



Assessment Validation Procedure

Contents

1. Associated policy	2
2. Scope	2
3. Procedure.....	2
3.1 Validity of the assessment tools (pre-delivery assessment review)	2
3.1.1 New training products: Pre-delivery Assessment Review	3
3.1.2 Existing training products: Pre-delivery Assessment Review	3
3.2 Validation of the application of assessments (post-assessment validation)	4
4. Supporting Documents	8
4.1 Legislation/Regulation.....	8
4.2 Policy and Procedures	9
4.3 Related Documents	9
5. Definitions	9

1. Associated policy

The *Assessment Validation Procedure* has been developed in conjunction with the *Assessment Validation Policy*.

2. Scope

Where this procedure refers to CIT, it includes CIT Solutions.

This procedure applies to:

- all nationally recognised training products on the scope of registration, both qualifications and explicit units
- administration staff and educators with responsibilities related to assessment validation.

3. Procedures

Validation of assessment will occur:

- in the design process (pre-delivery assessment review)
- after delivery (post-assessment validation):
 - as part of the published cycle of post-assessment validation
 - as part of continuous improvement actions arising from feedback from assessors, students, or other stakeholders.

The design or purchase of assessment tools is part of CIT's assessment system under the RTO Standards (Clause 1.8).

Validation resources will be published internally and accessible to all staff.

3.1 Validity of the assessment tools (pre-delivery assessment review)

All assessment tools for new and re-developed training products, whether purchased or designed internally, will be reviewed against the principles of assessment and rules of evidence:

- during the design process
- prior to first use
- prior to finalisation of the Training and Assessment Strategy (TAS) for new training products.

Refer: ***Amendment to Scope of Registration Procedure***

Pre-delivery assessment review is conducted by the teaching department with the assistance of Program Services, as part of the assessment system design process for all new and reviewed assessments including assessment resources acquired or purchased from a third party, including from other TAFE Institutes.

Refer:

- ***Academic Quality Procedure***
- ***Amendment to Scope of Registration Policy***
- ***Assessment Procedure***
- ***TAS Development Policy***
- ***TAS Development Procedure***

3.1.1 New training products: Pre-delivery Assessment Review

Step	Action	Responsibility
1	Plan pre-delivery assessment review in consultation with the Head of Department.	Head of Department Program Services
2	Design and write assessment tools for the new training product. Confirm the new assessment meets unit of competency requirements using the mapping tool, principles of assessment and the rules of evidence.	Teaching Department Subject Matter Expert (SME)
3	Complete pre-delivery assessment review for each unit.	Teaching Department (educator independent of the writing of the assessment)
4	Review assessments in conjunction with Education Advisors – Program Services.	Teaching Department SME
5	Record outcomes and confirm completion of pre-delivery assessment review for each unit.	Education Advisors – Program Services
6	Update record tracking progress of pre-delivery assessment review. Include pre-delivery assessment review documentation with the scope package to Education Quality for scope review. Refer: Amendment to Scope Policy	Head of Department Program Services

3.1.2 Existing training products: Pre-delivery Assessment Review

All re-developed assessment resources, whether purchased or designed by CIT are to be reviewed and approved prior to being published for student use.

Step	Action	Responsibility
1	Determine the need for pre-delivery assessment review of existing training products in consultation with the teaching team during department meetings. Reasons for pre-delivery assessment review of a UoC include, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feedback from students • industry engagement • teacher concerns around the student submissions • concerns arising from PRI. • assessment validation • addition of units added to a course 	Head of Department

Step	Action	Responsibility
2	Review and make planned assessment/s changes. Confirm the new assessment meets requirements of the unit of competency and update mapping, teacher guide and all other assessment tools	Teaching Department Subject Matter Expert
3	Prior to delivering the new assessment, complete the pre-delivery assessment review by an independent educator not involved in the initial review or creation of the new assessments.	Teaching Department experienced educator independent of writing the assessment tools
4	Approve new assessment for delivery.	Head of Department
5	Record outcomes of the pre-delivery assessment review at the teaching team's validation/continuous improvement meeting and on the continuous improvement register, complete and attach pre-delivery assessment review documentation to meeting minutes. Save the new version-controlled assessment tools and pre-delivery assessment review in Program Services Final Assessment folder.	Head of Department and/or Educator Level 2

3.2 Validation of the application of assessments (post-assessment validation)

The post-assessment validation is a quality process that evaluates if:

- assessors reached accurate and consistent decisions that resulted in nationally recognised training outcomes
- the collection of valid, sufficient, authentic and current evidence meets the Rules of Evidence
- competency decisions are valid, fair and reliable in accordance with the Principles of Assessment
- assessment validation outcomes and actions are used to inform continuous improvement of assessment.

The validation process provides recommendations for future improvements to the assessment tool, delivery and/or assessment outcomes.

