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Executive Summary

The findings of the Post implementation Review of the WELL Program are that the Program is meeting its objectives and as a result has considerably developed the field of workplace English language and literacy training in the first three years of its operation. This success can be seen in the reach of the Program, the nature of the projects funded by the Program, and the impact of the Program on enterprises.

The Program is beginning to reach enterprises of all sizes in a wide range of industries, across all states and territories, in metropolitan, non-metropolitan and remote areas and, in so doing, is bringing a range of different providers into the field. It has funded innovative and strategic projects which are starting to set the pace for workplace English language and literacy training nationally. The Program has been a positive force for change in workplaces which have conducted WELL projects, acting as a catalyst for furthering the reform process in many enterprises, promoting the development of a training culture at work and influencing current workplace communication practices.

The Program is moving from its establishment phase into a stage of maturity, with sound strategies and policies in place, and increasing industry commitment and awareness of possible outcomes from this training. With funding maintained at least at the current rate, the WELL Program can expect excellent results for its initiatives over the next three to five years.

Reach of the Program

The range of program contractors is broad, including government and private providers, unions, industry training advisory bodies, enterprises and community agencies. New program contractors have entered the field each year including non-metropolitan colleges of TAFE and enterprises. The Program has reached a broad range of industries, with several new industries undertaking to place English language and literacy on their national training agendas through WELL funded national projects in 1995.

The Program is increasingly reaching small and isolated businesses. WELL projects in the review sample, funded between 1992 and 1994, were conducted in a range of small, medium and large enterprises. Promotional activity in regional areas in 1994, for instance by the NSW Government Language, Literacy and Numeracy Taskforce has had a positive impact on the number of applications from non-metropolitan enterprises and providers for the 1995 funding round.

Nature of WELL projects

The WELL Program has promoted two major initiatives in the field of workplace English language and literacy training - the linking of English language training with literacy training and the integration of English language and literacy training with
industry endorsed or enterprise specific training. Forty two percent of projects surveyed had linked English language with literacy training to some degree. The percentage of integrated projects in the survey increased from 22% in 1992 to 39% in 1994. Stand-alone English language and literacy training, however, is still the most common model of training. While this type of training is valued by those surveyed as a means of introducing new workplaces to English language and literacy training, and new providers to the workplace context, it is also viewed as a step towards integration.

Almost 100% of personnel surveyed credited the tripartite arrangements in the establishment of WELL projects at enterprise level, between unions, employers and providers, as playing a valuable role in encouraging ownership of the project by the enterprise in which it is operating.

Flexibly delivered training to meet the needs of small and isolated businesses across the states and territories is becoming a more common mode of delivery for WELL projects. In the majority of projects surveyed, however, training was delivered in the classroom. The WELL Program funds resource development activities which have broad industry application. Resource development activity, while accounting for a relatively small percentage of WELL projects, is the key means, at this stage, to the provision of flexible delivery in the WELL Program.

The WELL Program’s strategy to place English language and literacy training within the training plans of an industry at national level through its National Projects has been successfully implemented through major national projects influencing several industries by 1995. The major impact of the National Projects is in the positioning of English language and literacy within the particular industry’s training plan, their influence on smaller projects in those industries and liaison across industries. Liaison across industries is being facilitated through the funding of project officers whose role is to act as advocates of English language and literacy training with enterprises, to network both within and across industries and to coordinate strategic resource development within the industry.

Impact of WELL Program within enterprises

A considerable majority of informants considered the WELL Program to have had a significant impact on enterprises, although specific data concerning the impact of WELL projects on enterprises has not been kept systematically by enterprises over long periods of time. The evidence workplace personnel were able to provide regarding benefits to course participants of participation in English language and literacy training at work fell into four main categories - achievement of work related credentials, increased confidence and orientation to work, participation at work and career pathways. Increased confidence, as a result of work related English language and literacy training, was the most highly valued outcome by workplace personnel since it facilitated the implementation of workplace reform. The WELL Program is benefiting workplace management and training providers through cross-fertilisation of knowledge of their relative fields.
The WELL Program is establishing the view in several enterprises that English language and literacy training is a significant contributor to the success of their reform process with 83% of the group surveyed crediting it with a role in facilitating reform in their enterprises. The Program is able to promote reform from the operator level up through the workplace in a way that other training and procedural initiatives are not able to.

Ninety percent of respondents said that the WELL project, conducted in their enterprise, has influenced workplace communication practices, mainly through increased awareness of the role of and need for plain English, and the recognition that good communication practices are the responsibility of all parties at work.

Train the Trainer programs in English language and literacy awareness and skills, and consultation on the development of clearer documentation are some of the WELL projects promoting better communication practices. Eighty one percent of surveyed personnel said that there was a greater value placed on training in general in their enterprise as a result of the WELL funded English language and literacy training.

Enterprises have made a considerable commitment to English language and literacy training, providing a venue and work release for participants, as well as a 25% contribution to training costs in the first year, and 50% of training costs in cases of enterprises entering their second year of WELL funding. As a result of the success of their WELL projects, several enterprises have completely funded their English language and literacy training programs after their WELL funding has ceased. Seventy five percent of workplace personnel and educators surveyed thought that the WELL funded project would have a lasting impact on their organisation after the funding stopped.

The WELL Program has taken some account of the many professional development needs, resulting from the nature of the WELL Program and its policy directions, with the provision of language and English literacy awareness raising training for workplace personnel as part of each project and with some of its national projects, such as guidelines and best practice models. There are on-going professional development needs associated with linking of ESL and literacy training and integrating with mainstream training.

**Effectiveness and efficiency of program administration arrangements**

In order to consolidate these positive outcomes, several of the Program’s administrative arrangements require some adjustment in order to make them more effective and efficient. The application process was viewed as lacking the flexibility to meet applicant’s requirements. The reporting process was viewed as heavily weighted with numerical data requirements while not capturing outcomes and other descriptive data concerning the projects. Part of the ineffectiveness in the application and reporting process was due to the continued use of the ASLPR and ALAN scales to report English language and literacy gains.
Representatives of all parties surveyed and consulted considered the WELL Program to be under-resourced. Workloads of DEET officers managing WELL programs are much higher than staffing allocations allow, and their roles, especially at the time of submissions, require specialised knowledge and considerable consultation with project personnel. Project personnel required more access to DEET staff for advice, consultation, guidance and feedback during all stages of the project. Information about the Program’s policy, application requirements, outcomes and examples of best practice was not sufficiently disseminated. Systems and structures to collect and organise useful data for program monitoring and evaluation are not adequate. There is considerable reliance on networks and committees to disseminate information about and promote the Program. Consultative arrangements such as the National Consultative Group which consults on outcomes of activities and determines national priorities and directions for the Program, need to be better utilised.

In conclusion, there is considerable evidence and opinion that the WELL Program has already made a significant contribution to the field of workplace English language and literacy training in Australia in the first three years of its operation. Industry is increasingly taking up the challenge to integrate English language and literacy training with mainstream training initiatives. The Program is entering a stage of maturity with sound policies and strategies in place to ensure, through the variety of its enterprise level projects, the strategic direction of its national projects, the opening of the training market, the linking of English language and literacy training, and the integration of English language and literacy training with mainstream objectives and excellent outcomes over the next three to five years of its operation.
1. Introduction

1.1 Context of the review

The review of the Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) Program has taken place as part of the post implementation review of the Australian Language and Literacy Policy which includes the review of the National Adult Literacy Projects Program, the National Language and Literacy Institute of Australia, the Asia Education Foundation, the Special Intervention Program and the Australian Language and Literacy Council.

The post implementation review of the WELL Program was conducted by Unisearch Consulting and Research between October and December 1994.

The review is limited in scope as a result of the short time frame which was set in order to inform 1995-96 budget processes. As a result, this project provides an overview of the impact of the WELL Program rather than a detailed evaluation. The conclusions drawn in this review are based on information derived from a desk audit of a representative sample of 10% of projects funded over the three years of the operation of the WELL Program; a comprehensive phone survey of seventy representative project personnel, including workplace and union personnel, training providers and project participants; and face-to-face consultations with fifty personnel including representatives of peak and union bodies, the WELL National Consultative Committee, the State and Territory Advisory Bodies and staff in DEET, DIR and DIEA.

1.2 Terms of reference

The review of the WELL Program has been framed around the following questions as indicators of its impact and the efficiency of its administration and data collection methods (refer to Appendix 1 for the consultancy terms of reference).

- Is the WELL Program meeting its objectives effectively?
- What are the outcomes of the program? Are they consistent with the WELL Program objectives?

