

# Validation Record

---

## Part 1: General Information

Validation details	
Validation led by	Chemène Sinson (Blackwater Projects)
Validation date and times	06 August 2015, 6:00 - 8:00pm
Validation approach	Webinar
Purpose and focus of the Validation	
Purpose	Validate an assessment tool
Relevant unit/s	TAELLN411 Address adult language, literacy and numeracy skills
Resources needed (emailed to validators prior to the validation webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This validation record</li> <li>• Unit: TAELLN411</li> <li>• Assessment requirements: TAELLN411</li> <li>• Assessment booklet: TAELLN411</li> <li>• Assessment tools: Instructions for use and marking guide</li> <li>• Competency matrix (map)</li> </ul>
Participants	
Name	Organisation / RTO
Ann Leske (assisted throughout development, sent email comments and webinar)	LLN In-Sight
Colin McKenzie (by email)	Kiama Community College
Chris Keefe	Verto
Anthony Currie	Compass Training
Marina Chadiloff	Self-employed consultant
Tamara Reeves (assisted throughout development)	Compass Training

## Part 2: Code of conduct

### Participants in this validation acknowledge and agree that:

1. **Be honest, respectful and open-minded**  
With me and with each other
2. **Equal 'air time'**  
Allow everyone to have their say without interruption
3. **Share diverse opinions—aim for consensus, time permitting**  
With these assessment tools, I'm trying to produce a 'one-size-fits-all' product that suits as many RTOs as possible and that is flexible enough for RTOs to adapt to suit their needs. Please share what you need in your RTO, and I'll do my best to accommodate this in the final product.
4. **Chemène will listen—she'll decide response to mixed feedback**  
Further to above: I'll do my best to meet everyone's needs, knowing that fully meeting such diverse needs with one product is impossible. But I'll try to get as close as possible!!
5. **Copyright**  
Please respect copyright of the materials and templates we'll use in the validation. I realise that your RTO may or may not end up purchasing the licence to use them. Do not distribute them to others.
6. **Confidentiality**  
I will produce documented validation record for each assessment tool validated. I will distribute this record to all RTOs who purchase the TAE40115 resource suite. I may also post the record on my website (still undecided)  
  
Unless you request otherwise, I will list you (name and RTO) as a participant on the validation record. Please let me know if you prefer that I not list you as a participant (in this case I would list you as 'anonymous' on the validation record). If I don't hear from you I'll assume you are willing for me to name you as a validation participant.
7. **Mute mic when not speaking**  
Just protocol, to reduce background noise during the webinar.

#### Did all participants agree to these terms:

- verbally at the start of the validation meeting
- or by email beforehand?

 Yes

 No (details below)

### Key

Throughout the rest of this document, text typed using:

- **Black** or **coloured** font—notes items discussed and validator feedback
- **Purple** font—notes Chemène's response to feedback and conclusions drawn about that feedback.

