



Assessment Tool Validation Record

Contents

General Information	1
Purpose and focus of the Validation	1
Participants	2
Terms of Participation	2
Validation Criteria Checklist	3
Summary of feedback and recommendations	21
Follow-up	22
Endorsement of this report	23

General Information	
RTO	Blackwater Projects (not an RTO)
Validation date	Friday, 13 September 2013
Validation approach	Online Validation Session Two-hour webinar. Participants unable to attend webinar emailed feedback for discussion during the validation.
Purpose and focus of the Validation	
Purpose	To validate first draft of assessment tool for TAELN411 Address adult language, literacy and numeracy skills
Relevant unit/s	TAELN411
Resources to be used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assessment tool documentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Assessment booklet for TAELN411 – Competency matrix – Instructions for use ● Unit of competency addressed in tool (TAELN411) ● This validation record

Assessment Tool Validation Record

Participants		
Name	Organisation	Position
Attendees in online validation		
Chemène Sinson	Blackwater Projects	Consultant & assessment tool developer
Arian Ploeg	Community Child Care Co-Operative Ltd (NSW)	RTO Manager
Peta McGrath	TAFE NSW: Riverina Institute	Head of Department - Business
Sandie McCoy	TAFE: Tropical North Queensland Institute	Teacher - TAE
Dean McDonald	Dean McDonald Consulting	L&D Consultant
Trevor Manning	TMC	Training Consultant
Su Montgomery	Kiama Community College	VET Manager
Anne McCarthy	Training Services Australia	Consultant
Participants who emailed feedback before the validation, for sharing at the validation		
Ann Brady	Learning Lines	Consultant
Madeleine Hopkins	Self-Employed	Contractor and Freelancer
Debbie Guy	Self-employed	Contactoer and freelancer
Peta McGrath*	TAFE NSW: Riverina Institute	Head of Department – Dept of Business
Kylie McFarlane	TAFE NSW: Riverina Institute	R/Head of Department – Dept of Business
Helen Devlin	TAFE NSW: Riverina Institute	Head Teacher – Dept of Business
Anne McCarthy*	Training Services Australia	Consultant

* Peta and Anne both sent in emailed feedback before the validation and attended the webinar.

Terms of Participation	
Participants in this validation acknowledge and agree that:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ▶ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No (details below) ▶ <input type="checkbox"/>

Validation Criteria Checklist

Key:

- Comments by validators are made using **this black font**
- Comments from Chemène made using *this purple font*.
- Agreed actions are highlighted using green shading.

GENERAL & FIRST IMPRESSIONS

Preliminary general comments

This validation record

- Item no. 7 – should this now read “cover all aspects of performance evidence?” *Yes it should!*
I have now changed for this validation, and also changed item No 8 and deleted No 9. Thanks! 😊

General

Email feedback received before webinar

- **Email #1:** Concerns that participants need real vocational learners with LLN issues to complete the project—we feel that a simulated/hypothetical environment could also be used.
- **Email #2:** Some issues were raised about the unclear requirements of the unit, making it hard to know exactly how to interpret. One participant noted the following:
 - Unit of competency—Foundation skills listed include a description of competent performance. It is unclear whether the description is provided as an example or whether it is a must. If a must, then there may be a requirement include assessment questions/tasks about the ACSF.
 - Assessment Requirements—Are the items listed assessable, if so it may impact on what should be assessed? *From Chemène: My understanding is that everything in the assessment requirements document is assessable.*
 - Learner group—does this mean group based learning / assessment or can you select one individual from a learner group and address LLN skills through one-on-one training and assessment?
- **Email #3:** I wondered if there should be a pre-requisite to undertaking this UOC if it was to be done as a stand-alone. Reason being that there is a lot of VET speak that may not make sense if it was done completely in isolation from other UOCs—e.g. the words ‘validation’, ‘portfolio’, ‘tools’.... OR alternatively, put a ‘glossary of terms’ somewhere in the assessment booklet?
- **Email #4:**

Chemène as usual your work is of a very high standard. My concerns are not with what you have produced but whether there is genuinely an opportunity for the masses to achieve this unit using a work-based assessment process.

You'll hate me for this but I would prefer two days of training, a week apart, where the second day is a simulated assessment using a case study. I think this resolves the problem.

Validation Criteria Checklist

Conversely I think the work-based approach would work well if a screening process is implemented as part of the enrolment process. This may also eliminate the possibility that students enrol and then are unable to complete the task.

Most of my comments refer to those delivering training at higher AQF levels.

It's interesting that the UOC focuses specifically on LLN rather than including learning which is a core skill. I think it's a pity they have removed that component as it provided more options for our learners to choose from.

Great work as always – hope the validation goes well and I look forward to reading the summary.

Discussions in webinar and consensus reached

Question: What does “real” vocational learners mean?