These two major questions are addressed by considering the following issues:

- Has integration of workplace English language and literacy training with mainstream training been successful? What are the reasons for this outcome? How is integration happening?
- Has the integration of workplace English language and literacy training activities been successful? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the integrated model in achieving the objectives of the WELL Program?
Has the WELL Program increased awareness of the value of workplace training within industry and the training community?

Has the WELL Program funding acted as a catalyst for other English language and literacy activities in the workplace either during or after the funding has ceased?

Has the WELL Program improved and facilitated links within enterprises and across industries in terms of workplace English language and literacy training?

What have been the outcomes for workers who participate in WELL funded English language and literacy activities?

Are the administrative arrangements for the WELL Program efficient and effective?

What changes can be made to the WELL Program to improve its efficiency and effectiveness?

2. Methodology

The review brief specified a research design which included the following three research elements:

- a desk audit of a representative sample of the projects which have been funded,
- surveys of project personnel, industry and union representatives,
- face-to-face consultations with members of the WELL National Consultative Group, the WELL State and Territories Advisory Committees, selected project personnel, (including enterprise training providers, and course participants) and staff from Department of Education, Employment and Training, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, and Department of Industrial Relations, as well as representatives of peak industry bodies and unions.

2.1 The desk audit

2.1.1 Purpose of the desk audit

The desk audit sought to collect data on the following aspects of the WELL Program over the three years of its operation in order to identify:

- the extent to which the WELL Program has been able to integrate English language with literacy training, and to integrate English language and literacy training with mainstream training across the states over the three years of its operation,
• the range of organisations which have been contracted to implement WELL projects, including the range of participating industries, the range of business sizes among participating enterprises and the extent to which the Program has reached non-metropolitan areas in Australia.

2.1.2 **Size and scope of the desk audit**

From a total of approximately 1500 enterprises in which English language and literacy training and development activity has taken place over the three years that the WELL Program has been operating, submissions and reports for 140 enterprises were examined and data was collected in the categories listed below. After taking account of several representative factors such as the year in which the projects were conducted, the state in which the projects took place and the size of the projects, a representative number of project files were then selected randomly within these categories. Where there were program contractors providing training in several enterprises, relevant data concerning each of those enterprises were collected.

The following categories were examined:

- type of program contractor,
- year of project,
- state in which project was funded,
- type of project (training or resource),
- industry,
- locality of project (urban or rural),
- type of training (classroom based or flexible delivery),
- nature of the training content (stand-alone or integrated),
- type of participant (ESL, Literacy, ESL and literacy integrated).

Refer to Appendix 2 for desk audit data collection instrument.

2.2 **The phone survey**

2.2.1 **Purpose of the phone survey**

The phone survey aimed to review the impact of the WELL Program on enterprises.

It sought to obtain an overview of how the WELL Program was operating at enterprise level through an in-depth survey with project personnel based on the key questions of the brief. In the process, it aimed to analyse administrative procedures for projects which either contributed to or hindered the implementation of a successful WELL project within an enterprise.
2.2.2 Target population of telephone survey

The personnel surveyed were drawn from the three different populations associated with the WELL project at enterprise level and represented three different perspectives on the English language and literacy project in the enterprise. They were selected to represent the range of project contractors, and the range of project size and location. People surveyed included:

- workplace personnel associated with managing the project, including union representatives,
- workplace personnel participating as learners in the project,
- providers, either teachers delivering the training or educational program managers.

Seventy four project personnel were surveyed in depth. Twenty five respondents were workplace and union personnel, thirty four were providers and fifteen were training participants.

2.2.3 Survey instrument

The survey instrument consisted of twenty nine questions and sought information on the following topics:

- the character of the WELL project in the enterprise, including the:
  - degree of integration with mainstream training,
  - flexible delivery arrangements,
  - type of learner ie whether they were only ESL learners or only literacy learners or a mixture of ESL and literacy learners.

- the impact of the WELL project on the enterprise, including the:
  - outcomes and benefits for all parties,
  - contribution to the reform process,
  - impact on communication practices within the enterprise,
  - effect on attitudes to training within the organisation,
  - lasting impact,
  - changing attitudes within enterprises,
  - contribution to establishing links with other enterprise and training providers.

- administrative features of the Program, including the:
  - skills requirements of all parties to implement a WELL project,
  - process of applying for funds,
  - reporting and monitoring process,
  - importance of WELL funds.

Refer to Appendix 3 for phone survey instrument.
2.3 Consultations

2.3.1 The purpose of the consultations

The consultation examined in more depth the ten questions outlined in the terms of reference and explored the issues raised by a Discussion Paper outlining the emerging findings from the phone survey. It aimed to gain a more detailed understanding of the perspective of industry, unions, employers, government and providers of the effectiveness of the WELL Program within the broader climate of the national training reform agenda and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy. A copy of the Discussion Paper is attached as Appendix 4.

2.3.2 Key personnel consulted

Consultations took place with fifty people from:

- the WELL National Consultative Group,
- the WELL State and Territory Advisory Committees,
- selected projects, (including enterprise and union personnel, training providers, and course participants),
- the Department of Education, Employment and Training, the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Department of Industrial Relations and the Australian National Training Authority,
- peak industry bodies and unions.

A list of all people surveyed and consulted is attached as Appendix 5.

3. Background

3.1 Rationale

The WELL Program was announced in 1991 in *Australia's Language, the Australian Language and Literacy Policy* as a response to increasing recognition that literacy skills training as well as ESL training were required in Australian workplaces.

*Australia's Language: the Australian Language and Literacy Policy* states that:

through its Literacy in the Workplace Program, the Commonwealth would provide catalytic funding to help industry assess literacy competencies and literacy training needs in specific workplaces, and to develop, deliver and evaluate training modules for workers needing assistance. The Department of Education Employment and Training (DEET) and the Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs (DILGEA) in consultation
with Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), will jointly manage the program with DILGEA’s English in the Workplace Program as the Workplace English Language and Literacy Program’ (1991: p10).

Funds from the English in the Workplace Program (EWP), administered by Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (DIEA) and the Workplace Literacy Program (WLP), administered by Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) were combined to form the WELL Program on 1 January 1992. The English in the Workplace Program was an allocation, made since 1985, from the Adult Migrant English Program which was administered by DIEA. The Workplace Literacy Program was announced in the March 1991 Industry Statement and supplemented in the 1991-92, 1992-93 budgets. The year 1992 was a period of transition for the EWP and WLP programs while arrangements were made to fully implement the Program. From 1993 the WELL Program has provided a common planning and management structure for Commonwealth workplace literacy and ESL programs.

The WELL Program was administered jointly by DEET and DIEA in consultation with the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) between 1992 and 1994. The 1994-5 Budget transferred the EWP funds from DIEA to DEET. In May 1994, the Commonwealth Government’s White Paper Working Nation: Policy and Programs maintained funding for the literacy component of the WELL Program at 1993-4 levels. From 1995, in order to simplify the interdepartmental administrative arrangements, the Program will be solely administered by DEET.

3.2 English language and literacy in the workplace

The Australian national context of workplace reform and restructuring towards a more internationally competitive and productive position has had significant consequences for employees. Restructuring has resulted in leaner organisations requiring a different approach to work. Participative workplace practices and multiskilling are two of those differences.

The impact of these new practices and the national training reform agenda aimed at equipping workers with accredited and transferable competencies to meet these and other emerging needs, has resulted in a greater emphasis on training across all levels of an organisation.

These reforms have brought about major changes in the English language and literacy demands on workers. The wider use of new technology and a shift towards quality assurance have increased further the requirements for workers to speak, listen to, read and write English in a greater range of contexts.

These changes require an approach to workplace English language and literacy training which places English language and literacy firmly within these reforms so that it can both facilitate the process and provide workers at risk of losing employment with the necessary skills to maintain their position and prepare for future employment and training needs.
3.3 **Objective of the WELL Program**

The objective of the WELL Program is to assist workers to achieve English language and literacy skills which are sufficient to enable them to meet the demands of their current employment and their future employment and training needs, particularly in the context of award restructuring and workplace reform.

3.4 **Key features of the WELL Program**

The key direction of the WELL Program is to place English language and literacy training firmly within the context of mainstream training to ensure outcomes through understanding and commitment to English language and literacy training, at industry and enterprise level as well as at the individual level.

To these ends, the Program:

- is strategic in meeting its objective by working with increasing numbers of National Industry Advisory Boards to encourage them to place English language and literacy firmly within their national training strategies, in order to address the English language and literacy needs of employees at the same time as the training demands of current and future employment;

- funds both national and state level projects, drawing on input from State and Territory Advisory Committees;

- promotes the linking of workplace English language with literacy training activities in order to ensure access to and equity in training for all workers;

- promotes the integration of English language and literacy training with mainstream training in order to facilitate English language and literacy skills development which is focussed towards enterprise and industry outcomes.