**Part 3: General questions about this particular assessment tool**

Question	Yes	No	Comments
<p>1 Should we keep all introductory information in the assessment booklet?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>One validator's comments:</b>  <b>Assuming you mean page 6?</b>  <i>My suggestion is that P6 have blank spaces for flexibility so that the RTOs record what approach RTOs are taking ie it may not be that everyone completes part of the tasks in class training time</i></p> <p><b>Instructions for use doc</b>  <i>Suggest not prescribing when people complete the tasks.</i></p> <p><b>Comments from other validators (collected in webinar):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In guide for short answer questions: could be confusing to allow hand writing sometimes and not others.</li> <li>● Leave it as it is—specify typed (exception)</li> <li>● Why do they need to be typed? Could also offer option of allowing people to answer orally. Is typing really necessary?</li> <li>● remove but add options.</li> </ul> <p><b>Another validator:</b>  Yes, no matter how many times we go through the information, the students invariably forget. Gives us a way to tell them where to look</p> <p><b>Chemène's 'to do':</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ask about this in subsequent webinars</li> <li>● Remove line re typing/handwriting if other validator groups agree.</li> </ul>
<p>2 Should we keep assessment guide as part of the main booklet or present as a stand-alone document?</p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Separate: 1</li> <li>● When this unit becomes compulsory! There will be people who only need this unit (TAELLN411) and people new to the TAE so having the assessment guide available as a separate document and within the TAE may be helpful.</li> <li>● Keep together: 4</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> This group felt guide should stay with assessment booklets. Chemène to compare these findings with those of other validation groups.</p>		
<p><b>From participant manuals:</b>  Should we remove blank templates from appendices to reduce bulk?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Take them out: 3</li> <li>● Keep them: 1</li> <li>● Definitely don't move worked examples of templates to where appendices currently are</li> </ul>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>now (feedback on suggestion from one person in the DES group)</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This group was 50:50 on this issue</li> <li>Definitely won't put worked examples in the appendices as suggested by DES group</li> <li>Chemène to consider once opinions of other groups is heard.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4 From templates:</b> Should we remove non-essential templates (e.g. client consultation plan in DES)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Not discussed by this group.</p> <p><b>One validator emailed to say no—keep:</b> Good way to visually show the process and that there are other types of templates out there</p>
<p><b>5 Change term 'project' to 'task'</b> Should I change the term 'project' (e.g. Project 1) to Task (e.g. Task 1?)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes it clear, easier to check of all tasks required for the assessment</li> <li>Reduces the emphasis of the task whilst at the same time still abiding by the U of C</li> </ul> <p>Other validators were ambivalent.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> Chemène to compare these findings with those of other groups.</p>
<p><b>6 One or two assessment booklets?</b> Should we have one booklet for everything, or:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two booklets—one handout for 'in class' and</li> <li>One Word doc for post-training tasks, or</li> </ul> <p>Everything in one document (as shown in the draft assessment booklet you have been sent to validate) and see how far we get in training??</p>			<p>Validator comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep everything in one document. Easier for the student to keep track, and some ideas/responses in earlier tasks may assist thinking/responses for the workplace task, so good to be able to access them. Flexibility is critical.</li> <li>Everything in one booklet (2 people)</li> <li>Emailed comment from one validator: I have been getting my manuals, activities, templates and assessment booklets all in the one booklet. Makes it harder for the candidates to get lost or loose the booklets all together</li> </ol> <p><b>Consensus</b> Keep everything in one document and let RTO decide how to distribute—hard or soft copy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep spaces for responses collapsed, assuming participants will type responses.</li> <li>Add to instructions for use document—If the RTO intends to use hard copy materials, it should expand response boxes to allow participants space for hand writing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7 Task 4 – revise documents</b> Should we replace Ppt with a set of assessment instructions (i.e. modify one learning and one assessment</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Validator comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No: I believe that you will see very quickly from any 2 learning documents that they know the reasons why the need for the</li> </ol>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
document, or is revising two learning docs okay?			<p>change and the ability to complete the change</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Yes, replace Ppt. The examples are very similar with limited text. Adapting something more complex will demonstrate understanding of underlying principles better. It could be interpreted that these are either a learning resource or a prelude to an assessment question/task – greater differentiation between text types will enable distinction between the two resource types.</li> <li>3. Yes, change: two docs are too similar—both are about changing words (from 2 validators)</li> <li>4. Don't need to change to one learning and one assessment</li> <li>5. What about changing the core skill focussed on in each resource—e.g. one that focuses on words / pictures, and another that focuses on numeracy?</li> </ol> <p>This led to another good discussion about whether or not to blend tasks 4 and 6. Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During training, make Task 4 cover only one resource—incorporate the need to develop a second resource into task 6 (e.g. this way they put together something for a particular context)</li> <li>2. Combine tasks 4 and 6—they don't do task 4 but add more to task 6 (2 people)</li> <li>3. Contextualise the resource for the situation—give 2 or 3 examples. Choose 2 out of 3.</li> <li>4. Suggest keeping task 4 and doing one resource during training and the other resource in task 6.</li> </ol> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Keep Task 4 but base it only one resource</li> </ul> <p>Add requirement to modify a second resource to task 6.</p>
<p><b>8 Task 6 – Provide LLN support in workplace</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to manage this? Can they do this in class time?</li> <li>• Is one delivery sufficient to meet performance requirements (are two needed?)</li> </ul>			<p><b>Comments from validators (this discuss started with Task 6 and moved to other tasks, also):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One delivery is sufficient as long as the strategy and the delivery addresses at least 2 LLN gaps</li> <li>2. They need to DO something.</li> </ol>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p>3. Options for this task are workable (e.g. during TAE training or in workplace). Value in increasing the length of time they are training. Should be longer. (2 people support this)</p> <p>4. Possibly combine the LLN support training with Delivery module—group training??</p> <p>5. Assessment must be linked to something they've received training in, so we can't randomly walk in and just 'assess'</p> <p>6. Task 6—Three validators (more than 50%) stated that one delivery was sufficient to meet performance evidence requirements that candidates “select, use and review at least two instructional strategies” and (some mixed feelings about this: see item 9 below from one validator)</p> <p>7. Increase session delivery time to 30 minutes and include two instructional strategies</p> <p>8. Do this task in class</p> <p>9. Task 6 instructions will need to state, “select use and review 2 instruction and two assessment strategies”.</p> <p>10. There was some discussion of whether or not it's safe for people to assess each other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Two validators have taught TAELLN411 this way—they said participants were open to the process</li> <li>● Chemène mentioned strong discussion in validation of version 1 of this assessment tool—most validators felt very strongly that TAE participants should not asses each other's LLN skills (too dangerous).</li> </ul>
9			<p><b>Comments emailed by one validator</b></p> <p>From the past courses that I have done, there has been a very low completion rate. This may be because there had been no real reason to complete i.e. new TAE package hadn't been endorsed. Also there was a need to complete more of their work in class [sic: in the workplace?] which I now see has been addressed in the new format. I am looking forward to using the new docs.</p> <p><b>Comments emailed ahead of time by another validator</b></p> <p><b>1 Performance Evidence: Query how well the tasks cover:</b></p> <p><u>Select <b>use</b> and review at least two assessment strategies.....</u></p> <p>Task 3 doesn't require them to 'use' and Task 6 doesn't require them to select use and review an assessment strategy – focus is on instruction</p> <p><u>Select <b>use</b> and review at least two instruction strategies.....</u></p> <p>Perhaps Task 6 should require 2 instruction strategies</p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p><b>2 Achieving ACSF level – Task 6, under Submit – responses to the following questions</b></p> <p><i>Point – point d</i>  Describe the learners' gaps in this core skill. This should be a paragraph that includes somewhat detailed and (most importantly) specific information.  This second sentence could preface the sections requiring the candidate to Describe/explain/justify.</p> <p><i>It may labour the point but experience highlighted how easily some candidates revert to one or two dot points.</i></p> <p><i>Writing a paragraph is an ACSF level 2 requirement. The writing requirement for this assessment is ACSF level 3 so perhaps the statement should read This should be at least one paragraph that includes somewhat detailed and (most importantly) specific information – and could be added to the TAELLN50114 booklet for the assessors</i></p> <p><b>2 In TAE40115 Instructions for use and Marking Guide</b></p> <p><b>p19</b> – wondered why handwriting is not acceptable or considered satisfactory?</p> <p><b>p34</b> – responses to where can LLN information be accessed  Comment: the Department of Industry site url now defaults to <a href="http://www.industry.gov.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.industry.gov.au/Pages/default.aspx</a>. The site has 'shifted' information related to LLN to the 'back' so locating information could be confusing. Also, SEE is not a program that anyone can access resources from at this site, and what's there is not useful for assessment or instruction, WELL is no longer offered, most of the resources from Industry areas are not able to be accessed unless purchased – and will be located on the relevant Industry skills site anyway.</p> <p><b>Suggest a move with the current focus on foundation skills – perhaps have as examples</b>  The Core Skills for Work developmental framework url and the Reading Writing Hotline plus the urls for the outcomes/resources/champions etc arising from the National Foundation Skills Strategy projects – each has 'champion' names and contact details to contact and ask questions of</p> <p><b>Workforce development Projects</b>  <a href="http://www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/skills/national-foundation-skills-strategy-project/foundation-skills-workforce-development-project">http://www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/skills/national-foundation-skills-strategy-project/foundation-skills-workforce-development-project</a></p> <p><b>National NFSS project</b>  <a href="http://www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/skills/national-foundation-skills-strategy-project">http://www.statedevelopment.sa.gov.au/skills/national-foundation-skills-strategy-project</a></p>