The assessment requirements of TAELLN411 state that assessment must be undertaken with “real” vocational learners. The implications of this were discussed at length in webinar. Summary of discussion:

- Real vocational learners could include TAE group participating in TAELLN411 training. The implication is that therefore, TAELLN411 participants could potentially assess LLN skills of each other as ‘real’ vocational learners, and therefore complete parts of Project 1 in class.
- Also discussed: What of the sensitivities of TAE learners? We don't want to marginalise them. What of a “really great” simulation, to make it more safe?
- Another solution: May some form of internship or work placement?

Poll taken, asking all learners: How should we set up Project 1? Is it okay to use TAE group as real vocational learners? Responses were:

- Yes, okay to use TAE group as real vocational learners: II (2 participants)
- No: 0 (no participants)
- We should use a simulation: III (3 participants)
- Sitting on the fence: I (1 participant).

Chemène to keep wording of the project as-is (i.e. designed for completion in the workplace) but will design a case study that would allow this Project to be started during training time. The case study will include a hypothetical group of learners rather than the TAE learner group, to ensure safety as discussed above. In this case, ‘real’ vocational learners will be encouraged as ‘plan A’ (preferred option) for how to approach this project, and ‘plan B’ will be to allow people to base the project on the ‘realistic’ vocational learners described in the case study. Using the TAE participants as the target learner group for Project 1 is not recommended.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Project re-written to clarify that ideally a real workplace scenario is used, but that a case study scenario may be provided if needed.

Validation Criteria Checklist

Re question: How should this unit be integrated into Cert IV Delivery?

There was robust discussion of how to integrate delivery and assessment of this unit into the Certificate IV TAE. Options discussed include:

- Should this unit be clustered with other units? If so, which?
- Should this unit be delivered as a stand-alone?

Comments made included:

- It's a big ask for existing students when just learning about the VET sector. It would be better if this unit were taught as a stand-alone at the end of peoples' TAE Training.
- This unit could be introduced after the Design module, when getting into assessment and delivery.
- Point made: This LLN unit is being seen as something really different, when really this underpins everything we're asked to do as a trainer/assessor. Validators generally agreed with this comment.
- Participants agreed that to be successful in this unit, we need underpinning skills and knowledge in design, delivery and assessment. LLN considerations should ultimately be integrated into everything we do (design, delivery and assessment).
- (received by email after the webinar): "I believe the unit could easily fit / be covered across the design, delivery and assessment components. For example, I believe identifying LLN issues would sit in the area of learner needs; already considered by TAE students when working through program design. I agree that the integration, clustering and holistic assessment, needs further thought."

Summarising feedback:

- There was strong support for keeping this unit as a stand-alone unit, to be delivered at the end of Cert IV Training delivery, and to approach this unit as a "Now that you have the skills to design, deliver and assess, what if you identify a learner group with LLN skill gaps? How would you adjust what you do? To cater to these people?" In this way, the unit could be seen as a consolidation and extension of peoples' skills in design, delivery and assessment.
- Conversely, the requirements of this unit are reflected throughout the design, delivery and assessment-field units. Some validators suggesting that this unit could be integrated into other TAE training modules. The logistics of how to assess this unit if integrated throughout the TAE qualification would need to be considered, especially for those RTOs that offer modularised or unit-by-unit training.

There are benefits and challenges of both approaches—stand-alone delivery or clustered.

For now, Chemène will retain this assessment as a stand-alone assessment. This will cater well to two target markets: 1) those who already have TAE40110 and need to add this unit; and 2) those currently undertaking TAE40110 who may want to add this unit to the end of their program delivery. In the longer term, Chemène to re-visit the notion of integrating assessment of this unit with other units in 2014.

Validation Criteria Checklist

Mapping document

Email feedback received before webinar

- **Email #1:** We liked the mapping to the dimensions of competence but felt that it was not necessary to map to foundation skills. Foundation skills are already mapped to the UOC, and the assessment validated to the relevant AQF level.
- **Email #2:** No comments to make here Chemène. It all looked straightforward to me. Chemène – I honestly couldn't find any significant gaps. I matched it up with the assessment requirements etc and I think you've done a very thorough job.

Discussions and consensus reached in webinar

One participant noted that Community Services ISC has advised that we [RTOs] should map to foundation skills as well as dimensions. Another participant suggested waiting to see what IBSA say about mapping to the foundation skills. Participants agreed that it's not the skills councils' place to say what should be assessed and mapped. That comes from the quality audit.

For now, Chemène will map this assessment to dimensions of competence but not to foundation skills.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Assessment map completed as per recommendations above.

