The following is submitted for the assessment of:
TAEASS403B: Participate in assessment validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration of assessment task requirements</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Validation 1

**Unit:** Operate word-processing applications (ICAICT102A)

**Validation documentation**
- Post-assessment validation cover sheet: 3
- Validation Checklist: 4
- Validation Report: 6
- Validation Meeting Notes: 7

**Other Materials**

**Validation 1 Videos** – see attached

### Validation 2

**Unit:** Develop keyboard skills (BSBITU102A)

**Validation documentation**
- Post-assessment validation cover sheet: 9
- Validation Checklist: 10
- Validation Report: 13
- Validation Meeting Notes: 14

**Other Materials**

**Validation 2 Videos** – see attached
Validation Activity (this is a formal meeting)

For this activity you will need to be part of a validation group (minimum of 3).
(yes – 3 members – me, Antonella A, Sina C; details given in Post-assessment validation cover sheet)

You may use a simulated organisational setting (yes)
You are required to participate in two validation activities (yes – see two videos)

Using the templates provided (or your own organisations documents)

1. Prepare for a validation meeting/s (see validation Meeting Notes for information of how this was done)
   Your validation activities will be against the assessment
   1. Process or method (yes – imbedded in review of marking guide)
   2. Instruments/tools (yes – see two videos)

You will need to:
- Prepare for the meeting activities (yes – as above)
- Gather all appropriate documentation (yes – as above)
- Have a clear purpose for the validation activities (yes – see Post-assessment validation cover sheet)
- List the people involved (yes – see Post-assessment validation cover sheet)

2. Contribute to the validation process
- Participate in the validation sessions (yes – see two videos)
- Discuss, agree and record recommendations (yes – see validation report)
- Check all documents are completed fully and checked for accuracy and version control (yes – checked off in validation checklist)
Post-assessment validation cover sheet

This cover sheet acknowledges the participants and assessment tools validated during the meeting held at:

**Location:** Simulated work environment

**on:** 26/11/2013

**Purpose for validation activity:** The purpose is to review the quality of the assessment tool below, with reference to the process and criteria (referred to as ‘relevant factors’) specified in the Validation meeting notes.

**Assessment tools/processes to be validated:** Assessment Exercise for Assessment Project 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of validators participating</th>
<th>Position or role of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sam Capurso</td>
<td>Trainer/assessor (trainee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Antonella A</td>
<td>Certified trainer (in-house, insurance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sina C</td>
<td>Industry expert (administration: data entry and Office Suite)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the recommendations**

- For the pre-assessment validation process, please see the Record of Trial Outcomes.
- Allow for more candidate autonomy in these activities (and Activity 4 in particular).
- Reduce the number of different documents required by the assessor.
**Validation Checklist**

**Qualification title:** Cert I in Information, Digital Media and Technology  
**Date:** 26/11/2013

**Benchmark/s:** ICAICT102A – Operate word-processing documents

**Assessment instrument being evaluated:** Assessment Exercise for Assessment Project 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments or recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment task instructions and assessment conditions are clearly identified</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Clear and comprehensive (discussed prior to meeting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written information is at the appropriate AQF level and grammatically correct</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evidence requirements of the unit of competency are covered</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following are supported in the assessment instrument:</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employability skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Essential skills requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Essential knowledge requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity could sustain more than one assessment method for reasonable adjustment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>How/why? Verbal explanations in place of written evidence, help with computer skills outside of assessment. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> add provision for extra time if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A marking or assessment guide is provided with the instrument</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Referred to during assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessment activity is relevant to a number of different situations/contexts</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Activities 6 and 7 provide for different contexts (production of documents for different purposes), but activity could be restructured to be less rigid and allow for better representation of candidate’s actual workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principles of assessment have been addressed:</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Yes, individual activities were assessed with these in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rules of evidence has been addressed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Authentic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check all documents are completed fully and checked for accuracy and version control</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td><strong>To do</strong> (this was forgotten during this meeting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional facilitator comments:** See below.

The assessment tool has been modified as per recommendations  
**Yes:** 2BC  
**No:**

