Assessment Tool Validation Record

General Information	
RTO	Blackwater Projects (not an RTO)
Validation date	Validation started Thursday, 30 May 2013, 10:00am – 12:00noon This report finalised on 11 August 2013
Validation approach	**Phase 1 – Online Validation Session** Two-hour webinar on 30 May 2013: Participants unable to attend validation session emailed feedback for discussion during the validation. **Phase 2 – Pilot with additional changes following pilot** Blackwater Projects (Chemène Sinson) will revised assessment tool according to result from the online validation, then piloted the revised assessment tool when delivering a TAELLN401A program the following week. Following pilot, Chemène made additional changes to address outcomes of the pilot run.
Date version 1.0 (final) first released	12 August 2013

Phase 1: Online Validation

Purpose and focus of the Validation	
Purpose	To validate first draft of assessment tool for TAELLN401A Address adult language, literacy and numeracy skills
Relevant unit/s	TAELLN401A Address adult language, literacy and numeracy skills

Resources	● Assessment tool documentation:
	  – Assessment booklet for TAELLN401A (main assessment booklet)
	  – LLN Project 1 assessment booklet
	  – Case study handout to be used with LLN Project 1
	  – For general reference:
	    ▪ Competency matrix for the assessment tool

	▪ Master Record of assessment results for LLN Project 1 ● Unit of competency addressed in tool (TAELLN401A) ● This validation record	

Participants		
Name	**Organisation**	**Position**
Attendees in online validation		
Chemène Sinson	Blackwater Projects	Consultant & assessment tool developer
Sue Hughes	Australian Institute of Management, NSW & ACT	Curriculum developer (assessment specialist)
Helen Devlin	TAFE NSW: Riverina Institute	Teacher – Department of Business
Sandie McCoy	TAFE: Tropical North Queensland Institute	Teacher – TAE
Madeleine Hopkins	State Transit Authority	Learning & Development Advisor
Participants who will email feedback before the validation, for sharing at the validation		
Denise Bell	TAFE NSW: Sydney Institute	Head Teacher – Foundation Studies
Ros Hewes	TAFE NSW: Sydney Institute	Head Teacher – Foundation Studies & WELL Coordinator
Debbie Guy	Self-employed	Contactor and freelancer

Terms of Participation
Participants in this validation acknowledge and agree that:

● All documents used in this validation are subject to copyright. Validators will use these documents for the purposes of validation only. No part of the publications used in this validation may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

● Participants will be given equal opportunity to participate in this validation.

● Participants have a responsibility to:
– prepare for this validation as required

–   participate actively in this validation, respectfully sharing open and honest opinions relevant to the purpose and focus of this validation.
● Information and documents shared within this validation are confidential and will not be shared or used outside this forum
● They realise how very grateful Chemène is for their help! ☺

Did all validators verbally accept the above terms at the start of the validation?			
Yes ▶	✓	No (details below) ▶	
N/A			

About the comments that follow:

Below is a key for the comments found on the following pages:

Comments in black font:

These are comments about items discussed in the first validation meeting in May 2013 and documented following that validation.

Comments in blue, italic font:

These are comments added in August 2013, after the first pilot and after final revisions were made to version 1 of the assessment tool and case study documentation.

Validation Criteria Checklist

GENERAL & FIRST IMPRESSIONS

Preliminary general comments

Email feedback received before validation session in May 2013:

- **The resources are fantastic**, I enjoyed looking at something that was well written for a change. I have attached the UoC outline which I have mapped.

- **The content of the material is good**, covers the unit well and we believe would give the TAE student a good understanding of LLN support practices.

- **Project 1:** I really like the idea of working this in class in teams, well worked out steps and adding a case study is always fun, I only had time for a glance at the case study, I enjoy writing my own given them odd names and job roles to suit the group I'm with.

- **Third party questionnaire:** Not a fan of 3rd party, just because it tends to be a tick and flick. But it's in the critical aspects so what do I know? It also ticks a lot of the learning support strategies in the range statement (not that they are a MUST) but does come back to P.C. 3.2.