Assessment booklet

General

Email Feedback before webinar

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Comments below using this font indicate how Chemène modified the assessment booklet to reflect this feedback:

Email #1: Perhaps make it a little clearer by putting:

- Under Assessment Cover Sheet, “you, the candidate, to complete” **Not done:** *There is already an instruction telling the candidate which part of the cover sheet they must complete.*
- Under List of Assessment Tasks with marking checklist, “your assessor to complete marking checklist”) **A variation of this request was done:** *There is already a statement that says the assessor will complete ‘shaded columns’. Rather than adding a new statement, the existing statement was changed to read, “assessor to complete the assessment results column”.*
- Page 5: Assessment Tasks at a glance: Perhaps this is where the ‘right of Appeal’ information could go? **Not done:** *agreed in webinar that general information about assessments (e.g. appeals, right to confidentiality, etc) should be provided separately by each RTO—see item 19 of the validation checklist below.*
- Page 6, point 3 in the table: Perhaps change the wording to be more unambiguous. Say: “Place this complete 20 page booklet at the top of your portfolio” **Statement modified to incorporate both this feedback and the feedback made about instruction on page 7, below.**
- Page 7, in the notes to the candidate at the top of the page under the UOC title – maybe change

Validation Criteria Checklist

that to read: "Remember, place this complete booklet at the top of your portfolio. Do not remove or separate pages. Complete your details below so your assessor can clearly identify your work."
This statement was deleted and relevant information added to page 6, point 3 of the table (see comment above).

Consensus reached

Comments above were not discussed in the webinar. Any changes made to this assessment tool affect the template used for all Blackwater Projects assessment tools.

Chemène to consider suggestions above. If Chemène makes any changes to this assessment tool to reflect comments above, she will also apply the same changes to all assessment tools in this series.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Changes applied as per comments above. Changes were applied to the global template used for all assessment tools in this series.

Questions

Email feedback received before webinar

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

For information about changes made to the assessment tool to accommodate this feedback, see information provided below using this font:

Email #1: Questions are definitely needed in addition to the project. We would suggest the following:

- Q4: Do we need an alternative question for learners that do not have an organisation on which to base their response? *Questions adapted to enable both learners with and without an organisation to answer them.*

Email #2: Overall the questions worded well and easy to understand. I would say they are all needed as they link to knowledge evidence and other criteria. I have made some suggestions below:

- Q3: Could be split into separate questions as the topics are different in a. and b. **Done.** I am not sure that this question links to item 6 in the Performance Evidence. Perhaps the question could be expanded to ask what type of support and advice could the LLN Specialist provide? **No changes made to question 3 in this regard.** *Item 6 in the Performance Evidence is covered in two parts of the Project.*
- Q4: The question does not appear to link to all the PCs in Element 4. The question could [be] more targeted about seeking feedback and evaluating learning support and assessment strategies? 4.3 is covered in Project 1 Task 8. **Question was modified to reflect this feedback, plus other feedback received.** *PCs 4.1 – 4.3 are all implicitly addressed with the question, and explicitly addressed in the Project.*

Email #3: [Word 'discuss' in the questions is unclear]. Many of my own candidates really didn't know what 'discuss' meant in some of the questions they'd had in TAA/TAE. Some even thought they had to go and find someone to talk to about it!! [or a glossary somewhere, explaining terms like this?]

"Discuss" was removed from all questions and replaced with 'explain' or 'describe'.

Email #4: Short answer Q4: I would add "or describe processes and systems you would like to see in place." Our experience with a recent client was that numerous processes and procedures did not exist

Validation Criteria Checklist

and this was our workaround.” **Question modified** to read, “describe a ‘best practice’ system your organisation uses (or could use) to...”

Email #5: I really like questions 1, 2 & 4, covers the ‘Knowledge Evidence’ from the ‘Assessment Requirements’ really well. Question 3 is much the same as questions in the Project. Would it be worth asking a question about ACSF so that the ‘Assessment Conditions’ are covered? **No changes made.**

Discussions in webinar and consensus reached

In addition to feedback above, the following suggestions were made in the webinar:

- Question 2: Challenged with ‘explain how you would...’ because it can’t be marked incorrectly. Suggest change to, “give an example of...” **Done**
- Question 4: Add statement: “Does it meet best practice standards, and if not, how could it be changed...” **Question modified to require candidates to describe a ‘best practice’ system...**

Also discussed: whether or not question 3 could be removed or modified, as it duplicates a similar assessment requirement in the project. Consensus was to retain both. Rationale: The questions confirm that candidates know what they could do/where they could go to get support and the project confirms that the candidate could identify and access an appropriate form of support.

Chemène to retain all questions and modify them as follows, to increase clarity and reliability:

Q1: Change first word to “explain”

Q2: Change 2b to read, “Describe how to approach...”

Q3: Separate 3a into two parts

Q4: Describe a ‘best practice’ system that is, or that could be used... (but is this best practice?)

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Questions revised as per recommendations above.

Project

General question about presentation of Project 1:

Chemène prepared two options for how Project 1 could be presented and asked participants in the validation to select their preferred option:

- Option 1—slightly more detail
- Option 2—more concise, leaving people to go to the Appendix for more detailed information.

100% of participants preferred option 1. This includes those who gave email feedback before the webinar and those who attended the webinar. See validation checklist, item 15a.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Option 2 deleted.

