuals who hold the following qualifications and experience:

- Vocational competencies and current industry skills relevant to the assessment being validated
- Current knowledge and skills in vocational teaching and learning, and
- The TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment (or its successor) or the TAESS00001 Assessor Skills Set (or its successor).

Individuals involved in validation must also demonstrate industry relevance through vocational competence. Those with vocational competence will:

- Hold competency in the training product being validated; or
- Be able to demonstrate they have skills and knowledge equivalent to the requirements of the training product.

Statistically Valid Sampling

A statistically valid sample will be used in the validation process.

The ASQA validation sample size calculator will be used to determine the sample size.

In the first two years of registration, where the number of assessment judgements may be small, MiTraining may apply an increase to the confidence level to increase the chance that the sample will be statistically valid. This is because those individuals making assessment judgements, although appropriately qualified, are new to assessing in the MiTraining framework.

VALIDATING ASSESSMENT PRACTICE AND JUDGEMENTS

Reviewing Assessment Practice

Validation determines if assessment tools have produced the intended evidence. Validators must look at the evidence in the sample, and determine if it is valid, reliable, sufficient, current and authentic.

In reviewing assessment practice, validators should consider whether the assessment tools:

- Comply with the assessment requirements of the relevant training product (as listed on www.training.gov.au);
- Ensure the principles of fairness, flexibility, validity and reliability are adhered to;
- Have been designed to produce valid, sufficient, authentic and current evidence;
- are appropriate to the contexts and conditions of assessment (this may include considering whether the assessment reflects real work-based contexts and meets industry requirements);

- Are appropriate in terms of the level of difficulty of the tasks to be performed in relation to the skills and knowledge requirements of the unit;
- Provide sufficient instruction to clearly explain the tasks to be administered to the learner (if the assessment samples demonstrate the evidence provided by each learner is markedly different, this may indicate that instructions are not clear);
- Give sufficient guidance as to the evidence to be gathered from the learner;
- Outline appropriate reasonable adjustments that could be made to the gathering of assessment evidence;
- Provide sufficient instructions for the assessor on collecting evidence, making a judgement, and recording the outcomes of the assessment (assessment samples should validate recording and reporting processes);
- Are supported with evidence criteria to judge the quality of performance (if the assessment samples demonstrate the judgements made about each learner are markedly different, this may indicate that decision-making rules do not ensure consistency of judgement); and
- Adhere to the requirements of the MiTraining's assessment system.

Reviewing Assessment Judgements

In reviewing the assessment judgements, validators should consider whether the learners' assessment evidence:

- Complies with the assessment requirements of the relevant training product;
- Demonstrates that the assessment was conducted with fairness, flexibility, validity and reliability; and
- Is valid, sufficient, authentic and current.

VALIDATION OUTCOMES

The validation process is not complete until the outcomes of a validation meeting are actioned and documented. There are two reports used to guide the validation process and record the outcomes and actions of validation meetings.

The Assessment Validation Report – Review of Assessment Tool is designed to guide validators to review the effectiveness of the assessment tool/product and that it aligns to the principles of assessment.

Assessment Validation Report – Review of Candidate Assessment Judgements is designed to guide validators to review the assessment evidence of candidates and the assessment judgements made.

If the validation outcomes recommend improvements to the assessment tool, the recommendations will be implemented across all training products (not just those included in the sample).

If changes to the assessment tool are made, a quality check will be carried out prior to implementation to ensure it meets the requirements of the Assessment Policy and MiTraining's assessment systems.

PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The Candidate's (student) right to privacy is respected during the validation process. As such, individuals involved in validation ensure:

- • No copying or distribution of supplied materials without express written permission;
- • Ethical practice is respected;
- • Privacy of candidate information is protected.

POLICY DOCUMENTATION

Policies and procedures applicable to students are accessible prior to enrolment and throughout the duration of their learning via the MiTraining website, and on request. All RTO policies and procedures are available to staff and relevant contractors via the MiTraining VET Hub.

NOTES

Related Policies/Procedures:	*Assessment Policy* *Continuous Improvement Policy* *Validation Guide* *Records Management Policy*
Related Documents/Forms:	*Assessment Validation Report – Review of Assessment Tool* *Assessment Validation Report – Review of Candidate Assessment Judgements* *Validation Schedule and Plan*
Related Legislation:	*National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011*
Guidelines:	*N/A*
Approved By:	*Chief Executive Officer*
Date of Next Review:	