3.5 **Key features of WELL projects at enterprise level**

A key feature of WELL funded projects is the encouragement of ownership of the project by the enterprise in which it is operating.

Mechanisms in place to achieve this commitment include:

- consultative processes in setting up workplace English language and literacy training within enterprises.

In order to be eligible for funding, applicants for WELL projects need to demonstrate a tripartite agreement between the employer, the union and the provider outlining support for the proposed project. Almost 100% of personnel surveyed valued the tripartite agreement stating that it was 'essential', 'valuable
that the union was consulted early on, because it helps avoid problems' and that through it ‘everyone had a stake in the Program’. Non-unionised sites need to demonstrate employee endorsement of the proposed project.

- awareness raising training for workplace personnel

The WELL Program demonstrates its commitment to raising awareness of what English language and literacy training is and the role of English language and literacy in the successful implementation of change within industry by providing funds for training and consulting in this field as part of the project within the enterprise.

- enterprise contribution

The WELL Program encourages commitment from enterprises through a percentage contribution to the costs of tuition from the employer, except where it is an absolute barrier to expanding the program’s reach.

3.6 Key features of WELL National Projects at industry level

A key strategy of the WELL Program is the active promotion of English language and literacy training as an essential feature of an industry training plan. In this way, English language and literacy has a central position within the particular industry’s longterm training agenda.

This strategy is promoted through the WELL National Projects, which are resources which will have broad impact across the industry. Some outcomes of current and past National Projects are the establishment of principles of good practice in training needs analysis, program establishment and training delivery modes, information kits, training models and guidelines.

Another key strategy of National Projects is to appoint industry English language and literacy project officers to advise on and promote English language and literacy training to the particular industry. These officers are both resources and catalysts for English language and literacy training within enterprises and the industry at large.

National Projects are usually managed through Industry Training Advisory Bodies.
4. **Findings of the review: the reach of the WELL Program**

4.1 **Funding levels of the Program**

In the three years of its operation, the WELL Program has provided $32.8 million for submission based ESL and literacy projects.

Figure 1 shows the amount allocated to the WELL Program each year. In 1991-92, funding was for the Workplace Literacy Program (WLP) only. The existing English in the Workplace Program (EWP) $3.8 million allocation was not funded through the WELL Program in its first year of operation.


Funds have been allocated separately for English as a Second Language (ESL) and literacy training. Funds for ESL training, targeting non-English speaking background workers with low English language skills have been allocated by DIEA through the EWP and funds for literacy training targeting all workers with low level of literacy have been allocated by DEET through the WLP.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EWP</th>
<th>WLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>$2.5 million</td>
<td>$2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>$3.8 million</td>
<td>$6.032 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>$3.8 million</td>
<td>$7.627 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>$3.8 million</td>
<td>$7.78 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these funds have been distributed in NSW and Victoria. These states have the largest employee populations, the greatest numbers of non-English speaking background residents and the strongest industrial bases in Australia.

Figure 3: Distribution of WELL Program Funds for 1992

Figure 4: Distribution of WELL Program Funds for 1993

Figure 5: Distribution of WELL Program Funds for 1994
4.2 Numbers of participants, training hours and enterprises

The WELL Program has reached 1606 workplaces, providing 2.5 million hours of training to 48,428 participants over its three years of operation.

Figure 6 represents the number of participants, training hours and enterprises for the WELL Program from 1991 to 1994 and the totals for the three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>48,428</td>
<td>11,638</td>
<td>16,348</td>
<td>20,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training hours</td>
<td>2,500,347</td>
<td>523,525</td>
<td>898,779</td>
<td>1,078,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Number of Participants, Training Hours and Enterprises by Year

4.3 Interest in the Program through applications

The Program is run on a calendar year basis. In 1994-5 the Program will expend approximately $11.5 million.

- In 1994, 162 applications for funding, worth approximately $23.9 million were received. The number of applications is increasing each year.

- In 1994, 104 applications were approved for approximately $11.6. Many of these applications were renegotiated for a lesser amount than originally requested.

Figure 7: Total levels of funding requested by funding given in 1992-1993, 1993-1994, 1994-1995
4.4 Reach of the Program

4.4.1 Types and range of program contractors

In keeping with the National Training Reform Agenda, the WELL Program has sought to actively engage industry in determining the direction of English language and literacy training needs and to support an open and competitive training market consisting of both public and private training providers. One of the directions in which the Program has moved to achieve this end is illustrated through the promotion of project coordination by a variety of different organisations.

Organisations which successfully submit for WELL funds and enter into contractual relationships with the federal government to coordinate the delivery of workplace English language and literacy activities are known as 'program contractors'. Program contractors include unions; Industry Training Advisory Bodies; enterprises; ESL and literacy training providers, such as government providers like TAFE and the Adult Migrant English Service (AMES); private providers; and others such as adult and community providers.

The range of program contractors over the three years of the WELL Program's operation is shown in the following tables.

Figure 8, 9, 10 illustrate the types of program contractors by states and by years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Industry Training Advisory Board</th>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Private Training Provider</th>
<th>Government Training Provider</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Program Contractors of WELL Projects 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Industry Training Advisory Board</th>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Private Training Provider</th>
<th>Government Training Provider</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Program Contractors of WELL Projects 1993
Industry Training Advisory Bodies and unions have taken on significant roles as program contractors from the outset in the WELL Program, nominating a training provider for the project in their application. In this way, a strong industry or union perspective is maintained throughout the project, with the industry training advisory body or union advising and supporting training providers in the delivery of appropriate training.

An increasing number of enterprises have successfully applied for WELL funds to introduce workplace English language and literacy training over the years in which the WELL Program has been operating. This direction supports the WELL Program's aim to engage commitment from industry for workplace English language and literacy training. It demonstrates management's involvement to the choice of training provider and commitment to successful outcomes for the project in their enterprise.

Projects coordinated by enterprises are typically quite small. Exceptions are BHP which received $502,046 in 1993 and $260,000 in 1994, Email Limited and Controlled Entities which received $130,601 and Lend Lease Learning Pty Ltd which received $166,074, both in 1994. All these larger projects have involved training across many worksites.

Types of providers

The WELL Program has contributed to opening up the field of workplace English language and literacy training provision to a range of new providers including private providers, non-profit agencies and regional and metropolitan TAFE colleges in all states which had not previously provided workplace English language and literacy training.

* The small number of providers in NSW is explained by the fact that a centralised provider submits a large application to conduct training in many worksites, whilst in Victoria, TAFE colleges submit separate applications
The private provider was not a significant program contractor type in 1992, however by 1994 there were several private providers in the field. They are typically small organisations providing training for one or two worksites. Private providers had acquired an 8.75% share of WELL funded projects allocated to providers in the sample of projects surveyed.

The impact of the government provider, such as TAFE or AMES on the WELL Program has been considerable. The government provider is by far the major program contractor type in the Program. AMES, the provider of the earlier DIEA administered English in the Workplace program, and TAFE, have well established infrastructures, such as administrative systems, trained staff, professional development programs, and reputations which have allowed them to maintain and increase their share of the training market in the current competitive tendering environment within which the WELL Program operates. At the same time, they recognise the need to adjust some of their structures to this environment in order to maintain their competitiveness.

The range of government providers varies considerably from state to state, depending in part on the degree of reform of the structures of these systems.

In Victoria and Queensland, many independent TAFE colleges have developed workplace literacy units which each provide literacy training for several enterprises. In Victoria, in 1994, Dandenong College of TAFE provided training in 27 enterprises and Northern Metropolitan College of TAFE provided training 13 worksites, while AMES Vic provided English language and literacy training for 28 enterprises. In Qld, South Burnett College of TAFE, Mt Isa College of TAFE, Ipswich College of TAFE and Gold Coast Institute of TAFE all provided training in three or four worksites in 1994. The range of government providers in Vic and Qld contrasts with NSW where between 1992 and 1994, NSW AMES was the largest government provider, eg. in 1994, AMES provided English language and literacy training for 116 enterprises.

4.4.2 Range of industries

The WELL Program has reached a broad range of industries in the three years of its operation. Figure 11 shows the range and number in each industry from the sample.