**Validator name / position:** Sam Capurso / Trainer (trainee)  
**Date:** 26/11/2013

**Validator name / position:** Antonella A (trainer)  
**Date:** 26/11/2013

**Validator name / position:** Sina C (industry expert)  
**Date:** 26/11/2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.1</th>
<th>Question Reviewed?</th>
<th>Answer Guide Reviewed?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td><strong>Marking guide:</strong> it was decided that if an ergonomic requirement is not possible to be completed (e.g., the chair being used is not an adjustable office chair), then the assessor should be required to ask the candidate how this should be remedied in an ideal (hypothetical) situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.2</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> an example should be provided to the candidate in order to given guidance on what is expected of the candidate when answering this question (examples can be obtained from the marking guide).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 2</th>
<th>Omitted</th>
<th>Omitted</th>
<th><strong>Note:</strong> Omitted in simulated setting, but please note this would have been reviewed in reality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Activity 3  |                      |                       | **Question:** this question demonstrates job-management employability skills. **Marking guide:** the issue of the comprehensiveness of the marking guide for this activity was discussed, and it was deemed suitable (as there are a number of different application tools the candidate can employ to complete the task, and it would be impractical to list all of these in the marking guide). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 4</th>
<th>Omitted</th>
<th>Omitted</th>
<th><strong>Note:</strong> Omitted in simulated setting, but please note this would have been reviewed in reality. However, it was noted that this activity, along with Activity 3, meet the requirements of sufficiency (the demonstration of skills in different contexts) for this assessment tool.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Validation Report 1

Unit: **ICAICT102A** – Operate word-processing documents

**Assessment tool:** Assessment Exercise for Assessment Project 1

**Recommendations:**

1. Activities 3 and 4 have been structured with three things in mind.
   - To ensure the assessment exercise meets all of the relevant performance criteria, and presents different instances and contexts for skills to be performed (in order to ensure reliability and sufficiency).
   - To make it clear what the assessor is expected to look for and assess, which is supported by the provision of a marking guide.
   - To reduce the time spent by the candidate in thinking of or finding data to enter into the word-processed document. This also addresses some of the consistency implications discussed below if the candidate was required to do this.

   **Recommendation:** Allow for more candidate autonomy in these activities (and Activity 4 in particular).

   **Justification:** This would allow job role / environment skills to be better represented in the assessment activity.

   **Explanation:** The activity could be restructured so that it is not in the form of step-by-step instructions but is structured so that the candidate is just given information and style specifications and then is asked to produce the document for a particular purpose (like a flyer). The data to be entered would still be provided in the assessment tool. The marking guide could also be adapted to accommodate this assessment method.

   **Action:** Issue a rewrite of Activities 3 and 4, or the development of another activity in the next six months, and submit for a trial.

   *Another adoption would be to ask the candidate to provide data from their organisation that they could use to enter into a word-processed document.*

   **Explanation:** The assessor would need to make a determination of whether this is suitable material for the purposes of assessment, and whether the development of a document incorporating this material will meet the relevant benchmarks. To allow for the possibility that the candidate is unable to provide suitable material, there could be a choice of two activities the assessor could select – one like the current assessment activity, and the other allowing for the candidate to provide their own material to enter into a word-processed document. The question and marking guide would need to be clear in what is expected of the candidate to ensure consistency in the assessment outcomes.

2. **Recommendation:** Reduce the number of different documents required by the assessor.

   **Justification:** This would minimise the chance of the assessor missing instructions or components of the assessment process.

   **Explanation:** For example, rather than having the assessor bring a copy of the assessment exercise and the marking guide to the assessment, the assessment questions could be included in the marking guide.

   **Action:** Edit the marking guide as soon as possible (say two weeks), and submit for informal review amongst colleagues.
The following documentation will be considered:

- The ICAICT102A unit of competency
- The ICT Training Package
- The Assessor Instructions
- The Assessor Marking Guide
- The Candidate Instructions
- The Assessment Exercise
- The Assessment Plan

Supplementary documentation:

- The Assessment Map – this will be referred to in order to check validity.
- The candidate’s assessment feedback – which you have been invited to read this before the meeting.
- The record of the trial outcomes – which you have been invited to read this before the meeting.

Summary:

The candidate reported an overall positive response to the assessment in their feedback.

In response to the trial, the main improvements made to the assessment tool were based on providing clearer instructions and reducing ambiguity in what was expected of the candidate, improving the clarity of expression, and removing components that did not relate to the performance criteria to ensure validity.

Validation documentation:

- Post-assessment validation checklists
- Validation meeting notes (this document)

Structure of the meeting:

1. Consideration of Assessment Plan (for the purposes of my assessment, this was not considered separately but, as all content covered in the assessment plan is evident in the other assessment materials reviewed, any issues that were raised will be linked back to the assessment plan in this documentation), Assessment Instructions and Candidate Instructions (read prior to the meeting)
   - Includes consideration of assessment process

2. Consideration of each activity in the Assessment Exercise, in conjunction with the Assessor Marking Guide - for the purposes of my assessment and the time constraints of the volunteers involved, I chose a representative selection of activities to review (instead of all of them)
   - Includes consideration of assessment content and methods
   - A template has been provided to document this review

3. Brief discussion of assessment tool overall
   - Completion of validation checklist

4. Summary of recommendations that have been made
   - Including who and how these modifications will occur

Recommendations may include:

- Professional development of assessor
- Change in assessment procedure
- Management of records
- Change to assessment tools and resources
- Partnership arrangements
- Improvement to evidence collection process
- Revised information for assessors and/or candidates
- Liaison with industry experts
### Relevant factors to consider during validation:

#### Principles of assessment

- **Validity** — satisfies the benchmarks, without going above or below the relevant standards, and relevant to industry practice. Reference to the assessment map can also be used to address questions of validity.
- **Reliability** — consideration of the consistency and accuracy of the assessment, and whether the use of different settings, times and assessors will produce the same assessment outcome.
- **Flexibility** — consideration of provisions of reasonable adjustments.
- **Fairness** — verification that there is no discrimination to particular candidates or groups.

#### Rules of evidence

- **Validity** —
- **Authenticity** — consideration of methods used to verify authenticity.
- **Currency** — consideration of currency requirements.
- **Sufficiency** — consideration of the number and quality of activities and assessment methods used, and whether different work-related contexts were used in the simulated assessment environment.

#### Employability skills

- **Communication**
- Teamwork
- **Problem-solving**
- Initiative and enterprise
- Planning and organising
- Self-management
- **Learning**
- **Technology**

#### Dimensions of competency

- Task skills
- Task management skills
- Contingency management skills
- Job/role environment skills
Post-assessment validation cover sheet

This cover sheet acknowledges the participants and assessment tools validated during the meeting held at:

**Location:** Simulated environment

**on:** 26/11/2013

**Purpose for validation activity:** The purpose is to review the quality of the assessment tool below, with reference to the process and criteria (referred to as ‘relevant factors’) specified in the Validation meeting notes.

**Assessment tools/processes to be validated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of validators participating</th>
<th>Position or role of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Capurso</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Antonella A</td>
<td>Certified trainer (in-house, insurance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Sina C</td>
<td>Industry expert (administration: data entry and Office Suite)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the recommendations**

- For the pre-assessment validation process, please see the Record of Trial Outcomes.
- Increase the scope for other forms of RPL evidence able to be presented.
### Validation Checklist

**Qualification title:** Cert I in Business  
**Validation date:** 26/11/2013

**Benchmark/s:** BSBITU102A – Develop keyboard skills

**Assessment instrument being evaluated:** Assessment Exercise for Assessment Project 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Comments or recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment task instructions and assessment conditions are clearly identified</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Clear and comprehensive (discussed prior to meeting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written information is at the appropriate AQF level and grammatically correct</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evidence requirements of the unit of competency are covered</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following are supported in the assessment instrument:</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employability skills</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Essential skills requirements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Essential knowledge requirements</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity could sustain more than one assessment method for reasonable adjustment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>How/why? Verbal explanations in place of written evidence, help with computer skills outside of assessment. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> add provision for extra time if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A marking or assessment guide is provided with the instrument</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Referred to during assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assessment activity is relevant to a number of different situations/contexts</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Activities 7 provides for different contexts (use of different data entry applications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principles of assessment have been addressed:</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Yes, individual activities were assessed with these in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valid</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reliable</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexible</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fair</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rules of evidence has been addressed</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valid</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Authentic</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check all documents are completed fully and checked for accuracy and version control</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional facilitator comments:** See below.

The assessment tool has been modified as per recommendations:  
**Yes:** 2BC  
**No:**

**Validator name / position:** Sam Capurso / Trainer (trainee)  
**Date:** 26/11/2013

**Validator name / position:** Antonella A (trainer)  
**Date:** 26/11/2013

**Validator name / position:** Sina C (industry expert)  
**Date:** 26/11/2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Question Reviewed?</th>
<th>Answer Guide Reviewed?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The set-up of the two options from which the candidate could choose was clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Note: Omitted in simulated setting, but please note this would have been reviewed in reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Note: Omitted in simulated setting, but please note this would have been reviewed in reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Note: Omitted in simulated setting, but please note this would have been reviewed in reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Question: it was decided that what a ‘certified typing test’ is should be defined – consult industry expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: it was considered whether the assessment activity was too rigidly framed for RPL, but was decided that a typing test was the only way the speed and accuracy of the candidate’s typing could be ascertained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Question: it was decided that there was a need to investigate better alternatives to current typing tests – consult industry expert. This is not urgent, as the current typing tests are sound, so this can be completed in the next six months. If a new test is chosen, this will need to be submitted for a trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marking guide: it should be specified in the marking guide that the assessor needs to refer to organisational benchmarks for speed and accuracy (as outlined in the unit of competency) for the purposes of ensuring validity. A provision should also be made for candidates who do not have organisational requirements for speed and accuracy; an industry expert should be consulted to ascertain these benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Marking guide: it should be made clearer that this answer guide is not for the purposes of ensuring validity (i.e.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Reviewed?</td>
<td>Answer Guide Reviewed?</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Testing performance criteria) but for authenticity. It should also be made more explicit that both the processes and the reasons for the proof-reading amendments that are shown should be considered by the assessor when questioning the candidate for authenticity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question: a concern about whether requiring the candidate to observe and then implement a change in font in the prescribed text was beyond the scope of the unit of competency (and therefore not valid). However, the validation panel agreed that this was not beyond what would be reasonably expected of someone working in an office environment. Another concern about whether requiring the candidate to edit grammatical errors in the prescribed text was unfair for candidates with LLN needs. However, it was decided that the changes required to be performed were basic, and not atypical of an employee undertaking data entry. Spell check was also allowed to be used to ensure fairness in this activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Note: Omitted in simulated setting, but please note this would have been reviewed in reality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit: BSBITU102A – Develop keyboard skills
Assessment tool: Assessment Exercise for Assessment Project 2