Additional things discussed in webinar

- **Front cover design:** Consider changing use of solid colours on front cover. Looks 'dark' when printed and takes up a lot of ink. *Action taken: Made only a portion of the page solid to reduce ink requirements for printing. Decision to make the front cover of assessment booklets look different from front cover of the training materials was based on previous feedback that it was hard to tell the difference between the learning and assessment materials.*

- **Project 2 (for completion in workplace):** One participant expressed concern about Project 2, intended for completion in the workplace. Said this would be hard. We acknowledged that in RTOs with clients who aren't working, Projects 1 and 2 may need to be completed during training.

- **Size of the assessment**: One participant made the point that it's a big assessment for just one unit. *This was discussed in the webinar. One participant in the pilot program also made this point. That said, another participant in the pilot disagreed, saying that the assessment contained no un-necessary assessment tasks. In August 2013 Chemène mapped the 'final' version 1 of the assessment to the unit in detail, and could not identify any opportunities to remove assessment tasks without leaving gaps in assessment of the unit. Therefore, the 'size' of this as a stand-alone assessment remains unchanged.*

- **Terminology:**

  - Some wording (some queries), language used in some tools, formatting, consistency, etc. were identified as areas for improvement. To be discussed as we progress through the validation session.

  - Revisit wording of some questions to make more specific. *Action taken: Items for improvement were discussed throughout the first validation session in May 2013. Furthermore, after marking the first two assessments completed by the pilot group, Chemène identified some additional minor changes to phrasing of instructions after seeing how students interpreted them. These changes have been made to the 'final' version 1.0 produced.*

- **Suggestion: to include LLN specialist feedback** on analysis of units and students' LLN skills. *Action taken: This requirement not added to the assessment, as it was considered difficult for*

Validation Criteria Checklist

some candidates to find an LLN specialist who has time available to offer such feedback. We agreed that where such feedback is possible, it should be encouraged, but not mandated. The requirement to involve an LLN specialist was covered more indirectly, with: a short answer question about where LLN specialists could be found, a requirement on the individual learning plan that LLN specialist's input is summarised on the plan, and (indirectly) through the third party questionnaire.

- **Integration of this assessment with other TAE assessments:** Discussed future possibility of integrating this assessment with other assessments already being completed—point made that experienced practitioners are likely already integrating LLN without realising it. *Action Taken: none now, but perhaps re-visit at a later date. This version of the assessment tool remains a stand-alone assessment.*

	Does/is the assessment tool:	Y or N	Comments
1	Clearly identify unit/s assessed by code and title?	Yes	
2	Show version control?	Yes	**Email feedback:** • Version control – don't know if it's required but we suggest that you show page x of y. **Discussed in validation** Only covered quickly. Will leave as-is for now *Page numbering was left unchanged.*
3	Formatted and organised in a logical, easy-to-understand way?	Could be better	**Email feedback:** • We found the two 'assessment booklets' confusing – and had difficulty at first finding "Project 2". • **Also found the use of the terms "Project" and "assessment" a little confusing.** Suggest perhaps one booklet outlining the whole course and the assessments, then separate booklets for the two separate projects and short answer questions – which we would call assessments 1, 2 and 3, as opposed to Projects. ***Feedback from webinar participants:*** • *One person likes idea above* • *One person likes it as it is* Maybe add on front of main booklet (brackets: includes project 2 and questions and third party report) ***Action taken** re 2 points above: Following pilot… although there was sufficient time for participants to*

Validation Criteria Checklist

complete Project 1 during training time, it wasn't reasonable to sign off all participants during training, for the following reasons:

- *There is too much work to go through—Chemène ended up having people who had completed Project 1 stay behind after class to look over work.*

- *Some people wanted the chance to 'tidy up' work before showing to Chemène.*

Therefore, the following changes were made to the final version of the assessment tool:

- *What was previously called Project 1 is now called an LLN Case Study to be completed during training. The Project 1 assessment booklet is now called "LLN Case Study Workbook". The 'assessment results' page was removed. Therefore: there is now only one assessment booklet which lists all assigned assessment tasks for this unit.*

- *The assessment booklet still lists projects 1 and 2. Project 1 may be completed during training (through the LLN Case Study) and Project 2 should be completed in the workplace.*

- *An "Instructions for Use" document has been created for this assessment tool. In these instructions, completion of the Case Study is recommended as a way for people to complete Project 1 during training time. Candidates would need to submit the completed Case Study workbook as proof of having done this. The instructions document also contains an alternative if the RTO doesn't have time to take participants through the case study during training time.*

- *Project 1 is to be marked after the conclusion of training, along with the rest of the portfolio for this unit.*

- **Page 18 of Project 1** might be better placed in the initial general assessment booklet.