In 1993 and 1994, priority industries were targeted by the WELL Program. This policy promoted the support of English language and literacy training in industries where it had been identified that significant English language and literacy training would be needed to facilitate training for workplace and industry reform. The policy however tended to reduce the access to training of the WELL target group in industries which were not WELL priorities. For this reason, there were no particular industries given priority in the 1995 WELL Program guidelines. Figure 11 describes the range of industries in which projects in the sample were conducted.
4.4.3 Range of business sizes

In the desk audit sample, there was a fairly even representation of enterprises with fewer than 100 employees and of enterprises with between 100 and 200 employees. There were slightly more enterprises with more than 200 employees.

Some larger organisations, especially in the Building and Construction Industry and Road Transport Industry, share characteristics of small businesses such as small scattered work sites and a largely self-employed workforce. They need to be considered as small businesses, requiring the same flexibly delivered training which typifies small business training needs.
The following diagram shows the relative sizes of businesses represented in the sample.

![Bar chart showing the range of business sizes in the sample.]

**Figure 12: Range of Business Sizes in the Sample**

4.4.4 **Proportion of metropolitan and non-metropolitan businesses participating in the WELL Program**

Of the 113 worksites where training was delivered in the sample of projects examined, 90 were in metropolitan and 23 were in non-metropolitan locations. In some cases, program contractors based in metropolitan areas provided training in non-metropolitan worksites.

![Pie chart showing the proportion of metropolitan and non-metropolitan worksites.]

**Figure 13: Metropolitan and Non-metropolitan Worksites in the Sample**

Of the complete set of WELL Program contractors in 1994, Queensland had the most decentralised delivery pattern with seventeen out of twenty seven program contractors located outside the Brisbane metropolitan area.

There was considerable marketing of the WELL Program during 1994 to non-metropolitan areas of NSW through the NSW Government Language, Literacy and
Numeracy Skills Taskforce. Regional seminars were held in Newcastle, Lismore and Wagga. These seminars were set up to inform industry in regional NSW through a case study approach, of the benefits of English language and literacy training in the reform process and to provide information on the WELL Program. Applications from regional enterprises and training providers increased significantly for the 1995 WELL funding round as a result of this promotional activity. In fact, the distribution of projects for the 1995 major funding round in New South Wales is approximately 50% non-metropolitan and 50% metropolitan. The percentage of non-metropolitan projects is significantly higher than the 1994 round.

Figure 14 shows the types of program contractors in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas from the sample. (The sample only included projects from 1992 -1994.) Most of the projects in the sample were metropolitan and of those most were provided by government providers. Private providers and government providers have an equal representation as providers in non-metropolitan projects.

Figure 14: Program Contractor by Location from the Sample

4.5 Variety of training provision

4.5.1 Linkages between ESL and literacy provision

The Australian Language and Literacy Policy 1991, states as one of its key directions, the establishment of 'links between ESL and general English language and literacy programs to allow teachers and programs to address the same English language and literacy goals in the most efficient manner.' (1991: p.59). These links are critical in the context of award restructuring in the workplace.

The WELL Program Guidelines for 1995, state that:
workplaces, which have workers requiring only one or other of literacy or ESL training assistance will be eligible for assistance. However, applications must demonstrate that the needs of all eligible workers within the workplace have been considered as equal access for all workers in a workplace is an important consideration in funding decisions made under the WELL Program. (6.2)

Linking ESL and literacy training in the workplace context is a key direction of the WELL Program not only for purposes of access, equity and efficiency, but also in order to position workplace English language and literacy training within the national training reform agenda. Competency based training, a major feature of training reform looks at outcomes rather than processes. Workers, regardless of prior learning, need to reach the same outcomes, if these outcomes are the focus of workplace training. In certain instances, there will be pedagogical and methodological considerations requiring the separation of groups of workers into ESL and literacy training categories in order to reach these outcomes. Recent research, The Pedagogical Relations between Adult ESL and Adult Literacy, (Hammond et al. 1992) has documented major issues in this field.

Figure 15 indicates the extent to which this linkage has occurred in the sample of projects analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of WELL projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL/Lit Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/Lit Linked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: ESL and Literacy Training Distribution in the Sample

Over the three years of the WELL Program's operation, Industry Training Advisory Boards, unions and some providers have readily embraced the model of linking ESL with literacy training. However, some providers have maintained the separation of ESL and literacy training. In the sample analysed, the majority of projects provided either ESL or literacy training rather than a linked program. Of these projects, most were projects in which providers were the program contractors.

There are several possible explanations for the less extensive use of the model linking ESL and literacy provision among providers than among Industry Training Advisory Boards and unions.
These include:

- the traditional separation of ESL and Adult Basic Education (ABE) departments within the organisational and administrative infrastructure of larger providers,
- the theoretical specialisation in ESL or literacy provision among providers,
- pedagogical considerations among providers about the merit of linking ESL and literacy training in particular instances,
- the readiness and expertise of providers to link ESL and literacy training,
- a greater understanding of the national training reform agenda and workplace needs by Industry Training Advisory Bodies and unions.

Another consideration applying to all parties is the requirement in the WELL Program application form for applicants to separate requests for funding for ESL and literacy training, and to estimate the numbers of participants who would be targeted for literacy and/or ESL training in their applications. The separate data was required for reporting against the two programs which have been joined to form the WELL Program. Comments collected in the phone survey indicate that the statement regarding linkage of ESL and literacy in the Program Guidelines and the way in which the statistical requirements of the Program have been described was contradictory and caused confusion during the application process.

It is possible that prospective program contractors would interpret the requirement to describe ESL and literacy training activities separately as a requirement to provide separate training.

### 4.5.2 Advantages and disadvantages of linking ESL and literacy training

Both workplace personnel and educators surveyed indicated that one of the advantages of linking ESL and literacy training provision was that it didn’t single out non-English speaking background employees and it minimised division, cultural misunderstandings and racism in the workplace. It, in fact, created goodwill and understanding. Both groups said the separation of ESL and literacy was not necessary when working towards common worker needs and mainstream outcomes.

Educators expressed pedagogical advantages to separate ESL training in some situations such as the two which follow. If English language skills are low, separate ESL training is required. In the teaching of numeracy there are advantages to separation also, since frequently NESB trainees already have the mathematical concepts in their first language. The general opinion was that the focus needs to be on individual training needs rather than on employee differences.

Informants from all survey populations made comments about teachers’ experience and expertise across the two fields of ESL and literacy more frequently than about the value of linking ESL and literacy training. The need for adequate professional development to meet this challenge was the major concern.
Among the projects in the sample, there is a strong relationship between the degree to which English language and literacy training has been integrated with enterprise goals and mainstream training, and the degree to which ESL and literacy training have been linked with each other.

4.5.3 Integration of ESL and literacy with enterprise goals and industry training

The WELL Program Guidelines state that an eligible workplace training activity is one which integrates literacy and ESL provision with workplace and accredited competency-based industry training programs.

The desk audit sought to find out to what extent workplace English language and literacy training projects were integrating with workplace and accredited competency-based industry training programs, and to what extent they were 'stand-alone' projects with general aims. Projects were categorised as stand-alone projects with general aims if they were not linked into some initiative, not necessarily a training initiative, already taking place in that workplace.

Figure 16 and 17 show the relative percentages of workplace English language and literacy training activities from the desk audit sample which were integrated with enterprise objectives or with industry endorsed training and those which were stand-alone projects in the first year of the program 1992 compared with the percentage in the third year of the program.

Between 1992 and 1994 there has been an increase in the number of workplace English language and literacy training activities which are integrating English language and literacy training with enterprise or industry training objectives, even though there is still a relatively high number of projects which have general aims.

The high number of projects which are providing English language and literacy training with general aims may be explained in two ways:
- the number of new providers in the field and the resulting lack of experience in workplace English language and literacy research and curriculum design, training and assessment,

- the number of new enterprises each year introducing English language and literacy training for the first time which are testing the waters with their workforce and with their own expertise in managing such a project.

Language and literacy projects with general aims are a legitimate and an on-going feature of the WELL Program for these reasons.

A discussion of the range of enterprise initiatives and industry endorsed training activities, and the different ways in which English language and literacy training has been integrated with these activities follows in Section 5.

Both workplace personnel and educators commented on the value of an English language and literacy training approach which is not sitting apart from the company training. One training participant surveyed was unable to answer questions relating to English language and literacy because the training had been so closely aligned with in-house training that he was not aware he was involved in English language and literacy training.

### 4.5.4 Training and resource development

Over the first three years, the majority of applications funded by the WELL Program were for training but it has also funded several strategic resource development projects which have broad industry application, as well as projects which seek to both develop resources and provide training.

Figures 18 and 18a. show the breakdown of projects from the desk audit sample.