Email feedback received before webinar

Email #1:

- P5 Under the heading: “How Individual assessment tasks will be assessed” refers to ‘satisfactory standard’ and ‘satisfactory quality’ – could there be a statement here that indicates that Appendix

Validation Criteria Checklist

1 indicates requirements? **Great idea!** *Text box added to this section, highlighting Appendix 1.*

- P11 3b Submit one example of a “validated LLN assessment tool” – just wondering if this is necessary as validated LLN tool would be something that an LLN specialist would use. The performance evidence in the UC states “use tools to identify skill requirements...” and “Use various sources to gather information on the current LLN skills of the learner group” so is the submission of a completed and validated LLN tool necessary? **No changes made:** *PC 1.3 refers to use of “validated tools”.*
- P16 The second dot point caused some discussion “At least some individuals in the target learner group must have suspected LLN skill development needs” – this was because the unit is about identifying these needs so it was felt that our learners were being asked to identify probably LLN needs for their project, but this is what the unit was actually about (tough one—just a comment!). **No changes made in this regard.**
- Item 6, page 19: Video recording or observation rather than reference letter. **This task was revised so that video recording or direct observation by TAE trainer was required.**
- P10 and P11 under Evidence to submit at points 2, 3, 6 the word “Proof” is used and we were wondering if the word “Evidence” could be used in this context? **Done.**

Email #2:

- Project, task 6: I think a third party checklist would be useful. An observation checklist might be difficult to administer because the candidate needs to use both training and assessment strategies, so timing might be an issue. The report could ask questions about how the candidate customised the material, when the learners were trained and assessed and how the candidate responded to the needs of the learners. There could also be some questions about evaluating the effectiveness [of] the strategies chosen, what type of support if any the LLN specialist provided. **No action taken in this regard.** *Chemène to consider including statement from candidate describing what they did (to be set up as a questionnaire).*
- Project, task 9: Candidate should explain how they determined that the LLN Specialist had the necessary qualifications to offer support. **No changes made in this regard.** *There is nothing in the unit that requires this.*

Email #3: Based on option 1 presentation of project:

- Page 11 question 3a ii) Make the last part of this question separate. i.e. iii. Identify the two (2) biggest LLN skill gaps. I suggest this as when questions like these are not separated some of my guys missed the question completely. If it was numbered, they saw it. **Done.**
- Page 11 question 4 (me being picky again): Discuss – then explain your answer? Perhaps put this question in two parts, i.e.:
 - i. Discuss how you would decide whether or not you’ll need help from an LLN specialist to address the LLN skill gaps identified
 - ii. Explain why you made that decision.

Didn’t break up question into two parts, but modified the question to highlight the two parts of the question. New question reads: “Identify whether or not you’ll need help from an LLN specialist to address the LLN skill gaps identified and explain how you arrived at this decision.”

Validation Criteria Checklist

Email #4: Based on option 1 presentation of project:

- Page 10, point 3: Can they use the same answer here that they used in the short answer question? Or vice-versa? If yes, does it matter? Have you collected enough evidence if they use the same example? Maybe you need a caveat either here or in the questions which states they must come up with something different. **No changes made.** *Discussed in webinar. Validators agreed that the question assess knowledge of what they could do, and similar question in project assess what they did in the scenario used for LLN Project 1.*

Email #5: Based on option 1 presentation of project:

3b Suggestion to change wording of this part of the project to:

“Submit one (1) completed example (customised if necessary) of a validated LLN tool used to determine LLN skill levels of at least one learner in the learner group” This would cover all points in UoC – PC 2.2 Use learning and assessment materials to support identified LLN requirements, ‘customising where necessary’. **No changes made.** *PC 2.2 was interpreted as referring to the learning and assessment materials used to deliver the training, not the materials (the ‘tools’) used to assess learners’ LLN skills.*

4a Remove ‘discuss’ and replace with ‘determine’ or ‘review’. Discuss isn’t in the UoC, this saves the learner having to prove discussion with a third party. **Discuss removed.**

4b List and describe at least two (2) instructional strategies you will use... **Done**

4c List and describe at least two (2) assessment strategies that are appropriate...

(I don’t see a need to have a list at the beginning of 4b and 4c unless you say list four strategies and describe 2...) **Done**

4c. I would remove LLN development needs as this is about assessment and in ‘theory’ they have been developed. **Done**

4d. I would remove this question if you keep the short answer questionnaire, as this is a repeat of short answer question 3a and b. However, if you change the wording of 4d to:

“4d Insert two (2) website addresses for of other sources of LLN support available.” *This would cover the point in the UoC 3.2 Access specialist LLN support where available.* **No specific changes made in this regard.**

Discussions in webinar and consensus reached

Discussions on how to approach this project:

In training, introduce a case study that participants have the option of using as the basis for Project 1. After training, participants complete Project 1. To do this, they either finish the case study (best choice if they don’t have a workplace) or base Project 1 on a real workplace situation (preferred). *Will do, when developing learning materials.*

Discussions re Project 1, evidence item 6: Proof of having delivered the LLN support

Below are various options/comments offered by validators as to what forms of evidence would be suitable as proof of having provided the support:

- Validator 1) Requirement for observation in person or video evidence

Validation Criteria Checklist

- Validator 2) Delivery and assessment is a minor part of this, maybe a third party checklist
- Validator 3) Need a couple of alternatives to video evidence
- Validator 4) Agree with checklist, not reference letter
- Validator 5) Alternatives to video evidence.