Step	Action	Responsibility
1	Develop and implement a Post-Assessment Validation Schedule Allocate courses and units to be validated post-assessment over a five-year period using a risk approach and all courses on scope are included. Possible risk factors may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new courses being offered • overseas delivery • assessment only (RPL) courses • online delivery and assessment • multiple sites and large numbers of educators and assessors 	Head of Department Education Quality

Step	Action	Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the use of new assessment tools • delivery of training products where safety is a concern • delivery of training and assessment as part of a formal arrangement with a secondary school • level and experience of the educators • change in technology • change in workplace processes • change to licencing requirements. <p>Refer: ASQA Risk Assessment Framework and ASQA Risk Priorities</p> <p>Provide Heads of Department with a copy of the post-assessment validation schedule at the start of each year.</p> <p>Support Heads of Department through the validation process and scheduled meetings.</p> <p>Quality assure and store all final post-assessment validation reports.</p> <p>Maintain up to date information and templates on SharePoint for validation of new training products and post-assessment validation.</p>	
2	<p>Identify units to be validated based on a risk assessment</p> <p>Sample a minimum of 2 units of competency for validations of qualifications typical of the qualification or skill set.</p> <p><i>Note: This number may be increased where validation outcomes indicate assessment judgements are not valid.</i></p>	Head of Department Education Quality
3	<p>Appoint Lead Validator</p> <p><i>Note: Validation must be led (Lead Validator) by individuals who were not part of the delivery and assessment being validated. The Lead Validator may be an educator from another teaching department, Head of Department, or a Quality Advisor.</i></p>	Head of Department
4	<p>Identify panel members involved in Assessment Validation meeting</p> <p><i>It is a requirement that one or more persons participate in the validation who are not directly involved in the unit's delivery and assessment. This can be an educator from another department or preferably an Industry representative.</i></p> <p><i>At CIT it is considered good practice to have an industry representative involved in validation.</i></p> <p>Ensure the validation is completed by people who collectively hold:</p>	Lead Validator Heads of Department Educators

Step	Action	Responsibility
	<p>(a) vocational competence for the training product being validated (evidenced by formal qualifications or demonstrated equivalence)</p> <p>(b) current industry skills (evidenced by work in industry, professional development, experience with latest techniques, product knowledge)</p> <p>(c) credentials specified in the Standards for RTOs</p> <p>(d) current knowledge and skills in VET (evidenced by professional development, current practice).</p> <p><i>Note: Above requirements may be met via a team approach whereby one person can demonstrate (a) and (b) and another person is able to demonstrate (c) and (d).</i></p> <p><i>Note: The exception to this process applies in the case of applications to add any qualification or assessor skill set from the TAE Training Package to the Scope of Registration. Assessment validation of current TAE training products must be carried out by an external, independent validator. They must not:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>be employed or contracted by CIT to provide training and assessment</i> • <i>have any involvement or interest in the operations of CIT.</i> 	
5	<p>Prepare for Validation</p> <p>Determine the valid sample of students based on completions in the previous six months and confidence level, to reduce the margin of error.</p> <p><i>Note: The sample should be large enough that the validation outcomes of the sample can be applied to the entire set of judgements.</i></p> <p>Select students having completed (results UP, F, RG) the same assessment for the unit in the previous 12 months.</p> <p>Export records for students in the sample from the Student Management System (SMS) into MS Excel and save document.</p>	Head of Department Education Quality
6	<p>Collect assessments for validation</p> <p>Enter the number of assessment judgements onto the validation report.</p> <p><i>Note: This is the total number of assessment judgements made in the training product being validated over a period of at least six months; this aligns with the retention requirements described in ASQA's General Direction—Retention requirements for completed student assessment items.</i></p> <p>Populate student details in the Validation Report.</p> <p>Customise rows for each assessment tool.</p>	Lead Validator

Step	Action	Responsibility
	Consider the time available for the validation meeting. <i>Note: approximately two to three hours.</i>	
7	Schedule validation meetings Set dates with educators/assessors for validation meetings for the calendar year. Book and coordinate meetings; advise Head of Department Education Quality of meeting details.	Head of Department
8	One week before the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepare the Validation Report for each unit/qualification. <i>Note: Where a unit is in multiple qualifications a Validation Report must be prepared for each qualification subject to validation.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • email course, unit information and blank student assessment instructions to stakeholders in preparation for the meeting. • ensure the relevant documents are available on the day, either digital (eLearn) or in hard copy including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ completed marked student assessments ○ assessor Instructions and Educator/Teacher Guide ○ Unit of Competency (UOC) outline ○ mapping document ○ knowledge questions ○ observation checklists ○ case studies ○ project tools ○ any other Assessment Tools. <i>Note: If the marked student assessments are not on hand the post-assessment validation cannot proceed.</i> Completed marked student assessments must remain confidential and are not be provided via email to panel members.	Lead Validator
9	At the Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use the validation report as a meeting agenda • acknowledge student privacy requirements • review one unit at a time • review all student assessments in the sample • analyse and interpret the assessment task tool, instructions, and conditions for assessment, cross-referencing to the Educator/Teacher Guide • analyse and review the model answers for each task • respond to the questions listed in the Validation Report 	Lead Validator Panel members