![Figure 18: Types of Projects](image-url)
The value of resource development at enterprise level has met with diverse response among participants in the phone survey. A summary of their opinion is presented here.

On the one hand, informants expressed the view that for resources to be really useful, they needed to be highly customised. As a result, they were not readily transferable to other contexts because the information in them is too confidential to that enterprise's commercial activity, and too specific. Other informants held the opposite view that resources are, by their nature, models from which transfer to another context, including the contexts of other industries, can take place. Carefully planned resource development is regarded as a key strategy in adopting more learner centred and flexible training delivery modes by informants.

This view is supported in the WELL Program Guidelines (5.3) which state that national and state/territory resource development activities are eligible activities which, among other functions:

- contribute to the development of cost effective delivery modes, and ESL and literacy training methodologies,
- have occupation or industry-wide application,
- develop curricula, strategies and training materials which integrate literacy and/or ESL skills development with accredited industry training programs,
- disseminate best practice in workplace literacy and ESL curriculum, training, assessment, audit and reporting methods.

WELL funded resource development activities usually have a broad industry focus. A discussion of WELL funded resource development projects occurs in Section 5.4.
4.5.5 Training delivery modes

Flexible training delivery is a feature of competency based training and the national training reform agenda, and is, in restructured workplaces, an important option due to production demands and smaller levels of staffing.

Among WELL funded projects, there is only a small percentage of projects which describe a flexible delivery mode for training. In the WELL Program Guidelines, the development of flexible delivery modes is described as a resource development activity rather than a workplace training activity.

The current application process does not encourage a full description of flexibly delivered training. The current means for calculating unit cost is based on a group of learners undertaking training at the same time, and current reporting requirements stress numbers of training recipients. More flexibly delivered training, such as Open Learning Centres or one-to-one training, will result in a higher cost and possibly fewer numbers of courses and training recipients. While the WELL Guidelines are broad and invite innovation, encouraging the development of cost effective delivery modes as resource development activity, flexible delivery is not actively promoted as a preferred mode of training delivery.

![Figure 19: Training Delivery Modes in the Sample](image)

There are several projects which have delivered training in a range of delivery modes, all of which are addressing specific workplace constraints:

- peer tutoring, a resource development kit, Moorabbin College of TAFE Vic; Email Ltd Vic, Swinburne University of Technology, Vic.;
- open learning centre within enterprises Carlton and United Breweries, NSW; Holden’s Engine Company Vic; Alcan, NSW;
- on-the-job tutoring ICI Dulux NSW; Alcatel NSW;
- one to one tutoring, Nestlé NSW;
- distance learning NSW AMES.
5. Findings of the review: nature of WELL projects

5.1 Training models

5.1.1 Training models integrating with industry training

WELL projects have integrated with industry training and in several different ways depending on the industry. In some cases, these have been industry endorsed competency based credentials and in others, trade licences and union training. Twenty percent of enterprises in the sample were running projects linked to one of the following forms of industry training:

- competency-based training endorsed by industry
  - Engineering Production Certificate,
  - National Certificate in Food Processing,
  - Vehicle Industry Certificate,
  - Certificate in Food and Domestic Service Operation,
  - Operative Certificate in Chemical Plant Skills,
  - Chemical Operators Certificate,
  - Training modules within National Building and Construction Industry Training Framework.

- training for trade licences
  - Unrestricted A Class Electrical Mechanic’s Licence,
  - Forklift driver’s licence,
  - Crane Chaser’s Licence

- union training

Nature of the integration of English language and literacy training with industry training

The integration of English language and literacy training with industry training is a major research field in the broader English language and literacy training context. An example of current research being undertaken by NSW TAFE Commission is the Australian Language and Literacy National Project, *Development of Strategic Framework for the Investigation, Evaluation and Development of Models of Integration of Language, Literacy and Numeracy Provision into Vocational Education and Training Programs.*

There are two main ways in which English language and literacy is currently being integrated with industry training in the WELL Program. One model seeks to fully integrate English language and literacy within an appropriate training model without describing any explicit English language and literacy outcomes. The other model seeks to make explicit the English language and literacy competencies required to achieve
mainstream competencies, and to describe them as separate outcomes. Both models have the same purpose of providing training for the WELL target group in a fair, equitable and effective way and of promoting access to other mainstream opportunities where possible.

There are currently more industry endorsed competency based certificates in Victoria than in the other states, so that integration of English language and literacy training with these certificates is concentrated there, whilst integration with trade licences is more widespread.

Integrated training model 1

*Integration with competency-based training endorsed by industry where separate English language and literacy competencies are not expressed - The National Automotive Industry Training Board Model.*

Integration in the Automotive industry is based on the view adopted by the National Automotive Industry Training Board that it is not desirable to express separate English language and literacy competencies (or elements of competencies) in its industry standards for the following reasons:

- that separate English language and literacy standards may create barriers to successful participation in the Vehicle Industry Certificate by establishing a mandatory requirement for particular English language and literacy skills at each level,

- that stating minimal levels for English language and literacy skills may have a reductionist effect on the teaching of these skills by limiting it to the completion of tasks such as ‘is able to complete a simple form’,

- that placing English language and literacy hurdles in levels of the VIC may devalue evidence of thinking skills and understanding of content simply because they are not expressed in standardised form of English as specified in English language and literacy competencies.

The model ‘was prefaced on the idea that the particular English language and literacy of each plant or workplace (in which the Vehicle Industry Certificate is to be applied), could be used to develop the training curriculum’.

The model is a people-centred one, and holds that the most valuable resource for supporting the learning process in a workplace is people, not books, videos, curriculum packages and training kits. It supports peer tutoring and group learning delivery modes as promoting effective interaction, networking and group work which are the basis for the processes of workplace reform.
In this model, English language and literacy teachers are accredited trainers of the Vehicle Industry Certificate.

This model is part of the National Automotive Industry Training Board WELL national project which received $1,557,550 to develop and implement training in the vehicle industry over the three years in which it was funded.

The majority of educators consulted from the field in this review who commented on the nature of integration expressed concerns about Integrated Model 1.

These concerns are summarised below:

- the model, in integrating English language and literacy skills training in an implicit way leaves workers vulnerable to not achieving English language and literacy skills development which will enable them to meet the demands of their future employment and training needs, particularly in the context of award restructuring and workplace reform,
- the model is dependent on the particular context and particular skills of the resource people involved and may not be readily transferable to another industry, without considerable resourcing,
- the model does not promote independent or flexible learning delivery modes which are not resourced by people.

**Integrated training model 2**

Integration with competency-based training endorsed by industry with explicit English language and literacy competencies expressed.

While it is not as well documented nor as systematically implemented from a national level as the Automobile Industry model, this model is the more common model of integration in the WELL Program. It looks for two types of outcomes - English language and literacy outcomes as well as mainstream training outcomes. It is based on the notion that English language and literacy competency needs to be explicitly described and taught in order to advance participants' English language and literacy skills in the context of mainstream training. It works within the mainstream training environment accepting that training often takes place in a training room dependent on the abstract written word of training materials and the spoken language of training.

Typical approaches in this model are team teaching between ESL and literacy teachers and mainstream trainers, actual delivery of core modules by ESL and literacy teachers and support training. There is usually a dual outcome, so that a language and literacy accreditation such as modules of the Certificate in General Education are achieved as well as the accredited mainstream module. Teachers are accredited trainers for these certificates. Two examples of this model, which are summarised in Appendix 6 are the Construction, Forestry, Mining and Engineering Union Project undertaken in 1994 in Victoria and the Automotive Manufacturing and Engineering Union Project, undertaken by AMES Vic in 1994.
5.1.2 Training models integrating with enterprise goals

English language and literacy is being integrated closely with specific enterprise objectives, which are not part of an industry endorsed competency based credential in a number of projects. Some of the range of enterprise activity with which English language and literacy training is integrated are outlined below. This model was used in fifteen percent of enterprises sampled. Examples of this model are described in Appendix 7.

- Total Quality Management and Assurance process and training.
- Occupation Health and Safety training, including enterprise based training for codes of practice such as Manual Handling and Dangerous Goods and Hazardous Chemicals training.
- Participative work practices training such as team skills, problem solving skills, meeting skills training.
- Enterprise specific skills training - eg. Civil Works Crew.
- Documentation skills training - preparing standard operating procedures, manuals, reports, plans, flow charts.
- Negotiation of enterprise agreements.
- Skills matrix, classification modules and career pathways training.

5.1.3 Stand-alone training models

The most common training objective put forward in WELL submissions sampled was that of English language and literacy development to improve communication at work. These objectives were not usually tied closely to any specific organisational objective or training.