  Not discussed in webinar. Chemène to review.

  Action taken: *Page 18 of the Project 1 booklet (now called the Case Study workbook) contained 'what next' info. Information on this page was*

Validation Criteria Checklist

retained, but adapted to reflect the revisions listed above.

- **Project 2: Could 'workplace' be more prominent** as at first we thought it was the same as Project 1.

  Briefly discussed in webinar but consensus not reached. Chemène to review.

  Action taken: Chemène increased size and prominence of the words "during training" (for Project 1) and "in the workplace" (for Project 2). Hopefully this will help! ☺

- **Project 2:** Prefers option 2 [for presentation of tasks]: "I think the first option is too wordy, much better to have a check list with more information if needed."

  Feedback from webinar participants:
  Unable to reach consensus for options 1 or 2. Three people liked detail with project info with more detail (i.e. option 1). Will use more detailed version for pilot and see how we go.

  Action taken: Following the pilot, Chemène chose a "middle ground"—list of evidence to submit for Project 2 contains less detail than option 1 did, but more detail than option 2. Additional assessment criteria and answers to questions (the 'detail') was added to the Appendix.

- **Assessment results** (main ass't booklet): I'd like to see page 19 (assessment results) after page 7 (Assessment Cover Sheet). Pages 9, 10 and 11 could have an 'assessors don't forget' enter results into final assessment result on page 8. That way you could get rid of page 5 assessments at a glance and the top of page 6 which is another checklist.

  Not discussed in webinar. Chemène to review.

  Action taken: None. This is one of those, "some like it this way, some like it that way" scenarios. Broad structure of the assessment booklet was kept the same so that it is consistent with the assessment booklets for other units. This template

Validation Criteria Checklist			
			may be revisited when the complete suite of assessment tools is next reviewed. ● **'About this assessment booklet' (page 4):** Suggestion: Change headings to, "information about this booklet for you the candidate" and "information about this booklet for your assessor". Not discussed in webinar. Chemène to review. *Action taken: Main heading "About this assessment booklet" was kept as-is, but a sub-heading highlighted with a different colour was added, to read: "Information for you, the candidate and for assessors"*
VALIDITY			
Do/are the required assessment activities/evidence:		**Y or N**	**Comments**
4	Feature holistic activities?	Y	
5	Pitched at the correct AQF level?	Y	
6	Cover all elements and performance criteria of the unit?	Y and N	Discussed in the webinar **Extensive discussions re LLN specialists** (element 2) and how to help people without access to a specialist, complete element 2. Creative ideas discussed including: ● Have LLN specialist attend training as a guest presenter, or team teach: add new assessment task to be completed during training stating that learners must interact and get assistance from the specialist. Chemène to consider this and decide if and how to incorporate into the assessment tool. **Suggestion:** to Project 2, add requirement that candidate submits written feedback from the learner, to better cover element 3. Need to add info to say that if learner is unable to write feedback, they may give it verbally and have it transcribed. *Action taken: Done.*
7	Cover all critical aspects of evidence?	Not sufficient	**Issue:** Not sure that enough third party evidence is included—

