

Didasko Learning Resources

Validation group summary report

December 13th 2016



VALIDATION GROUP SUMMARY REPORT

Meeting date	Tuesday 13 th December 2016		
Meeting address	5 th Floor, 332 St Kilda Road, Southbank		
Meeting start time	9.00 am	End time	1.00 pm

Attendees			
1.	Tim Haronga (Validator) Teacher, Melbourne Polytechnic	4.	Julie Grigg (Compliance advisor) Research writer Didasko Digital
2.	Sarah Phillips (Validator) Director of Learning and development, Pop Education	5.	Liz Grist (Chair) Content Development Manager, Didasko Digital
3.	Christine Imer (Validator) Operational trainer, RACV Victoria	6.	Daniela Baric (Admin) Research writer Didasko Digital

Report	
Prepared by:	Elizabeth Grist and Daniela Baric
Date:	13 th December 2017

Meeting Objectives	
1.	<p>Review and validate the Didasko Learning Resources (DLR) assessment tasks for the following units of competency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SITXFSA001 Use hygienic practices for food safety SITHCCC006 Prepare appetisers and salads SITXHRM002 Roster staff SITXCCS007 Enhance customer service experiences <p>The outcome of this validation process will provide DLR with the opportunity to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> reach a common understanding of the criteria DLR is using for the assessment to ensure our approach is consistently applied (reliable), and evaluate the technical quality of the assessment tools being used determine if DLR assessments meet the rules of evidence discuss issues of concern about the assessment process, particularly in relation to fairness and flexibility suggest improvements to the assessment task, system or processes.
2.	Make recommendations for improvements to the current assessment tasks in the listed units of competency.

MEETING OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS – ALL FOUR UNITS OF COMPETENCY

Outcomes and recommendations	
1.	Great content and assessments, very relevant, clean and easy to navigate. Adding information for students would improve the learner experience but as a whole, students would have a pleasurable experience completing these tasks.
2.	Observations were made on the assumption that these assessments were being conducted by Didasko, however resources are provided to other RTO's and some of the comments made are the responsibility of the RTO which is conducting the assessment and not the responsibility of Didasko.
3.	Recommend using measurable language in the third-party checklists as non-measurable language requires the non TAE qualified observer to make a judgement, contributing to risk of bias. Make third-party report available to students. This is probably one of your more valid assessments within the tool and therefore would assume this would be beneficial to the student to complete for validity and sufficiency of the assessment.
4.	Tighten up instruction on Moodle for all pieces of assessment, but particularly multiple choice. Provide details of what is required to reach competency and the purpose of the assessment. Include a short instruction to the student to explain you are assessing their knowledge or skill etc.
5.	List all resources and equipment student requires to complete each task. Ensure resource references are explicit in assessment.
6.	May be at risk of over assessing. Do not ask a quiz question to assess skill requirements, you have better assessment methods for these in your later assessments so no need to quiz them first. This compromises your last point of sufficient relevant evidence, as a quiz question gathering evidence for a skill is not relevant.
7.	Ensure performance evidence is explicitly covered, e.g., that the practical demonstrations cover each individual component in each of the performance evidence requirements. If you mapped to each component rather than to the entire performance requirement it would be easier to see if this was sufficiently covered.
8.	May want to add a conditional release on your assessments as an extra security measure that has the student tick a box declaring they are submitting their own work when they complete the case study and knowledge questions. Not required but good practice.

SITXFSA001 Use hygienic practices for food safety	
1.	Observation assessment does not seem to have answers made available to the assessor for questions asked during the practical task.
2.	Provide documents (templates) to the assessor to support a student with reasonable adjustment e.g., a section that allows the assessor to explain the adjustments they have made for the student that can be loaded into the LMS to support the evidence provided by the student.
3.	Provide an explanation to students regarding benchmarks and rules for competency in a couple of the assessments (provided in the practical demonstration) e.g., how many questions they need to get right, conditions e.g., open book, time limits, individual or group tasks, where they need to complete the task, submission details and resources required.
4.	Remove T & F questions as not in line with the appropriate AQF level. Replace with multiple choice.

5.	Ensure performance evidence is explicitly covered, e.g., that the practical demonstrations cover each individual component in each of the performance evidence requirements. If you mapped to each component rather than to the entire performance requirement it would be easier to see if this was sufficiently covered.
----	--

SITHCCC006 Prepare appetisers and salads

1.	True or false can be risky for valid assessment and are not in line with an AQF level of IV or higher. Since you are assessing them on these components in other areas, make these formative assessments rather than summative.
2.	Be careful of multiple choice, and allow provisions for the student to get it wrong but able to justify why by demonstrating understanding.

SITXHRM002 Roster staff

1.	In the group assessments, are the students required to submit individual evidence, where does it say this if so. If they submit as a group, how do you identify who made which decision so that you can evidence them as satisfactory for the component?
2.	Provide a provision in the group task for students to make their own decision on the roster and submit their own evidence. This is not explicitly explained and therefore a student may feel they should conform with the group and if the group is not correct, their fairness of assessment may be jeopardised.
3.	Differentiate between a case study and a scenario. These both seem to be in the same tense, a case study is more about 'what would you do'? Where a scenario is more in regards to 'what will you do'?
4.	Be careful in using the term competent when asking the student to complete a task e.g., In assessment E you say 'To demonstrate competency in completing a roster...' you are implying that this assessment would deem the student competent on its own. You want to make sure you use the term <u>satisfactory</u> instead to ensure the student is clear this will not on its own deem them 'competent'.

SITXCCS007 Enhance customer service experiences

1.	Role play is excellent, well thought through. See comments below in fairness in regards to participation before assessment.
2.	In regards to your role plays, since you have provided the assessor and students with a specific scenario, your checklist should be supported with model answers to remove risk of assessor bias. The language used is ambiguous and one assessor's determination of relevant may be different to another.
3.	Instructions on roleplay are great, and as a resource developer you may not be responsible for this, however you may want to advise those using your resources that they should not match students who do this task together to play support roles before they are assessed, as you are creating an unfair advantage to those who are participants before they are assessed.
4.	If this is used in a group, you should provide alternative participant roles so that the roleplay outcomes can be rotated to ensure the student does not witness the right protocol before the actually do the task. This might also compromise the validity of the assessment.
5.	Don't use terms like 'shows awareness of customer service standards' as each Assessor's perception of this will vary. Use measurable language.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	
1.	Instructions will be improved by the Didasko writing team for all assessments and resource references, explicit in assessment are to be added.
2.	The Didasko writing team will ensure that specific instructions regarding each unit validated will be implemented during the update of that unit.
3.	As we write further assessment for units or update older assessments, the recommendations made across all the assessments will be implemented.
4.	Our 'Didasko Assessment Overview' document is to be updated to provide the users' of our assessments a clearer guide as to how assessments are to be used.
5.	Will ensure that language around the word 'competent' is used in the right context and not used to mean 'satisfactory'.
6.	Are in the process of looking at our 'sufficient, relevant evidence' and determining where we are over assessing. For example, avoid asking a quiz questions to assess a skill requirement when we already have a practical observation to do that.
7.	Will ensure our observation checklists are free from non-essential judgements as this risks assessor bias.