These projects are often undertaken when an enterprise first introduces English language and literacy training and is testing for acceptance amongst its personnel.

Almost half of the enterprises which were examined were running this model of training. Some of these models can be very successful and lead to more integrated training at a later date. Others can fail through lack of obvious outcomes within the workplace, lack of commitment from key staff and a range of other reasons. Stand-alone training projects are more vulnerable than integrated projects when things go wrong in the workplace. Two examples of stand-alone models are attached in
Appendix 8. These examples are not examples of best practice, but rather examples of vulnerable stand-alone English language and literacy programs.

5.2 Flexible delivery to meet needs of small and isolated business

Various flexible delivery schemes are operating within larger provider projects in several states as outlined in Section 4.5.5. These types of schemes address some of the training needs of and constraints on small and isolated businesses such as small numbers of employees requiring training, shifts, as well as those of larger enterprises. There are several current WELL projects specifically addressing these and other needs of small business, in a range of different ways.

One of these projects is a strategic response at industry level to the needs of small, isolated businesses in rural areas. It is part of a National Project being undertaken by the National Food Industry Training Council Ltd. This strategy aims to reduce the effects of isolation experienced by many rural industries by providing them with greater access to information, to training and to physical resources, by developing networks linking business, training providers and government agencies. It does this by building on existing regional networks or facilitating the development of other networks which aim to promote English language, literacy and numeracy awareness and training and to provide a structure for assistance. Murray-Riverina Food Industry Advisory Group has developed this small business strategy called Networking in the Albury Wodonga district for the National Food Industry Training Council Ltd. This model is currently being adapted for ACT and for NT in the new year.

Some successful small business strategies operating at state project level which have innovatively addressed the needs of small and isolated businesses are:

- WELL on Wheels, 1994, a small business project for the domestic sector of the building industry. The program contractor is Southbank Institute of TAFE Qld, 1994.

- Small Business Strategies, 1994 a response to small business needs across industries. The program contractor is NSW AMES.

- SA State Strategy for the effective delivery of workplace education to small businesses, funded in 1994. The program contractor was Workplace Education Services, South Australia.

Descriptions of two of these projects are attached in Appendix 9.

5.3 Reaching the WELL target group through indirect means

The requirement to provide both cross cultural and English language and literacy awareness raising training as part of the WELL project is a demonstration of the WELL Program’s strategic aim to impact on the communication systems of the whole enterprise. There is evidence in more recent projects of other strategic activities which
promote this objective. Projects which train trainers to be aware of English language and literacy issues in their training, and which provide plain English advice and guidance in enterprises as well as rewriting documentation are two forms of these indirect ways of reaching the WELL target group. The direct recipients of the training in these projects may have English language and literacy skills above the designated ASLPR or ALAN scale cut off point for WELL funded training, but they are able to affect a broad range of workers in their enterprise who require English language and literacy skills development. There are several possible outcomes to be achieved through this approach such as contribution to the development of a training culture in the enterprise and promotion of ownership by the enterprise of effective communication systems.

Some of the enterprises in which indirect training delivery, such as Train the Trainer and plain English, is being implemented by a range of program contractors are:

**NSW**  
Ajax Spurways Fasteners through NSW TAFE; Sydney Electricity, Selleys, CCA, and ICI Pharmaceuticals, through NSW AMES.

**ACT**  
Woden Valley Hospital through Canberra Institute of Technology.

**Qld**  
Containers Packaging through Southbank Institute of TAFE; Northpoint College of TAFE in food enterprise.

**Tas**  
Northern Region Staff Development Services Department of Health.

**Vic**  
AMEU-Vehicle Division, CFMEU - Construction Division Council of Adult Education in food enterprise.

A brief description of the project at Containers Packaging Qld, 1994 is attached as Appendix 10.

### 5.4 Resource development activities

As stated in 4.5.4, the issue of resource development met with mixed opinions from educators and workplace personnel surveyed.

Concern was expressed by a workplace representative interviewed that developing training packages as resources was not cost effective since specific needs were so different across enterprises. A resources package already developed, *Literacy in the Workplace: an integrated literacy curriculum for the metals industry* was cited as too generic to be very useful at the specific enterprise level for which they were developed.
It is acknowledged that the requirement to promote flexibly delivered training necessitates strategic resource development. Another person surveyed representing an Industry Training Advisory Board viewed resource development as an important feature of a seed funding program such as the WELL Program. The challenge is to balance these considerations with the requirement to customise training for specific contexts. The current WELL Program approach is to generally fund resource development projects which have occupation or industry-wide applications.

Resources with Industry Applications

| Program Contractor: | Swinburne University of Technology |

| Program Contractor: | NSW AMES |
| Resource: | A set of modules of common workplace writing tasks for operators with non-specific industry focus for use in distance learning mode. |

| Program Contractor: | Holmsglen College of TAFE |
| Resource: | I CAN DO THAT Refresher course for the Plastics and Chemical Industry-reading and writing print-based materials with audio tapes. |

5.5 National projects

The WELL Program’s National Projects are large strategic projects funded through or endorsed by Industry Training Advisory Boards to link English language and literacy training with training plans at industry level. They are intended to facilitate the development of national English language and literacy strategies for industry. They are intended to leave some lasting impact on the industry.

Through these projects the WELL Program has been able to influence the way English language and literacy is positioned within the industry. The four industries in which National Projects were undertaken between 1992 and 1994 were, the Automotive Industry, the Food Processing Industry, the Textile, Clothing and Footwear Industry and the Building and Construction Industry. These projects were all managed by the representative Industry Training Advisory Board.

National Automotive Industry Training Board (NAITB)

The NAITB received $1,557,550 in funds from the WELL Program between 1992 and 1994. The following is a summary of the objectives and outcomes of this project.
Objectives of the project

- To meet the literacy numeracy and English needs of its non trades employees through innovative provision of the Vehicle Industry Certificate.

Outcomes of the project

- Establishment of National Automotive Language and Literacy Coordination Unit (NALLCU) to facilitate integration of English language and literacy into the Industry Training Plan.
- Staffing of NALLCU.
- Substantial training for and completion of Vehicle Industry Certificate amongst workers in the industry with English language and literacy needs.
- Report on action research project, entitled *Breathing Life into Training, a Model of Integrated Training*.
- Development of training resources, *Numeracy on the Line* and *Warehousing Elective*.
- Increased uptake of English language and literacy training in the industry.

National Food Industry Training Council (NFITC)

The NFITC received $530,000 in WELL funds between 1992 and 1994. A summary of the objectives and outcomes of this project follows.

Objectives of the project

- Develop national communication strategy for the food industry.
- Research and document best practice.
- Survey industry nationally to identify English language levels.
- Coordinate English language literacy and numeracy activities in the industry.
- Determine English language and literacy and numeracy competencies appropriate to industry classification levels.

Outcomes of the project

- Appointment of English language and literacy officer to oversee projects.
- Resource Development - three reports, from Qld, W.A. and N.S.W. documenting best practice in the setting up and provision of English language and literacy training in the food industry.
- *Fine Food*, describing five different approaches to training from examples in the food industry.

• Research into the industry which was then documented in a report entitled *Communication and Training, Research in the Australian Food, Beverage and Tobacco Industry*.

• Food Industry Literacy link - *Networking*, for small and isolated business.

• Guidelines for assessment practice in the food industry entitled *Assessment of Communication Practices - Principles and Guidelines*.

• Increased links with the Food Industry Language and Literacy Initiative Program.

**Australian Textile Clothing and Footwear Industry Training Board (ATCFITB)**

The ATCFITB received $467,540 from the WELL Program to promote English language and literacy training within the industry between 1993 and 1994.

**Objectives of the project**

• Research the TCF industries.

• Promote and coordinate English language and literacy training.

• Promote best use of English language and literacy training resources.

**Outcomes of the project**

The project has:

• appointed of national TCF Language and Literacy Coordinator and two part-time state coordinators to manage the promotion and provision of English language and literacy training in the industry, and oversee the production of strategic resources,

• produced industry specific resources such as the resource package entitled, *Communicating in the TCF Industry*, which is in three parts:

  - *Tips for Trainers*, which is designed to help trainers to make their own training materials more accessible to trainees with English language and literacy needs,

  - *Company Collections*, resource collection of print materials used in a range of TCF companies and tips on how to use them as training materials,

  - *Who to talk to*, a state by state list of contacts in the English language and literacy training field for TCF industry personnel.

• model of good practice in needs analysis entitled *Communicating at Supertex, from needs analysis to training strategy*.
achieved significant increase in number of applications for WELL funds from enterprises within the TCF industries in 1995, which may indicate increased awareness.