See also, comments above from email contributors.

Consensus:

Keep project requirements essentially as they are. Modify wording of project instructions as follows:

- 1: Background info: no changes *Done*
- 2: Add reference to ACSF or equivalent. *Info already in the Appendix.*
- 3: Consider re-wording the bit about validated tools to clarify what a validated tool is, plus how did they know it was validated? *FAQ answering question, "What is a validated tool"? Added to the Appendix.* Also break up 3aiii into 3aiii and iv. *Done.*
- 4: a. Change word discuss to 'explain'
b & c. Change "List and describe..." to "describe" *Done*
c. Remove the last part of this instruction, as follows: "Describe at least two (2) assessment strategies that are appropriate for the learner group and their LLN development needs. *Done.*
- 5: No changes
- 6: There were varied opinions about the evidence required for item 6 (proof of having provided the LLN support). Chemène to review the conflicting opinions of validators and make a decision about what evidence should be required to show the LLN support has been provided. Chemène to present alternative options for people who don't have a workplace and who will need to complete this as a case study.
- 7: No changes.
- 8: No changes.
- 9: No changes.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Assessment map completed as per recommendations above. In addition:

- **Task 2** was divided into two separate tasks (task 2 and task 3):
 - First task (task 2) asked candidates to identify LLN skills needed to perform in the workplace
 - Second task (new task 3) asks candidates to identify LLN skills needed to participate in the training

All other tasks re-numbered. There are now 10 tasks total. Assessment map updated to reflect this change.

- **Project 1 proof-read for typos**—minor changes made.
- **Task 6 (now task 7) Use/apply LLN support**
All validators struggled with identifying suitable (valid, sufficient, reliable and authentic) evidence for

Validation Criteria Checklist

this task. RTOs will need to consider their clients and identify the best way to demonstrate competence. Chemène re-wrote this task to offer a range of options for how candidates could meet this requirement. Options presented are:

- *Direct observation by the TAE trainer:*
 - *Candidate may submit a video of them working with real learners in their workplaces (but since video may be problematic for confidentiality and accessibility reasons, the following other options were added)...*
 - *Candidate may demonstrate skills during training time, using the TAE learner group (good for direct evidence, but not the preferred way to address requirement that 'real' learners are used as the basis for the learning).*
- *Indirect evidence:*

Candidates may provide support in their real workplace and complete a questionnaire in which they describe in detail the LLN support provided. Information given in the questionnaire must be verified by a credible third party. Chemène created a questionnaire for this purpose and added to the assessment booklet as Appendix 2.

- **LLN Project 1, Task 8 (now task 9) (review LLN support provided)**

Divided part A into two parts (A and B), and changed part B to part C. Rationale: Part A asks candidates to reflect on the LLN support provided and was approved for use by the validators. Upon further reflection, Chemène noted two items of performance evidence in the unit, namely:

- *Select, use and review at least two instructional strategies...*
- *Select, use and review at least two assessment strategies...*

Evidence of having selected instructional and assessment strategies is gathered in LLN Project 1, task 5. Evidence of having used instructional and assessment strategies is gathered in LLN Project 1, task 7. To ensure that evidence is gathered of having reviewed both instructional and assessment strategies, Chemène separated Task 9 part A into two parts, requiring review of instructional strategies (A) and of assessment strategies (B).

Appendix 1

Email feedback received before webinar

Email #1: The Appendix provides specific details about the evidence requirements, listed in the Assessment Booklet.

- **Page 16:** Change to “must the training standard for LLN Project 1 be a unit of competence?” *Done, AND the term, ‘benchmark’ was also retained, as this is the term used throughout the Blackwater Projects materials.*
- **Page 18:** 3b: It might be useful to list the type of validated tools that are acceptable. *Not done here, but have added information to the FAQ section of Appendix 1, explaining what a validated tool is.*
- **Page 17:** 3a: Dot Point 1 & 2 are duplicated. *They’re not duplicated, but they’re very similar. One refers to the training process and one refers to assessment requirements. This section was revised so that the differences between the two dot points are more obvious.*

Validation Criteria Checklist

I found a User Guide from the IBSA site for Skill Set TAESS00009 - Foundation Skills in Vocational Practice. The Skill Set includes the unit above and provides some useful information about validated tools, instructional and assessment strategies, etc. I attach a copy of the User Guide FYI. *Chemène's comments: There wasn't time to look at the User Guide in detail in webinar, but this is Gold! Loads of info that will help deliver this unit and answer some questions asked. Interestingly, knowledge of ACSF not required for TAELLN411 according to this document (p.33).*

Email #2:

- P.16 FAQ: Do you need to define a group? Is it 3 or 4 or more? **Done.** *Added to FAQ #1.*
- P.16 FAQ: "May I base LLN Project 1 on a hypothetical scenario?" I think this might be a major problem as I explain later. Maybe after you have run it a couple of times you can come up with a generic scenario. Although I don't know how you will get around the implementation unless you have a group who can teach each other. At (RTO name removed) that's what we used to do for individuals who did not have access to opportunities to train and assess in the workplace. I don't think you can really deal with this until you come up against it. *Project re-written to suggest that it could be completed as a case study if a real workplace isn't available. Case study scenario to be developed as part of the learning materials.*
- P.16 FAQ: Bottom of page: I think you need more info here – although you are probably covering this in the training. As I said earlier my issue here is finding appropriate validated tools to meet the needs of any and all situations is likely to be challenging. *Info about where to find validated assessment tool should be covered in training. A competent person should know where to find tools. Added info about what a validated tool is, to the FAQs.*

Email #3:

Project 1 task 6 asks for proof of having delivered LLN support—much of the detail is in the Appendix:

- Typo in the Appendix (item 6) "For a satisfactory result on this task you must submit at least ~~submit~~ one (1) of the following..." *Oops, thanks! Corrected.*
- In response to Chemène's specific questions about this project:
 - Guidance about Item 6 in Appendix... is it okay? Email feedback said: "At Certificate IV level, I don't like third party or reference letters. I video everything, and even if the learner did a voice recording on their mobile it is better proof." *Okay.*
 - Should I add a third party observation checklist? Email feedback said, "No."

Discussions in webinar and consensus reached

Above items were not explicitly discussed in the webinar.

Chemène has reviewed email feedback and identified the following changes to the Appendix:

- Action all recommendations given in Email #1 above.
- Define a group as recommended in Email #2 above.
- Fix typo identified in Email #3 above.
- Concerns expressed in Email #2 about how people without a workplace can complete this assessment are discussed in previous sections of the validation record. Chemène to review the

Validation Criteria Checklist

assessment information in the Appendix and make sure it accurately reflects the updated version of the project. Some information for people without a workplace will be given.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

All changes listed above were applied.

Instructions document

- **Email #1:** Personally, I'm very used to your instructions documentation and I had no trouble with this. I guess if you're a TAE40110 trainer/assessor teaching TAE it should be fairly straightforward?
- **Email #2:** Great document, very clear instructions for RTOs to brand tools.

Discussions in webinar and consensus reached

Above items were not explicitly discussed in the webinar.

Chemène to modify the instructions document as follows:

- Instructions for use: no changes
- Marking guide for short answer questions: Modify short answer questions to match the final versions of the questions after validation. Add guidance and model answers for each question.

Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013:

Instructions document modified and marking guide completed as per recommendations above.

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	
3	Formatted and organised in a logical, easy-to-understand way?	Yes	Formatting allows for ease of use. Plain English is used throughout. Candidate will need to flick between pages when completing the project but guidance is provided at all stages. Could highlight reference to Appendix 1 by using bold text throughout instructions so this is easily recognised by the candidate. <i>Text box highlighting the Appendix was added to the assessment booklet (p.5)</i>

VALIDITY

Do/are the required assessment activities/evidence:		Y or N	Comments
4	Feature holistic activities?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email #1: Workplace project ● Email #2: One task which covers all aspects.
5	Pitched at the correct AQF	Yes	Email: Similar to TAE tasks – although a LOT of work

Validation Criteria Checklist			
	level?		for one unit
6	Cover all elements and performance criteria of the unit?	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email #1: Not sure. See below. ● Email #2: Mapping document clearly demonstrates that you have met the requirements of the unit. <p>Chemène to review comments below.</p>
7	Cover all performance evidence?	No	<p>Email #1: Performance evidence:</p> <p>a. Identify LLN skills of the training specification. Mapping states Task 3 in the Project however this is targeted to the LLN skills of the learners. Should this be mapped to Task 2 which relates to training specs?</p> <p><i>Competency map reviewed and revised.</i></p> <p>b. The next two performance items are covered by questioning only. As this is about Performance evidence is it OK to use questioning only? LLN Project 1 does not appear to cover this off in Tasks 3 and 4.</p> <p><i>Not discussed in webinar.</i></p> <p>Chemène to re-visit items a and b above and make sure all performance and knowledge items are addressed.</p> <p>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: <i>Assessment map updated as per comments above. Chemène also reviewed the Project and checked that all performance evidence was addressed in the Project (i.e. not just through questioning). With revisions, all performance evidence is covered with Project 1. Concerning the requirement that LLN specialists are consulted, two options are presented (contingency)—if the candidate did consult with LLN specialists, they are asked to explain what they did. If the candidate did not consult with LLN specialists, they are asked to explain what could have been done with an LLN specialist.</i></p> <p>Email #2: Mostly. But critical aspects state “Use advice from LLN...” This conflicts with performance criteria 3 which states “where required”. I thought your task reflected the ‘where required’ part.</p>