Validation Criteria Checklist

			need evidence of third party observations with a 'range' of learners. But… very hard with people who don't have easy access to practitioners.
			Suggestions:
			● Add 2nd case study to training that is smaller than first—then let TAE trainer (and LLN practitioner guest if possible) verify observations with additional learners
			● Could assess LLN levels of each other in the group?
			Additional suggestion by one participant was made that the third party questionnaire should be changed to required direct observation checklist.
			Other items discussed
			Suggestion that an LLN specialist teaches the unit and that specialist becomes the third party. Make it a team teach—one LLN specialist and one TAE trainer (LLN specialist could be guest teacher). Must have the unit to teach it, but must also have the vocational competence to teach it.
			For now: leave tool as is for pilot run. Add possibility of extra task with proven interactions with specialist.
			Action taken following pilot: All above suggestions are very good, but will depend on availability of LLN specialists to participate in the training. Action taken included:
			● *Strengthened short answer question about LLN specialists—added requirement to discuss the type of LLN specialist support available*
			● *Added requirement that the individual learning plan in LLN Project 2 is developed with input from an LLN specialist. The plan must include the name of the LLN specialist who helped, and a summary of their input (see Appendix, Project 2 Item 6, criterion A).*
8	Cover all required knowledge?	Yes	Email feedback:
			Gaps identified in required knowledge: "methodology for determining skill levels using the ACSF". Suggestion: Add another question for this: "What

	Validation Criteria Checklist		
			methods do you, or could you, use to determine a learner's ACSF levels?"
			Discussed in webinar:
			Decision made not to add a question, especially given previous comments that this is a 'big' assessment. This knowledge is based on process-based knowledge and can be assessed through the project work.
9	Cover all required skills?	Yes	**Email feedback:**
			Not sure if the required skill: "liaise with appropriate external authorities" is covered in Projects 1 or 2, I can see where you have entered it, but I think it will be hard to follow through on unless you have LLN specialists in your workplace, and at the RTO where the training is taking place. Sorry, no suggestions here, I can't think how I could get round this one. Even asking a question on it doesn't cover the skill of doing it.
			See comments above about strengthened requirements about LLN specialists.
10	Cover all dimensions of competence (i.e.reflect realistic working conditions): ● Task skills ● Task management skills ● Contingency management skills ● Job/role environment skills?	Yes	
11	Address the Rules of Evidence: ● Valid ● Sufficient ● Current ● Authentic?	Yes	
12	Cover employability skills as relevant to the unit/s assessed: ● Communication	Yes	

Validation Criteria Checklist		
• Teamwork • Problem-solving • Initiative and enterprise • Planning and organising • Self-management • Learning • Technology?		
13 Is this assessment tool free of un-necessary assessment tasks?	Yes	**Email feedback:** • Third party questionnaire: Point 3 – Encourage learner development mentions establish a positive rapport with learners; this is a repeat of point 1. Not discussed in webinar. Chemène to review. *Action taken: Duplication removed from point 3.* • Declaration of Authenticity (p8)—Get rid of it, as there is already a third party questionnaire (too much third party) (repeat of the top section of the questionnaire p.16). Agreed – will do *Action taken: Declaration of Authenticity removed.* • Feedback from the other people: – Issue with third party evidence in general—remove both Will retain the questionnaire, as it's a critical aspect of evidence. *Action taken as described above.*
a. Specific question: Should there be both a declaration of authenticity and a third party questionnaire, or do we remove declaration?		**Email feedback:** • No. Remove declaration of authenticity. Consensus: See above for discussion. Declaration of authenticity to be removed from this assessment tool
FLEXIBILITY and FAIRNESS		
Are / do the assessment activities:	Y or N	Comments
14 Adaptable enough to reflect the range of workplaces in which candidates may complete the assessment tasks?	Yes	

Validation Criteria Checklist			
15	Written in 'plain English'?	Could be better	**Email feedback:** **Project 1 Booklet** • Suggestions—re-name and re-number: 2a Identify ACSF skill in a UoC 2b Identify ACSF in established (already written) training and assessment material 2c Identify ACSF skill held by the learner 2d analyse the gap between the required ACSF and the learner's skills 3 Questions for discussion 4 term: "LLN Support strategy" to "LLN Support Plan". Uncomfortable with the term strategy if they are involved in filling it in with the trainer. This person also noted that I used the word 'plan' on page 11, but is called strategy in point 5, 5c, 5d, 7 and 8a and in option 2 page 13 point 5&7. *Good point. Went through Workbook to ensure consistent use of terminology.* 5 Not sure if I like Activity 5 (re-design materials) after the support plan has been written, but I see why it's there. *Needed, relates to PC 3.1. In the plan they decide how to re-design materials, then in the next activity they do the re-design.* 6 Love reflection. **Project 2** Not sure I like the term, 'validated tool' (but I can't think of a better one) the learners I train think of validation as the big meeting that goes on forever, rather than a tool/instrument that is valid, how about ACSF assessment tool?