National Building and Construction Industry Training Council Ltd (NBCITC)

The NBCITC has received $172,000 from the WELL Program between 1993 and 1994 to develop an English language and literacy strategy within the industry.

Objectives of the project

- The development of a long-term strategy for the Building and Construction industry to increase the English language and literacy skills of its workers.
- To review workplace industry endorsed competency assessment materials to make them more accessible to readers.

Future WELL National Projects

Six WELL National Projects have been funded thus far for 1995:

- National Food Industry Training Council,
- Australian Textile Clothing and Footwear Industry Training Board,
- National Building and Construction Industry Training Council,
- Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union,
- Meat Industry Training Advisory Council,
- Tourism Training Australia.

The major impact of the National Projects is in the positioning of English language and literacy within the particular industry’s training plan, their influence on smaller projects in those industries and liaison across industries. Liaison across industries has been facilitated through the funding of project officers whose role is to act as advocates of English language and literacy with enterprises, to network both within and across industries and to coordinate strategic resource development within the industry.

6. Findings of the review: the impact of the WELL Program within enterprises

The WELL Program has required that English language and literacy gains achieved through training be measured according to the Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating (ALSPR) or the Australian Literacy and Numeracy (ALAN) scales. These scales can be used to group trainees, after assessment, for training purposes. However, they do not describe the nature of English language and literacy gains in context nor do they monitor the impact of English language and literacy training on enterprises. These scales have been the only mechanism in place to systematically capture data on English language and literacy gains within the WELL Program.
The review attempted to capture some sense of the impact of WELL projects on workplaces through several questions in the phone survey which were grouped within the following two categories:

- specific benefits for all parties involved at enterprise level with the project - the workplace personnel including the course participants and the educators,
- the impact on operational and organisational systems within the enterprise.

### 6.1 Specific benefits for all parties of WELL projects at enterprise level

#### 6.1.1 Outcomes for participants

Amongst the informants in the phone survey, there was little evidence of any formal measures in place within enterprises to collect data relating to any outcomes for employees participating in the WELL project. However, when questioned regarding outcomes, the following fields are the most common ones in which employers, course participants and educators indicated outcomes:

- achievement of a credential,
- increased confidence and orientation to work,
- improved participation at work,
- career pathways.

Most of the outcomes put forward are outcomes associated with performance at work rather than with improved English language and literacy skills. A comment made by a group of workplace personnel interviewed together that ‘the outcomes for workers and workplaces of English language and literacy training are more far reaching than simply achieving career paths or credentials’ was echoed by others from all three groups several times over. Workplace personnel listed non-measurable gains which have an indirect effect on performance such as increased confidence most frequently as an outcome of English language and literacy training. Increased confidence was highly regarded by workplace personnel as an important gain because they saw it as the linchpin to successful participation in reform.

### Achievement of industry level credentials

Many informants gave examples of the achievement of industry level credentials as a result of English language and literacy training, especially training which was integrated with these credentials.
Some examples of these are:

- achievement of the Vehicle Industry Certificate through the National Automotive Industry Training Board,

- achievement of generic modules such as OH&S, Health and Sanitation, Industrial Communications from the Certificate in Food Processing and the Engineering Production Certificate, Certificate in Brewing Operations,

- achievement of modules of training based on the Building and Construction Industry standards and the Building Inspectoral Certificate,

- achievement of Statements of Competency of specific and customised modules of English language and literacy skills training from Certificate in General Education, Certificate in Spoken and Written English and English in the Workplace Competency Framework,

- achievement of Forklift Drivers, Crane Chaser and Dogmen tickets.

Successful participation in enterprise based training such as base frontline supervisors program at Woden Valley Hospital, in First Aid training, manual handling training, team training and quality assurance training were seen as outcomes of English language and literacy training.

**Increased confidence and orientation to work**

Whilst it was recognised that increased confidence is difficult to measure, it was claimed as the most important outcome and it was also the most frequently cited outcome for participants, by all three groups in the survey - enterprise personnel, educators and participants.

Enterprise personnel cited increased confidence as an essential element in achieving better skills formation and performance at work because it leads to enhanced participation in training, interaction with management, and commitment. It led to seeking more information about workplace reform and more communication.

**Participation at work**

Greater participation in work was cited as the second most common outcome of the WELL project for course participants. Participation manifested itself as participation in an enterprise based climate survey operating in the hospitality industry; membership of an Occupational Health and Safety Committee; participation in workplace Communication Sessions; self selection as EEO Contact Officer; writing competencies for own work area; documenting procedures relating to own machine and membership of workplace Consultative Committee.
Career pathways

In one enterprise in the hospitality industry, five people moved from housekeeping positions to front of house jobs as a result of participation in the WELL project over eighteen months. In another manufacturing company in the food industry, 'quite a few' people from the warehouse had moved to the sales area, a move which the company personnel say was helped by the WELL Program. One employee in another enterprise has been accepted into an Accelerated Apprenticeship training program and several others are acting in higher grades. One employee has gone to do the Higher School Certificate at TAFE. Some have given Total Quality presentations as a result of their involvement with English language and literacy training. There were pay increases for multi-skilling, up-skilling and cross-skilling on the skills matrix in another company as a result of the English language and literacy training program.

There is no systematic data collection of these observations of the relationships between English language and literacy training through the WELL Program and outcomes for participants within enterprises. Recommendations to collect this data systematically follow in section 8.

6.1.2 Outcomes for other project personnel

Workplace personnel and educators were asked about benefits to themselves through involvement in the WELL Program. Their answers fell within a narrow range of fields mostly associated with contextual knowledge of each other's subject area.

Outcomes for workplace personnel

Some of the comments workplace personnel made are:

- 'I see the connections between English language and literacy and introducing reform'.
- 'I now understand that English language and literacy training is a longterm process'.
- 'I am able to talk with and understand NESB staff better'.

These statements from workplace personnel highlight the need for English language and literacy awareness raising training which the WELL Program promotes.

Outcomes for educators

A recurring theme from educators was an improved understanding of the industrial context. Some said they were more aware of issues and the constraints of their own systems. Others valued the professional development in areas such as negotiation skills, accountability and consultation. Many claimed employment opportunities and
career pathways for themselves as educators as some of the benefits of working in the WELL Program.

The positive impact of the different work cultures, attitudes and values systems of these two survey groups upon each other is an important outcome of the Program.

6.2 The impact of the WELL Program on the change process at enterprise level

The WELL Program, by introducing into workplaces integrated English language and literacy training to enable workers to meet the demands of their current employment and their future employment and training needs, in the context of award restructuring and workplace reform, has, in fact, been a catalyst for furthering the reform process in many enterprises. This outcome was a view expressed by survey personnel from both workplace and provider groups.

Coming into existence within the context of the national training reform agenda and targeting the group most at risk in the restructuring process, it has been able to promote reform from the operator level up through the workforce, in a way that other training and procedural initiatives have not been able to.

Workplace reform has been facilitated by the development of a training/learning culture and of a willingness to question communication practices within enterprises. These are two key outcomes identified by all groups in the survey.

Eighty three percent of the total survey group said the WELL Program had played a role in facilitating reform in the enterprise, either through helping people to understand the process or by helping people to participate in it. Comments such as ‘the climate was already there’ and ‘WELL is just supporting the training reform agenda’ are indicative of the timeliness of the Program in these enterprises.

6.2.1 Changes to communication practices: the WELL Program as a catalyst for other English language and literacy programs

A culture of shared responsibility for good communication practices is emerging in some enterprises. Ninety percent of respondents said that the WELL project has influenced communication practices in their workplace, mainly through an increased awareness of plain English. Some of their comments are:

*The WELL project in the enterprise has made managers and supervisors aware of the importance of communication and ‘plain English’ documentation.*

*The WELL project has influenced the style of training delivered in the enterprise. There is more account taken of the needs of workers with poor language and literacy skills.*
Language and literacy will be on the agenda from now on.

Several companies have paid in full for the development of plain English documentation, for the rewriting of manuals and standard operating procedures as well as for courses to train workplace trainers in English language and literacy skills awareness and training methodologies, as a result of their WELL projects.

Sydney Electricity is an example of an enterprise which introduced a full cost communication practices development program alongside its WELL project in 1994. The program involves Train the Trainers courses and the redesign of current examinations and procedures. Ajax Spurways Fasteners made communication practices development one of the key features of their WELL project at Marrickville.

6.2.2 Increased commitment to training

Eighty one percent of surveyed personnel said there was a greater value placed on training in general as a result of English language and literacy training in the enterprise. This opinion was shared by workplace personnel and educators alike.