Step	Action	Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reach agreement and record comments against each criterion and whether improvements are required or why they are not required. Record final recommendations/actions for improvements to assessment tools/ future assessment judgements and identify any trends or issues that need to be addressed sign hardcopy version of completed Validation Report after all student files have been validated and the outcomes of the validation are documented save the Validation Report under the course name and date of validation meeting, using 'National Code Validation ddmmyy'. 	
10	After the meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> document the outcomes of the post-assessment validation for the next Course Teams meeting and update the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP). discuss recommendations with staff members not in attendance at the Post-Assessment Validation meeting. 	Head of Department
11	Email the completed Validation Report including the SMS report highlighting the names of students whose assessments were validated, to educationquality@cit.edu.au and Head of Department Education Quality	Lead Validator or Head of Department
12	Review validation reports and upload to TRIM or return to the Head of Department for further clarification. Confirm completion of Validation Report with HoD and Lead Validator and ensure education quality administrator uploads Validation Reports to TRIM.	Quality Advisors
13	Notify the College Director and Education Design and Delivery Lead the outcome of the post-assessment validation including where changes are required to curriculum.	Head of Department
14	Facilitate the update of assessment of tasks/tools and other rectifications where required and advise the College Director, Education Design and Delivery Lead and Audit, Risk and Corporate Governance of the status of rectifications.	Head of Department Education Quality
15	Update the validation schedule.	Head of Department Education Quality

4. Supporting Documents

4.1 Legislation/Regulation

- [Standards for RTOs 2015 \(Clause 1.8, 1.9-1.12 and 2.2\)](#)

- *Standards for Registered Training Organisations Amendment (VET Workforce Support) Instrument 2024*

4.2 Policy and Procedures

- [Assessment Validation Policy](#)
- [Assessment Policy](#)
- [Assessment Procedure](#)
- [Amendment to Scope of Registration Policy](#)
- [Industry and Community Engagement \(Training and Assessment\) Procedure](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Training and Assessment Strategy Development Policy](#)

4.3 Related Documents

- Pre-Delivery Assessment Review Form
- Quality Review of Training Product Prior to Adding to Scope of Registration
- Assessment Quality Review template
- Assessor Decision Review
- Validation Report
- [ASQA Fact Sheet Conducting Validation](#)
- [Users' Guide to the Standards for Registered Training Organisations \(RTOs\) 2015 Version 2.2 October 2019](#)

5. Definitions

All terminology used in this procedure is consistent with definitions in the CIT Definition of Terms. Specific definitions relevant to this policy are:

Confidence level	<p>In survey sampling, different samples can be randomly selected from the same population, and each sample can often produce a different confidence interval. Some confidence intervals include the true population parameter; others do not.</p> <p>A confidence level refers to the percentage of all possible samples that can be expected to include the true population parameter. For example, suppose all possible samples were selected from the same population, and a confidence interval were computed for each sample. A 95% confidence level implies that 95% of the confidence intervals would include the true population parameter.</p>
Lead Validator	<p>The person charged with the responsibility to coordinate and lead validation activities. The lead validator cannot be the educator directly involved in the delivery or assessment being validated.</p>
Margin of Error	<p>The margin of error is a statistic expressing the amount of random sampling error in a survey's results. The larger the margin of error, the less confidence one should have that the poll's reported results are close to the "true" figures; that is, the figures for the whole population.</p>

Pre-delivery assessment review	<p>Also known as pre-delivery validation.</p> <p>Assessment tools are reviewed prior to use to ensure assessments can be conducted consistent with the principles of assessment and rules of evidence, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Training Product and • legislative, regulatory and licensing obligations. <p>The outcome of the review informs changes to the assessment tools.</p> <p>CIT will review all assessment resources including new and re-developed training products, whether purchased or designed internally, pre-delivery using Pre-delivery assessment review form for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new TAS documents, for the delivery of new courses, including additions to the Scope of Registration • new TAS documents where courses are transitioning to new qualifications and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ all non-equivalent units will need to be redeveloped and then validated ○ new courses including where courses are transitioning to new qualifications, and new units, while deemed equivalent, may have changes to assessment conditions • existing assessment tools modified through a review process • new assessment tools developed internally • assessment resources acquired or purchased from a third party including from other TAFE institutes. <p>Refer: Assessment Validation Policy and Assessment Validation Procedure</p>
Risk analysis approach	<p>Is a review to identify academic risk to courses through a number processes including but not limited to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referring to the ASQA risk priorities • Environmental scans • Internal and external audits • Student cohorts, i.e., number of international students in a course • Industries with high WHS risk • Student and industry feedback.
Training Product	<p>An AQF qualification, skill set, unit of competency, accredited short course and module on CIT's scope of registration. This includes all qualifications but also all explicit units of competency.</p>
Validation	<p>Validation is a quality review process for completed assessments that confirms the assessment system can consistently produce valid assessment judgements. Validation involves reviewing that the assessment tools produce valid, reliable, sufficient, current, and authentic evidence to enable reasonable judgements to be</p>



	made as to whether the requirements of the training package or VET accredited courses are met.
Valid assessment judgement	A valid assessment judgement is one that confirms a student holds all the knowledge and skills described in a training product.