Validation Criteria Checklist			
			This feedback not discussed in detail in webinar. Chemène to review. *Action taken: Removed reference to a validated tool, except in Appendix 1 where the term 'validation' is explained.*
	a. Specific question: Which option is the best way to present LLN Project 2? Option 1 or 2 (see draft of tool)		Email feedback: ● Option 2 – all detail in the Appendix Consensus: leave as option 1 for pilot. *Action taken: See previous comments: Final presentation is less detailed than option 1 and more detailed than option 2.*
16	Pitched at a suitable LLN level for the target candidates and the unit/s assessed?	Yes	
RELIABILTY			
	Does the assessment tool include:	**Y or N**	**Comments**
17	Instructions for assessors on how to administer the assessment?	No	**Comments from Chemène:** Standard instructions for use of the assessment instruments that make up all Blackwater Projects tools are found in one 'instructions for use' document. This document would need to be included if clients buy any assessment tool. Instructions exist, just not viewed by validators. *Action taken: Decided to produce a stand-alone 'instructions' document in case any RTOs purchase this assessment tool, only. Now part of the assessment tool documentation.*
18	A marking guide for assessors?	N	Email feedback: ● We didn't see a marking guide? See comments above, plus: Marking guide for short answer questions needs to be added to the instructions for use document. Not yet done. *Action taken: As above. Marking guide is part of the 'instructions' document.*

Validation Criteria Checklist			
			Assessment criteria for the Projects is in the Appendix of the assessment booklet so that both candidates and assessors may refer to it. Marking guide makes reference to the Appendix.
19	Clear and complete information and instructions for candidates, including: ● Name and code of the unit/s assessed ● Description of what candidates are asked to do and how well they must do it to achieve a competent result ● Information about the candidate rights in the assessment—e.g. right to appeal, right to confidentiality, etc. ● Information about the RTO and how to get help if needed ● Other information as relevant to the assessment?	Yes and No see ▶	● Name and code of the unit/s assessed Yes ● Description of what candidates are asked to do and how well they must do it to achieve a competent result Yes ● Information about the candidate rights in the assessment—e.g. right to appeal, right to confidentiality, etc. Not in the tools that were reviewed; there is a Program Information document that Blackwater Projects produces, which has a fill-in-the-blanks template for RTOs to note relevant policies and procedures; ultimately it is up to the RTOs buying this tool to provide this information, either using the Program Information document that Blackwater Projects provides, or doing so in their own way. *Action taken: None. If any RTOs purchase this assessment tool and no other Blackwater Projects resource, they will need present generic assessment information (e.g. appeals, etc) to clients in their own way.* ● Information about the RTO and how to get help if needed Yes: Fill in the blank section in the assessment booklet for this. ● Other information as relevant to the assessment? Not discussed. *No further action taken*

	Validation Criteria Checklist		
20	Template to record details of the assessment, including space to note: ● Name of assessor ● Name of candidate ● Assessment date/s ● Candidate's written consent to be assessed ● Results for individual assessment items (S or NYS) ● Final result (C or NYC) ● Feedback for candidate ● Action plan (if needed).	Yes	Email feedback: ● **Project 1 Master Record of Assessment Results:** Add 'step 1, step 2, etc. to columns' Not discussed in webinar: Chemène thinks this is a good point—will modify titles to more closely reflect wording in the corresponding Project 1 booklet. *Action taken: Assessment results page removed from the Project 1 booklet altogether when this booklet was re-badged as a Case Study Workbook.* Discussed in webinar: Validators agreed that there is provision to record everything listed to the left.

Summary of feedback and recommendations

Summary of changes to be made to the draft of the tool before the pilot delivery next week

1. Review wording of projects requiring input from LLN specialists and see what we can do to tighten it up

2. Review questions and make required responses more specific (e.g. Say, "Give 3 examples" instead of give examples). Don't add or remove questions.

3. Project 2 presentation: KISS as much as possible, but go with option 1 (more detailed explanation) in the pilot delivery. Perhaps review this after the pilot.

4. Remove third party declaration

Action taken: All of the above was done before the pilot program.

