

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

Document Name	05. Quality Assurance P&P 2025_v1.3
Status	Approved
Approved By	Tim Koster
Approval Date	19/08/2025
Review Date	19/08/2027
Standard Reference	Standards for RTOs 2025 - Standards 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 Credential Policy - Standards for Registered Training Organisations
Signature	

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

Table of Contents

Policy	3
Definitions	3
Procedure	4
1. Assessment Tool Development and Review	4
2. Assessment Practice and Validity	4
3. Validation of Assessment Systems	4
4. Using Review Outcomes for Continuous Improvement	5
5. Pre-Validation and Moderation	5
Extracts from Standards	6

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

Policy

Minda Inc t/a South Australian Learning Centre (SALC) is committed to delivering high-quality, compliant and industry-relevant vocational education and training through a structured and proactive quality assurance framework. This framework supports the continuous review and improvement of training and assessment practices to ensure they remain aligned with current training package requirements, industry expectations, student needs and regulatory obligations.

The organisation ensures that all training and assessment tools, strategies and delivery methods are reviewed, tested and refined prior to implementation. In addition to meeting the formal requirements for validation under the Standards for RTOs 2025, SALC also undertakes pre-validation of coursework materials prior to delivery, and internal moderation of assessment judgements throughout each delivery cycle. These non-mandatory practices are key features of our internal quality system and are used to support consistency, reduce risk and foster confidence in both our trainers and students.

Validation activities are conducted by appropriately skilled and credentialed personnel, in accordance with the Credential Policy. These processes are not static; they are embedded in a continuous cycle of improvement that reflects feedback from students, staff, employers and industry.

SALC adopts a risk-based approach to validation and quality review, with additional attention given to training products where delivery risks, assessment inconsistencies or student outcome concerns are identified. Validation outcomes, audit findings, complaints and informal feedback are all viewed as valuable sources of insight, helping to drive improvements in resource design, staff development and service delivery.

Through its quality assurance systems, Minda actively promotes consistency of assessment judgements, fairness in the student experience and the currency and relevance of all training delivered. This ensures that graduates meet the required competencies and are well-prepared for workplace or further vocational pathways.

Definitions

Term	Definition
Credential Policy	A national policy that defines the qualifications, skills and experience required of individuals conducting training and assessment, including for those involved in validation.
Quality Assurance	The systematic process of monitoring, reviewing, and improving training and assessment practices to ensure compliance, consistency and continuous improvement.
Pre-validation	A review of assessment tools before they are used to confirm they align with the unit requirements and meet the principles of assessment and rules of evidence.
Validation	A process where assessment tools, practices, and judgements are reviewed by independent, skilled and credentialed persons to ensure they meet the principles of assessment and rules of evidence.
Moderation	A process where assessors review and compare assessment judgements to ensure consistent decisions about student competency.

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

Risk-Based Approach	A method of prioritising validation and quality review activities based on the likelihood and impact of quality risks, such as changes to the training product, poor student outcomes or stakeholder concerns.
Validity	One of the rules of evidence requiring that assessment evidence is sufficient to allow an assessor to make a judgement that a student has the required skills and knowledge.

Procedure

1. Assessment Tool Development and Review

- 1.1. All assessment tools are designed to align with the requirements of the training product and mapped to the relevant performance criteria, knowledge evidence and performance evidence.
- 1.2. Before use, all assessment tools are reviewed by at least one qualified staff member to ensure they meet all requirements.
- 1.3. Any changes identified during this review are documented and applied prior to student delivery.
- 1.4. Records of assessment tool reviews and updates are maintained as part of the organisation's quality assurance documentation.

2. Assessment Practice and Validity

- 2.1. Assessors must ensure all evidence presented by students is adequate to demonstrate the required competence as defined in the unit or qualification.
- 2.2. Assessment decisions must be based on mapped benchmarks, clear assessment criteria and properly documented judgements.
- 2.3. Validation and internal moderation processes are used to monitor assessor consistency and the quality of evidence across assessors.

3. Validation of Assessment Systems

- 3.1. Each training product on the scope of registration is validated at least once every five years, as per Standard 1.5.