Question	Yes	No	Comments
			<p><b>Chemène response:</b> Terrific suggestions about marking guide in particular. I haven't yet updated the marking guide since it was first written almost 2 years ago, so I will incorporate your suggestions for more current links. Thank you for such detailed feedback. Will incorporate links and advice.</p> <p><b>Other comments given at validation webinar:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This is a messy unit; it's the best we can do.</li> <li>● Great tool: gives a great range of things to use and it's very flexible. I was quite surprised when I got into it because it had everything that I wanted. We're heading into that same direction.</li> </ul>
			<p><b>Conclusions reached re questions 8 and 9:</b></p> <p>Validators were happy with the idea of completing as many assessment tasks as possible in the 'training' (online, face-to-face, blended, or other). Therefore, the case study-based approach works well.</p> <p>Chemène to keep all assessment tasks as they are now, EXCEPT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Task 4—Will revise so that participants must only modify one resource (not two)</li> <li>● Task 6—Modify as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Increase required training delivery time to minimum 30 minutes, to allow more time for training and assessment support</li> <li>– Specify requirement that both training and assessment support must be provided (e.g. train the person then suggest assessment approach that includes suitable support)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Keep the two options for when this task is to be completed—during TAE training or in the workplace (this allows RTOs to be flexible and assess as it suits them).</p>