After pilot run

● Chemène to reflect on outcomes of pilot run and seek input from the client, then decide changes based on outcomes. *Done.* In addition:

● Chemène to pick up on additional feedback offered in webinar—e.g.

– Project 2—alternative option for people who don't have a workplace, or leave it to the individual RTO to revise the project so that it's completed in class, when needed

   Action Taken: The Instructions for Use document contains information about how to modify the assessment tool for candidates who don't have a workplace and for situations where there isn't time to do one project during training. It's up to individual RTOs to modify the assessment tool to reflect their own clients' needs and circumstances.

– Consider adding a new assessment activity during training in which participants must get advice/support/ideas from an LLN specialist (guest speaker?)

   Action Taken: Not done, as this will be hard for some RTOs to achieve. Highly recommended where possible.

– Longer term feedback that would affect all assessment tools in the Blackwater Projects suite to be considered at this time—e.g. changes to preliminary information in the assessment booklet (will affect the global assessment tool template, not just the template for TAELLN401A).

   Action Taken: Some changes made and applied across the suite of tools—e.g. Less 'ink' on front cover of assessment tools. Other changes not applied at this time but to be re-visited on the next major review of the assessment tools—e.g. Placement of assessment results page in assessment booklet.

And finally (not discussed in webinar)

Chemène to change the tool to address TAELLN411, now that we know that it should be endorsed in July, as a stand-alone unit, AND will be considered equivalent to TAELLN401A (based on verbal information provided one hour after conclusion of the webinar).

Work to begin week of 21 August 2013.

Recommended actions		
Action required	**By whom**	**By when**
1 Type / finalise this report	Chemène	30 May 2013
2 Adjust assessment tool as recommended in this report	Chemène	31 May 2013
3 Pilot adjusted tool	Chemène	8 June 2013
4 Make final adjustments and adapt to reflect requirements of TAELLN411.	Chemène	TBC

Signatures of validators
Email approval to be sought from all participants before this report summarising phase one of validation process is finalised.

End of assessment validation record for phase 1 of the validation process

Phase 2: Pilot and Subsequent Improvements

Outcomes of pilot
Pilot went very well with positive feedback, generally: ● All participants were able to complete LLN Project 1 during class time with the exception of one participant who has a minor hand impairment that made it impossible to write the detail he wanted to write during training time. He submitted Project 1 one week later. ● At times I (Chemène) felt as though the day we completed LLN Project 1 was more of a writing session than social learning experience for the group—some minor changes to be made to Project 1 documentation and to the training plan to make parts of LLN Project 1 more engaging and practical. ● I found it hard to sign people off in LLN Project 1 during training. Whilst there was time to complete the work, I think the process would work better if people were allowed to leave training, 'tidy up' project 1 work as required, and submit it later, along with the rest of the portfolio. ● One participant commented that it was a 'big' assessment—another participant openly disagreed with this statement. Others seemed happy to participate in the process.

Summary of changes and additions to assessment tool documentation made following pilot	
Assessment booklet	- Final decision made on presentation style for LLN Project 2. - Minor edits to clarify tasks. - Appendix 1 with assessment guidance and criteria was completed.
Project 1 Assessment Booklet	- Re-badged as a Case Study Workbook - Assessment Results page removed - Other minor changes to wording of activities - Streamlined instructions about the 'implement the learning plan' step to promote more active discussion and practical activities in class rather than a writing exercise.
Master assessment record for LLN Project 1	Deleted. No longer needed, as assessment results for Project 1 will be recorded along with results for the remaining assessment tasks.
Case Study Scenario Handout	- Minor changes to increase clarity and make it more realistic - Replaced core skill assessment examples used in the pilot with examples that were written from scratch - Removed photo of 'Arthur' (the learner)—Blackwater Projects purchased a photo from iStockphoto for use, but terms of purchase don't permit inclusion of photo in items for sale.
Competency matrix	Populated to reflect version 1.0, final, of this assessment tool
Instructions for use and marking guide	Created for the first time. Includes: - General information about the assessment tool - How to prepare the assessment tool documentation for first use - How to administer the tool - Marking guide for assessors.
Templates	Minor updates to reflect changes made to the same templates in the Case Study Workbook.

End of document