Validation Criteria Checklist			
			<p>See comments in earlier sections of this validation record about how to assess peoples' ability to access and use LLN support. This project must be written in a way to allow people without a workplace to access this assessment and still meet all requirements of the unit & assessment reqs.</p> <p>Chemène to review comments above and modify the assessment tool to hit the right balance between access to this assessment for participants and meeting requirements.</p> <p>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: <i>Project instructions revised to allow opportunities for this project to be undertaken as a case study during training (recommendation is that participants would need to complete the Project after the conclusion of training, but parts may be started during training).</i></p>
8	Cover all knowledge evidence?	Yes	<p>Email: Depends – If we are including foundation skill I'm not sure that you are collecting evidence of interpreting info from enrolment or pre-training assessment – or is this what will be done as a matter of course with the validated tool?</p> <p><i>In the webinar, a poll was taken to see if validators felt that the examples of actions listed in the foundation skills were specific actions to be assessed, or if they were examples of the types of things that candidates would need the foundation skills to do.</i></p> <p><i>100% of validators attending the webinar felt that the examples listed beside the foundation skills in the unit were not directly assessable. They were examples provided for guidance only. Therefore...</i></p> <p>Validators agreed that this assessment tool covers all knowledge evidence. No changes required in this regard.</p>
9	Cover all required skills?	N/A	This criterion removed from the validation record as required skills are no longer part of the unit.
10	Cover all dimensions of competence (i.e.reflect realistic working conditions): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task skills 	Yes	No changes

Assessment Tool Validation Record

Validation Criteria Checklist			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task management skills • Contingency management skills • Job/role environment skills? 		
11	Address the Rules of Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valid • Sufficient • Current • Authentic? 	Yes	No changes
12	Cover employability skills as relevant to the unit/s assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication • Teamwork • Problem-solving • Initiative and enterprise • Planning and organising • Self-management • Learning • Technology? 	Yes	No changes
13	Is this assessment tool free of un-necessary assessment tasks?	Yes	<p>Email: As already stated it's lengthy for 1 UOC completed in isolation. The general approach will work well when integrated with other TAE Units.</p> <p><i>Validators discussed the possibility of clustering this unit with other TAE units in the future. While the idea of clustering this assessment with other units (and therefore making this unit seem less onerous than it does as a stand-alone assessment) was appealing, validators were unable to come up with a clustering model that would be effective. See comments earlier in this record.</i></p> <p><i>In webinar, validators agreed that all tasks outlined in draft assessment booklet were necessary to address unit and assessment requirements. There were no un-necessary tasks.</i></p>
	a. Specific question: Should there be both a declaration of authenticity and a third party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email #1: Candidate should confirm that it is their own work and that they are aware of the consequences of plagiarism. I am not sure if you need the Third Party 	

Validation Criteria Checklist		
	<p>questionnaire, or do we remove declaration?</p>	<p>authentication here if a third party is going to verify the assessment in Task 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email #2: We thought that candidate signing for authenticity was sufficient ● Email #3: Personally, I thought both were useful. A declaration is a pretty easy thing to complete and kind-of adds that authenticity. ● Email #4: Both should stay just to cover yourself – you never know when they will switch back to saying 3rd party reports are in!! <p>Chemène to review and revise LLN Project 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If a third party questionnaire is added to LLN Project 1, Chemène will remove the Declaration of Authenticity. ● If a third party questionnaire is not added to LLN Project 1, Chemène will retain Declaration of Authenticity. <p>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: <i>Declaration of authenticity has been left in the assessment booklet for now. RTOs have the option of removing it if not needed.</i></p>
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?	<p>Yes</p> <p>Email #1: Project is completed in the workplace.</p> <p>Email #2: This is the one I feel unsure about – it only works when there is access to learners who need support. If I’m working in a law firm as a corporate trainer, what are the chances that I will have access to a group with LLN support needs? Where are the ACSF validated tools for me?</p> <p>Chemène to write LLN Project 1 as though it were to be completed in the workplace, but add information to the Appendix stating that this project may be completed as a case study if the candidate doesn’t have access in their workplaces to learners with special needs.</p> <p>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: <i>Changes recommended above were actioned.</i></p>
15	Written in ‘plain English’?	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email #1: Language is easy to understand ● Email #2: Going on my own experience some of

Validation Criteria Checklist			
			<p>the terms may need to be changed or popped in the 'glossary' suggested above. ... terms like: portfolio tools systems</p> <p>Chemène:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>will not</u> add a glossary as this only makes the assessment tool larger and more 'scary'. • will replace confusing terms with more clear ones. See earlier comments about word changes to questions and project instructions. <p>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: <i>Documented reviewed and modified to remove confusing terms.</i></p>
	a. Specific question: Which option is the best way to present LLN Project 2? Option 1 or 2 (see draft of tool)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email #1: Project 1 – Option 1 preferred as it is a bit more specific about the requirements and will encourage candidate to provide quality evidence up front. • Email #2: All of us liked the detail in Option 1 of the project. The detail is up front and leads the candidate through the evidence requirements without the need for constant referral to the Appendix. • Email #3: Option one preferred. • Email #4: I prefer option 1. I like the detail. That said, you go into great detail in the Appendix. In Option 2 you make reference to the Appendix. I think you could make more of this so it's absolutely unmissable, then I would be fine. But that's just me – I like the detail. • Email #5: I like option 1. <p>Chemène to delete option 2 from the assessment booklet.</p> <p>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: <i>Option 2 removed.</i></p>
16	Pitched at a suitable LLN level for the target candidates and the unit/s assessed?	Yes	☺
RELIABILITY			
Does the assessment tool include:		Y or N	Comments
17	Instructions for assessors on how to administer the assessment?	Yes	Clear instructions in the assessment booklet and assessment instructions