**Part 4: Validation Checklist**

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:	Yes	No	Comments	
<b>VALIDITY</b>				
1	Clearly identify units assessed by code and title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2	<b>Address all aspects of the competency standard/s assessed:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elements and performance criteria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Foundation Skills to the level described in the unit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Performance evidence <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Knowledge evidence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Conditions for assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			<p>Suggest specific reference to requirements for Describe, explain, justify (see other general comments)—Chemène to follow up with the person who made this comment; assume meant that we should clarify what we mean by these terms.</p> <p>Chemène to review the performance evidence requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Select use and review two instructional strategies”</li> <li>• “Select use and review two assessment strategies”</li> </ul> <p>Incorporate requirement to ‘use’ strategies more strongly into task 6.</p> <p>All tasks reflect realistic working conditions. Where possible, the tool encourages participants to complete Task 6 in their ‘real’ workplace, but offers flexibility to complete in a simulated (and realistic) working environment if needed.</p>
3	Include realistic work tasks that are relevant to the unit/s assessed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email comment:</b> Addition to the new documents looks great, will be good to see how they work out in a class setting.
4	<b>Reflect realistic work conditions and requirements</b> (dimensions of competence): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Task management skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Contingency management skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• Job / role environment skills <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			<b>Email comment:</b> As above
5	Reflect the Rules of Evidence:			<b>Email comment:</b> Having the student complete a substantial amount in class sure does help meet the rules of evidence