3.1.1 SALC maintains a validation calendar outlining a set schedule for product validation.

- 3.2. A more frequent validation schedule is applied in cases where:

- A unit or course is determined to be high-risk
- Student outcomes indicate a concern
- There has been a change to the training product
- Industry or student feedback highlights risks
- New delivery modes (e.g. online) are introduced
- High volume (eg. Provide first aid)

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

3.3. Validation is conducted by independent and appropriately credentialled persons with vocational competence in the relevant unit and current skills in training and assessment.

3.4. Validation includes review of:

- The assessment tools
- Activities and tasks
- A sample of student evidence
- Assessment decisions made by assessors
- Alignment of evidence with unit requirements

3.5. A risk-based approach is used to determine:

- Which units or qualifications require prioritisation
- The sample size of assessments to be validated
- The scope of validation (full tool vs. specific component)

3.6. Validation outcomes are documented and used to improve tools, update mapping, or provide targeted PD for assessors.

4. Using Review Outcomes for Continuous Improvement

4.1. Outcomes of assessment tool reviews, validation, student feedback, and complaints are recorded in the Continuous Improvement Register.

4.2. Identified actions are assigned to relevant staff with timelines for implementation and follow-up.

4.3. Changes made as a result of review processes are communicated to all affected trainers and assessors and embedded into future training delivery.

5. Pre-Validation and Moderation

5.1. Prior to use, new or significantly revised assessment tools and learner materials undergo pre-validation by an internal or external content expert to confirm alignment with unit requirements, clarity of instructions, and appropriateness of tasks.

5.2. Pre-validation includes checks against the unit mapping, assessment conditions, and assessment environment to ensure compliance and practical suitability.

5.3. Moderation sessions are scheduled for assessors to compare student submissions, benchmark marking decisions, and ensure consistency in application of the rules of evidence.

5.4. Outcomes from moderation sessions are documented and may result in changes to assessor instructions, rewording of marking guides, or updates to model answers.

5.5. Pre-validation and moderation outcomes are retained with assessment tool documentation and fed into formal validation planning.

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

Extracts from Standards

Standard 1.1 Training is engaging, well-structured and enables VET students to attain skills and knowledge consistent with the training product.

P.I.(a) training is consistent with the requirements of the training product;

P.I.(b) assessors make individual assessment judgements that are justified based on the following rules of evidence:

i validity – assessment evidence is adequate, such that the assessor can be reasonably assured that the VET student possesses the skills and knowledge described in the training product;

Standard 1.3 The assessment system is fit-for-purpose and consistent with the training product.

P.I.(a) the assessment is consistent with the requirements of the training product;

P.I.(b) assessment tools are reviewed prior to use to ensure assessment can be conducted in a way that is consistent with the principles of assessment and rules of evidence set out under Standard 1.4; and

P.I.(c) the outcomes of any such reviews inform any necessary changes to assessment tools.

Standard 1.4 The assessment system ensures assessment is conducted in a way that is fair and appropriate and enables accurate assessment judgement of VET student competency.

P.I.(b) assessors make individual assessment judgements that are justified based on the following rules of evidence:

i validity – assessment evidence is adequate, such that the assessor can be reasonably assured that the VET student possesses the skills and knowledge described in the training product;

Standard 1.5 The assessment system is quality assured by appropriately skilled and credentialled persons through a regular process of validating assessment practices and judgements.

P.I.(a) validation of assessment practices and judgements ensure the assessment system produces assessment judgements that are consistent with the training product and comply with the requirements set out in this instrument;

P.I.(b) every training product on the organisation's scope of registration is validated at least once every five years and on a more frequent basis where the organisation becomes aware of risks to training outcomes, any changes to the training product or receives relevant feedback from VET students, trainers, assessors, and industry;

05. Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure

P.I.(c) it utilises a risk-based approach – informed by any risks to training outcomes, any changes to the training product or any feedback from VET students, trainers, assessors, and industry – to determine:

- i the components of the assessment system for a training product which are to be validated; and
- ii the sample size of assessments that are to be validated in respect of a particular training product.

Credential Policy - Standards for Registered Training Organisations