Validation Criteria Checklist			
18	A marking guide for assessors?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email #1: Instructions booklet provides marking guide and sample answers (some to be finalised) ● Email #2: The marking guide looks good. <p><i>Follow up by Chemène—21 Sep 2013: Marking guide finalised.</i></p>
19	<p>Clear and complete information and instructions for candidates, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Email #1: All except details about appeals process. Cannot find details in the assessment booklet (maybe I can't see for looking) ● Email #2: There was no information about rights of appeal or confidentiality (did I miss it??) <p><i>Discussed in webinar:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Blackwater Projects offers a Program Information document that RTOs may modify for use. This document explains right of appeal, confidentiality and other information that is relevant to all competency-based assessments.</i> ● <i>Validators agreed not to add this information to the assessment booklet, and agreed that RTOs should ultimately bear responsibility for deciding how to present generic information about assessments to their clients.</i>
20	<p>Template to record details of the assessment, including space to note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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	<p>All are included in the assessment booklet.</p> <p>No changes needed in this regard.</p>

Summary of feedback and recommendations

Summarising email feedback and webinar discussions:

- Generally speaking, assessment tool documentation is clear and thorough. Some minor changes required to clarify instructions, as noted throughout this document.
- There remains concern over how to set up the requirements for LLN Project 1. Main issues raised included:
 - Accessibility—how can people without a workplace where there are learners with LLN skill needs get an opportunity to complete LLN Project 1? One suggestion was to complete LLN Project 1 during training, using the TAE Cohort as the target learners. However this raised the issue of...
 - Safety—validators were concerned about using the TAELLN411 training participants as the “real” vocational learners required for this unit. Although validators agreed that TAELLN411 participants would meet the requirements as “real” vocational learners, they agreed that the risks of having TAELLN411 learners assess each other’s LLN needs would be too dangerous.

To address the issues of accessibility and safety, validators agreed that Chemène will develop a case study for LLN Project 1. The requirement to “use” the LLN support strategies identified with “real” vocational learners will be addressed by having participants identify and model LLN instructional strategies that are appropriate for the target learner group in the case study.

- Two validators expressed concern about the size of the assessment. However, validators could not identify any assessment tasks that were not necessary. Validators were also unable to reach consensus about an effective way to cluster this unit with other TAE units in the longer term (the assumption being that if this unit were clustered with others, the assessment wouldn’t seem to ‘big’). This may need to be re-visited in 2014, when TAELLN411 is added as a core for the Cert IV TAE. In the short term, keeping this unit as a ‘stand-alone’ is the preferred option.

Immediate changes to be made to the assessment tool documentation

See **highlighted** and **purple** comments throughout this document.

Assessment Tool Validation Record

Follow-up			
Action required		By whom	By when
1	Type / finalise this report	Chemène	27 Sep 2013
2	Adjust assessment tool as recommended in this report	Chemène	27 Sep 2013
3	Distribute assessment tool to validators for final edits and/or sign-off.	Chemène / validators	27 Sep 2013
4	Write learning materials, including case study that reflects LLN Project 1 requirements	Chemène	TBC
5	Review LLN Project 1 to ensure that the case study described in the workbook that Chemène will put together will have consistent instructions to LLN Project 1.	Chemène	Within one week of finalising case study materials.

Assessment Tool Validation Record

Endorsement of this report

The version approved was dated 15 Sep 2013. It contained a summary of feedback received the validation plus items agreed upon in the webinar. Some items were left for Chemène to reflect upon after the validation. The final version of this report (dated 27 Sep 2013) lists final changes made to the assessment tool draft and released as version 1.0, final.

Validator	Endorsement date	How endorsed (email, phone, etc)
Chemène Sinson	15 Sep 2013	Wrote report
Arian Ploeg	20 Sep 2013	Verbal
Sandie McCoy	15 Sep 2013	Email
Dean McDonald	16 Sep 2013	Email
Trevor Manning	16 Sep 2013	Email
Su Montgomery	18 Sep 2013	Email
Anne McCarthy	19 Sep 2013	Email
Ann Brady	16 Sep 2013	Email
Madeleine Hopkins	16 Sep 2013	Email
Debbie Guy	19 Sep 2013	Email
Peta McGrath	16 Sep 2013	Email
Kylie McFarlane	18 Sep 2013	Email
Helen Devlin	16 Sep 2013	Email

End of assessment validation record