




# TRAINING PROVIDERS FORUM 2015

25 - 26 MAY | PERTH CONVENTION AND EXHIBITION CENTRE

Building the workforce to meet the economic and community needs of Western Australia



Independent validation of assessment pilot  
project - findings, recommendations and  
the way forward

Stephanie Hiraishi & Dr Ross Kelly

Department of Training and Workforce Development

This session will also be webcast



The views and resources presented in this workshop represent the views of the presenter(s) and do not in any way represent the views of VET Regulators.

For further information on the Standards or matters of VET compliance, please consult the '[Standards for Registered Training Organisations \(RTOs\) 2015](#)' or visit the VET Regulator websites;

Training Accreditation Council [www.tac.wa.gov.au](http://www.tac.wa.gov.au);  
Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA) [www.asqa.gov.au](http://www.asqa.gov.au).



# Independent validation of assessment pilot project

Findings, recommendations and the  
way forward



# Background

- National Partnership Agreement on Skills Reform – ‘Quality’ reform direction
- Industry consultation identified:
  - Perceived quality issues in VET assessment
  - Possible causes
  - Qualifications to be validated
  - Pilot model



# Governance

## Strategic Reference Group:

- TAFE Directors Australia
- Australian Council for Private Education and Training
- Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- State Training Board
- Training Accreditation Council (observer)
- Department of Training and Workforce Development (executive)

## Industry steering groups for each pilot implementation:

- Training councils, peak industry bodies, employers



# The pilot model - design

- Methodology not narrowly defined
- Iterative implementations
- Reviewed after each implementation
- The model:
  - Experts review RTO assessment documentation against industry-endorsed quality criteria
  - Supported by employer interviews and campus interviews (optional)
  - Constructive feedback to RTOs



# The pilot model - implementation

- ☑ Validator and industry steering group tailor the approach to industry requirements
- 📄 Validator reviews RTO documentation
- ☎ Validator interviews employers (if required)
- ✍ Findings with de-identified examples reviewed by industry steering group and recommendations developed
- 📧 Findings and recommendations provided to RTOs





# Pilot implementation 1 – Aged Care

- Certificate III and Certificate IV in Aged Care
- 2 units of competency, 9 RTOs
- Desktop validation and employer interviews
- RTO Assist (3 experts)
- Aged Care Pilot Steering Group members:
  - Community Services Health and Education Training Council
  - Aged & Community Services WA
  - Brightwater Homes
  - Juniper Central



# Pilot implementation 2 - TAE

- Certificate IV in Training and Assessment
- 3 units of competency, 11 RTOs
- Desktop validation
- Dr Russell Docking
- TAE Pilot Steering Group members:
  - Community Services, Health and Education Training Council
  - TAFE Directors Australia
  - Australian Council for Private Education and Training
  - Curtin University/Curtin College



# Pilot implementation 3 - Automotive

- Certificate III in Light Vehicle Mechanical Technology
- 3 units of competency, 5 RTOs
- Campus-based validation and employer interviews
- David Love
- Automotive Pilot Steering Group members:
  - Engineering and Automotive Training Council
  - Institute of Automotive Mechanical Engineers Western Australia
  - Commercial Vehicle Industry Association
  - Motor Trade Association of Western Australia



# Pilot implementation 4 – Brick and Block

- Certificate III in Bricklaying and Blocklaying
- 3 units of competency, 5 RTOs
- Desktop validation, case study (one RTO - campus visit and employer interviews)
- Dr Russell Docking
- Bricklaying and Blocklaying Pilot Steering Group members:
  - Construction Training Council
  - Construction Training Fund
  - Association of Wall and Ceiling Industries
  - Australian Brick and Blocklaying Training Foundation
  - Housing Industry Association
  - Alcock Brown-Neaves Group Training



# Feedback to RTOs

- Validator looked for evidence of quality features, e.g. “Assessment mapping is accurate and consistent”
- If evidence was found, the RTO received a
- Findings presented as:
  - quantitative data (Guttman charts)
  - constructive feedback



# Feedback to RTOs – Guttman charts

RTOs are ranked lower if their crosses are for higher-ranked features: e.g. RTO 4 after RTO 1 (highlighted)

RTOs are ranked

RTO	6	9	5	2	8	1	Your RTO	4	7
Sufficient information provided to candidates	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Valid methods used to gather evidence of skills	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x
Valid methods used to gather evidence of RPL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x
Individual performance sufficiently identified in group assessments	✓	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x
Valid methods used to gather evidence of knowledge	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
Industry consultation	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Features are ranked by frequency

RTOs with the same results are ordered numerically (e.g. RTO 2 before RTO 8)



# Feedback to RTOs – Guttman charts

- Guttman charts allow RTOs to:
  - See their results against a clear benchmark
  - See their results compared to other RTOs
  - See whether everyone makes the same ‘mistakes’
  - Prioritise the areas for improvement
- For example, RTO 4 may choose to revise the way they assess skills



# Constructive feedback to RTOs

## **Where quality features are observed:**

- Validator describes the observed practice
- Describes how it improves validity

## **Where quality features are missing:**

- Validator describes what is missing
- Describes how this reduces validity
- Recommends actions for improvement





# Common findings

## **Practices reducing validity**

- Unit of competency not used as the blueprint for assessment
- Insufficient industry involvement in development and review of assessment

## **Practices improving validity**

- Students are well informed about assessment requirements
- Reasonable adjustment for candidate needs
- Detailed assessment planning



# Experience with the pilot model

## Timing

- 👎 Significant delay in giving feedback to RTOs – some findings no longer relevant
- 👎 Timing of pilots was inconvenient (end of year): some RTOs too busy to participate
- 👎 Brief field research period - limited employer evidence collected
- 👍 Most RTOs felt it was worth the wait



# Experience with the pilot model

## Data

- 👎 Desktop validation may not provide an accurate picture of RTO assessment practices
- 👎 3 units of competency and 2 students unlikely to be a statistically valid sample of delivery
- 👍 Same documentation as required for audit, so readily available
- 👍 Further reduce burden on RTOs by accessing documents directly from regulator?



# Experience with the pilot model

## Employers and industry

- 👎 Difficult to engage employers
- 👎 Telephone interviews may be ineffective
- 👎 Getting sufficient employer feedback would increase validation costs
- 👍 Industry driven
- 👍 Gives industry insight into RTO practices



# Experience with the pilot model

## Validators' reports to RTOs:

- 👉 Single validator - some subjectivity
- 👍 Educative focus – helps improvement
- 👍 Benchmarking is valuable
- 👍 Confidential - can safely compare RTO products against competitors
- 👍 Large sample of RTOs - gives broader view than RTOs' own benchmarking and moderating arrangements
- 👍 Feedback is comprehensive and can be acted on



# Discussion

- What are the model's strengths and weaknesses?
- What are the potential costs and benefits?
- How would it fit with existing processes?
- What are the most important things to consider when validating assessments?
- Could this model be adopted as a standard approach for the VET sector?



# Your feedback

Please give us your feedback:

- Fill out the feedback slip on your table
- Or email [Karen.Purdy@dtwd.wa.gov.au](mailto:Karen.Purdy@dtwd.wa.gov.au)
- Or access this link  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/BD6Q79K>
- Or scan this QR code



# NEXT SESSION



Networking drinks