Recommendations:

1. **Recommendation:** It was suggested that the current structure of the assessment tool was somewhat limiting, and that it could be reshaped to fit performance criteria, rather than activities (like normal RPL assessment tools).
   
   **Explanation:** While the current structure was decided upon due to the technical nature of the unit, some of the opportunities for presenting RPL evidence lean towards assuming formal training has been undertaken by the candidate, which may not be entirely fair as this is a level I course.

   **Justification:** The candidate may wish to present evidence from other experiences (such as on-the-job learning) that they may wish to present.

   **Action:** Issue a rewrite of the assessment tool, using the same activities but broadening the scope for RPL submissions or adding other possible forms of evidence that may be presented by the candidate, and submit for a trial (timeframe: 12 months).
The following documentation will be considered:

- The BSBITU102A unit of competency
- The Business Services Training Package
- The Assessor Instructions
- The Assessor Marking Guide
- The Candidate Instructions
- The Assessment Exercise
- The Assessment Plan

Supplementary documentation:

- The Assessment Map – this will be referred to in order to check validity.
- The candidate’s assessment feedback – which you have been invited to read this before the meeting.
  
  **Summary:** The candidate reported an overall positive response to the assessment in their feedback.
- The record of the trial outcomes – which you have been invited to read this before the meeting.
  
  **Summary:** In response to the trial some restructures were made. These were mainly based on increasing the sufficiency of the evidence collected, streamlining the process of verifying authenticity, and modifying some of the language in the assessment to better reflect the relevant unit of competency and AQTF level.

Validation documentation:

- Post-assessment validation checklists
- Validation meeting notes (this document)

Structure of the meeting:

5. Consideration of Assessment Plan (for the purposes of my assessment, this was not considered separately but, as all content covered in the assessment plan is evident in the other assessment materials reviewed, any issues that were raised will be linked back to the assessment plan in this documentation), Assessment Instructions and Candidate Instructions (read prior to the meeting)

  - Includes consideration of assessment process

6. Consideration of each activity in the Assessment Exercise, in conjunction with the Assessor Marking Guide – for the purposes of my assessment and the time constraints of the volunteers involved, I chose a representative selection of activities to review (instead of all of them)

  - Includes consideration of assessment content and methods
  - A template has been provided to document this review

7. Brief discussion of assessment tool overall

  - Completion of validation checklist

8. Summary of recommendations that have been made

  - Including who and how these modifications will occur

**Recommendations may include:**

- Professional development of assessor
- Change in assessment procedure
- Management of records
- Change to assessment tools and resources
- Partnership arrangements
- Improvement to evidence collection process
- Revised information for assessors and/or candidates
- Liaison with industry experts
### Relevant factors to consider during validation:

#### Principles of assessment
- **Validity** — satisfies the benchmarks, without going above or below the relevant standards, and relevant to industry practice. Reference to the assessment map can also be used to address questions of validity.
- **Reliability** — consideration of the consistency and accuracy of the assessment, and whether the use of different settings, times and assessors will produce the same assessment outcome.
- **Flexibility** — consideration of provisions of reasonable adjustments.
- **Fairness** — verify that there is no discrimination to particular candidates or groups.

#### Rules of evidence
- **Validity** —
- **Authenticity** — consideration of methods used to verify authenticity.
- **Currency** — consideration of currency requirements.
- **Sufficiency** — consideration of the number and quality of activities and assessment methods used, and whether different work-related contexts were used in the simulated assessment environment.

#### Employability skills
- **Communication**
- Teamwork
- **Problem-solving**
- Initiative and enterprise
- Planning and organising
- Self-management
- **Learning**
- **Technology**

#### Dimensions of competency
- Task skills
- Task management skills
- Contingency management skills
- Job/role environment skills