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:		Yes	No	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valid</li> <li>• Sufficient</li> <li>• Current</li> <li>• Authentic</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>   <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Webinar discussion:</b> Task 6 to be made more robust (see comments re item 2, performance evidence above)</p>
6	Pitched at the correct AQF level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email comment:</b> See additional comment Chemène to follow up with validator who made this comment to seek clarification about the comment being referred to.</p> <p><b>Email comment #2:</b> In line with the rest of the TAE40115.</p>
7	Free of unnecessary assessment tasks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
FLEXIBILITY AND FAIRNESS				
8	Offer a reasonable range of flexible options for how candidates complete and submit assessment tasks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email comment:</b> The separation of the tasks will make the learning and assessment process more defined for the students</p> <p><b>In webinar</b> Flexibility was discussed extensively and validators agreed on the following steps to promote flexible assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present all tasks in one assessment booklet and let RTOs decide which tasks participants complete during training</li> <li>• Set up tasks so they could be completed in both online or face-to-face environments</li> <li>• Offer two options for completing Task 6 and let RTOs (or individual participants) choose the best option for them—complete in the real workplace or in a simulated workplace (e.g. the TAE classroom as part of a role play).</li> </ul>
9	Include information about available support and guidance if needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Email comment:</b> Very clearly set out for each of the tasks.</p> <p><b>Chemène's post-validation additions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of instructions for assessors (support for assessors)</li> <li>• Part of instructions for candidates (given RTO phone number for help)</li> </ul>
RELIABILITY				

Validation Criteria				
Does/is the assessment tool:		Yes	No	Comments
10	<b>Clear and easy to read:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure and layout is logical and easy-to-follow</li> <li>• Plain English</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email comment:</b> Language suitable to that of someone completing their TAE
11	Include clear and complete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>instructions for assessors</b></li> <li>• <b>instructions for candidates</b></li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email comment:</b> At beginning and each task <b>Chemène post-validation addition:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chemène noted comments in 'general comments' section of Part 2 of this validation record, about how instructions for assessors can be updated. She will action recommendations made.</li> <li>• Instructions for assessors exist but not yet updated to reflect version 3 of this assessment tool. Chemène to update.</li> <li>• Chemène still to decide whether to incorporate these instructions into the 'Instructions for Use' of all TAE40115 assessment tools, or whether to keep as a stand-alone document.</li> </ul> In the early section of the assessment booklet.
12	<b>Clearly identify version control</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Email comment:</b> Version 3.0
13	<b>Enable easy administration:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have space to document:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Name of assessor/s &amp; candidate/s</li> <li>– assessment date/s and location/s</li> <li>– candidate's written consent to be assessed</li> <li>– comments about quality of evidence gathered</li> <li>– assessment results</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Can the above easily be located in the assessment documentation?</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>	Suggestion from DES validators: can participants add space for USI number to assessment cover sheet. Chemène to action this (not discussed in this validation).

**Part 5: Validation outcomes**

Summary of feedback and recommendations			
<p><b>Email comment:</b> I am looking forward to using this assessment tool.</p> <p><b>Recommendations suggested by Chemène upon reflection of validators' comments:</b></p> <p>Chemène to modify the assessment booklet template so that it reflects the template used for assessment booklets in other TAE40115 clusters.</p> <p>In terms of the assessment tasks for this unit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Validators were happy with the idea of completing as many assessment tasks as possible in the 'training' (online, face-to-face, blended, or other). Therefore, the case study-based approach works well, with Task 6 giving the opportunity to transfer / apply skills in a real workplace situation.</li> <li>● Chemène to keep all assessment tasks as they are now, EXCEPT:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Task 4—Will revise so that participants must only modify one resource (not two)</li> <li>– Task 6—Modify as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase required training delivery time to minimum 30 minutes, to allow more time for training and assessment support</li> <li>▪ Specify requirement that both training and assessment support must be provided (e.g. train the person then suggest assessment approach that includes suitable support)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Keep the two options for when this task is to be completed—during TAE training or in the workplace (this allows RTOs to be flexible and assess as it suits them).</p>			
Recommended Actions			
Action required		By whom?	By when?
1	Finalise this report	Chemène	Within 10 days
2	Prepare next draft and email to validators for optional review	Chemène	ASAP
3	Finalise assessment tool and make available to clients	Chemène	ASAP
Signatures of validators			
Did all participants agree—either verbally or by reply email—that this report represents an accurate reflection of discussions and their outcomes?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No (details below)

end of template