This report is to be used to moderate assessment judgements of student assessments as part of the full validation process.

For the purpose of clarification, the following definitions have been used:

**Validation** involves comparing, evaluating and reviewing assessment processes, methods and tools and the subsequent assessment decisions.

**Moderation** is a subset of validation and is the process of ensuring consistency and accuracy (validity) in the marking of [student assessments](http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Test_%28student_assessment%29).

**Moderators must:**

* NOT be the trainer or assessor who is the subject of the moderation.
* Have the vocational competencies and current industry skills relevant to the student work being moderated.
* Hold the relevant TAE qualification required to deliver and assess the student work being moderated as specified in the Standards for RTO’s 2015.
* Have current knowledge and skills in vocational teaching and learning

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART A – VALIDATION OVERVIEW** | | | | | |
| **Preparation and Resource Requirements** | Moderators must each have a copy of:   1. The relevant unit(s) of competency 2. Student files containing completed and marked student assessments 3. Marking Guides for each of the assessments | | | **Date of Validation** |  |
| **Student Name, Initial** (eg. Jane Smith JS) | **Type of study – Traineeship, Course, Flexible/online, Blended** | **Assessment Decision** (e.g., C, NYC) | | **Location of student assessments** | |
|  |  |  | | Brainstorm LMS  Google Drive/Dropbox  Paper files | |
|  |  |  | |
|  |  |  | |
| **Trainer Name/s** |  |  | |  | |
| **Qualification / Unit** |  | | | | |
| **Completed Assessments being moderated – please select** | Observation Checklist  Questions – Verbal/written  Project/Assignment  Workbook/Portfolio | | 3rd Party Report  RPL Evidence  Other: | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PART B - VALIDATION POINT** | | | | | | |
| **AREA** | **REQUIREMENT** | | **Yes/No** | | **Comments** | |
| **Training Package requirements** | Were any “pre-requisite” unit requirements satisfied? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| Were the qualification entry requirements satisfied? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Principles of Assessment** | **Validity**  Do the assessment instruments assess knowledge, skills and foundation skills as described in the unit of competency?  Have the Dimensions of Competency been assessed to a sufficient depth and reflect industry practice?  Have the Assessment Conditions of the unit been adhered to? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Reliability**  Have assessor guides, marking guides and instructions for collecting, marking, and recording evidence been used to ensure that assessors make consistent decisions? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Fairness**  Are the assessment methods non-discriminatory and inclusive?  Is the language used in the assessment instruments clear and concise?  Was the student given clear and meaningful feedback? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Flexibility**  Are the foundation skill needs of the learner supported in the assessment instruments?  Were reasonable adjustments made to support the needs of the students?  Were assessment tools contextualised to suit the work environment needs of the student? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **RULES OF EVIDENCE** | **Validity**  Was the gathered evidence valid and relevant to the unit of competency?  (For example, did the assessment instruments test the required skills and knowledge?)  Were the assessment tools usable?  Did students and assessors interpret the instructions consistently? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Sufficiency**  Were assessment judgements made in accordance with the decision-making rules?  That is –   * Students’ responses reflect marking criteria/ benchmarks? * Too harsh or too lenient? * Did the assessment support ‘individual’ evidence of performance and knowledge?) * Applied appropriately and consistently?   Is there evidence of additional assessment where appropriate?   * (For example, alternative assessment in case of reasonable adjustment? Re-submission or   re-assessment in different form based on students’ needs? ) | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Authenticity**  Does the evidence demonstrate that the student work is authentic? | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Currency**  The assessor is assured that the assessment evidence demonstrates current competency. This requires the assessment evidence to be from the present or the very recent past. | | Yes  No | |  | |
| **Has a review of student feedback been completed?**  **Recommendations for amendments noted for action.** | | | Yes  No  Explain | |  | |
| **Should assessment decision be reviewed?** | | | Yes  No  Explain | |  | |
| **Are there any compliance or quality improvement recommendations?** | | | Yes  No  Explain | |  | |
| **Validator Declaration** | I verify that I meet the criteria specified for moderating the student work and have provided copies of my qualifications and resume to RTO management. | | | | | |
| **Validator Name** | |  | | **Validator Email** | |  |
| **Validator Name** | |  | | **Validator Email** | |  |
| **Validator Name** | |  | | **Validator Email** | |  |