Both managers, supervisors and operators had become more committed to training, and as a result, companies were becoming more aware of internal training needs. Language and literacy teachers in several enterprises were routinely meeting with trainers and human resources personnel. This had helped management to understand the nature and extent of the English language and literacy problem in their enterprises.

There was a growing commitment to the belief that language and literacy should be part of general training amongst those surveyed.

The WELL Project has helped to instil the notion of a co-ordinated approach to training.

Now there is integrated planning for mainstream and language and literacy training.

WELL Program has changed the view of what language and literacy is in the workplace.

The Company is developing a communication strategy linked to Total Quality Management (TQM).

Four workplace personnel said that as a result of the WELL project in their workplace, they planned to develop or were in the process of developing a training plan which incorporated English language and literacy training.

In some cases, there was already a well developed training culture within the company. Some of the comments made by respondents were:
The company had a meeting with course participants to get their input for a training plan.

The company would like to appoint a training coordinator as a result of having an enterprise based teacher.

Workers' attitude to training has improved.

Workplace personnel and educators were asked whether they thought the WELL funded project would have a lasting impact on their organisation after the funding stopped. Seventy five percent answered positively. They attributed this impact mainly to three features of the program. These were the contribution that English language and literacy training is making to better communication practices, the contribution it is making to the development of a training culture in enterprises and the effect it is having on operator level attitudes to training in particular, and to reform in general.

6.2.3 Encouragement of links between training providers, enterprises and industries

Responses were sought from survey personnel and during the consultations to determine whether there had been any significant networking between enterprises and training providers or across industries as a result of the WELL Program.

One of the outcomes mentioned by the survey groups was that the tripartite agreement required for WELL Program projects had required enterprises to consult extensively with different training providers in order to submit an application for funds and equally, had required training providers to consult with a wide number of enterprises. Consultation of this nature raised awareness of the different contexts in which each party worked.

In some cases, enterprises had consulted with each other within and across industries on non-competitive matters, including the selection of training providers.

The role of the National Literacy Coordinators working through Industry Training Advisory Bodies as part of WELL National Projects has been, in part, one of consultation across industries to look at best practice in the promotion and provision of workplace English language and literacy training. Regular meetings of the coordinators take place to further these ends.

6.2.4 Industry commitment to English language and literacy training - the industry contribution

The level of WELL funding to enterprises was generally considered to be adequate among those who participated in the phone survey, with many program contractors stating that their project had received enough funds for the current year in which they were funded.
Enterprises make a significant contribution in kind to English language and literacy training projects through the provision of training venues on site and the release and payment of workers.

Of the 92 records in the survey of enterprises indicating industry contribution to the costs of the English language and literacy training project, 87 enterprises made a contribution of 25% of costs over and above the costs of providing venue and release of workers. The other four enterprises contributed between 19% and 33%.

In 1994, all enterprises participating within the AMES NSW project contributed between 25% and 50%. Fifty nine enterprises contributed between 33% and 35%, fourteen enterprises contributed between 40% and 45% and twelve contributed 50%. The remainder contributed 25%. TAFE NSW, AMES NSW and AMES Vic all requested higher contributions from enterprises in the 1995 funding round.

The WELL Program has been responsible for establishing the view in several enterprises that English language and literacy training is a significant contributor to the success of their reform process. This is evidenced by the fact that several companies which introduced and maintained English language and literacy programs with WELL funds for two or more years, have paid full costs to continue the program after missing out on or not applying for funds in the 1994 funding round. In NSW, these include Kellogg's, Carlton and United Breweries, NSW State Rail Authority and Gazelle Foods. While in Victoria, full cost paying companies in 1994 include Vic Roads, Hayman Keese Stokes and Ajax Fasteners. Qantas Flight Catering and Sydney Electricity have maintained their English language and literacy programs for 1995 without WELL funding.

Some enterprises, recognising the strategic value of English language and literacy skills development have paid full costs to run additional training alongside their WELL funded projects. As mentioned in 6.2.1, Sydney Electricity commissioned NSW AMES to provide several projects to rewrite enterprise documentation and train trainers in English language and literacy issues associated with training. These projects are in addition to WELL funded training which has taken place at Sydney Electricity in 1992, 1993 and 1994. These full cost projects are targeting personnel or activities outside the WELL guidelines. CSR Wood Products in Victoria has similarly provided 100% of the costs for English language and literacy training for personnel outside the WELL target group in 1994.

6.3 Impact of the WELL Program for all parties: professional development needs

The professional development needs emerging from the policy directions of the WELL Program such as the linking of ESL and literacy training and the integration of English language and literacy training with industry endorsed training for all parties are considerable. Workplace personnel, union and employer groups, providers and DEET staff have all commented on this area of need, during the phone survey and
consultations. There are several national research projects, current and recently completed which seek to address some of the emerging issues.

The WELL Program supports some professional development needs. Outcomes of National Projects, such as the establishment of an English language and literacy support unit in the automotive industry and the production of guides to different training methods, guides for workplace trainers and examples of best practice in WELL funded English language and literacy projects, in the food and TCF industries offer professional development assistance to all parties. Awareness raising training in enterprises for workplace personnel as part of WELL projects is an example of professional development which is built into the WELL Program.

Several providers offer extensive professional development for teaching staff in workplace English language and literacy issues. Some enterprises offer providers professional development opportunities when they are working on-site. Part-time teachers and smaller providers have fewer opportunities for professional development. This raises issues of quality assurance and workplace English language and literacy provider competency standards.

Most informants recognised professional development as a major issue in workplace English language and literacy training. Information regarding professional development gathered in the survey can be summarised into two main areas of need:

- **Knowledge of different contexts**
  - workplace trainers need to understand English language and literacy issues,
  - providers need to understand the workplace context and the major issues associated with national training reform especially competency based training.

- **Research and curriculum writing skills**
  - providers and workplace trainers both need highly developed skills in these areas to attempt to integrate English language and literacy and mainstream training,
  - networking/consultation between industry trainers and English language and literacy providers,
  - parties need opportunity for cross-fertilisation of the two fields and mutual understanding of purpose.
7. Findings of the review: effectiveness and efficiency of program administration arrangements

Information was collected from project personnel during the phone survey and from representatives of employer groups and unions, from members of the National Consultative Group and State Advisory Committees as well as from DIR, DIEA and DEET staff, regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the administrative arrangements of the WELL Program.

Questions asked in the phone survey concerned the application process and the reporting and program evaluation process of the WELL Program. Consultations focussed on the infrastructure and consultative mechanisms of the Program.

7.1 Application process

Funding for WELL Program projects is allocated following submission. Prospective applicants are provided with an information package consisting of a set of guidelines, an application form, and examples of current and past projects, resource development activities and National Projects. Application for WELL funds can be made by enterprises demonstrating ability to manage activities, representative bodies such as unions, industry training advisory bodies and employer associations and ESL and literacy providers.

The WELL Program guidelines

A very comprehensive set of guidelines outlining the WELL Program policy principles and procedures is distributed in the information package.

Survey personnel were asked to rate the WELL guidelines in terms of their clarity and comprehensiveness as good, indifferent or poor. Nearly 60% of the total population of workplace personnel and providers rated them as good, while 24% considered them to be fair and 15 % said they were poor.

However, when the survey populations were separated, only 35% of workplace personnel rated the guidelines as good, while 75% of providers rated them as good. The most common reason given by those who rated them as fair or poor was that they were written in a very bureaucratic and jargonistic style and needed to be written in a simpler, plainer English. A second common reason was that they were too long. This data item is significant for the Program which is seeking to be industry-driven and is the basis of recommendations in section 8.
The application form

Applications are made for either enterprise level training activities or more broadly based resource development activities using different sections of the same application form.

The majority of applications are for enterprise level training activities.

Prospective program contractors applying for enterprise level project funds, fill in the application form which asks them to explain the objectives, the implementation stages, expected outcomes of their projects.

They are required to provide a brief profile of the workplace and to indicate the number of employees who will be trained and their level of English proficiency according to the ASLPR or level of literacy skill according to the ALAN scales.

They are also required to separate training into either ESL training or literacy training and to state the number of hours of training and courses to be delivered.

A description of how the proposed activities relate to workplace reform and industry approved standards, a statement of workplace and industry commitment and letters of support from Industry Training Advisory Boards and relevant unions for the proposed projects are required.

Since the application form is, for many applicants, their first contact with the WELL Program, it was reviewed in some detail.

Informants were asked to rate the form in terms of ease of use and appropriateness to workplace requirements. The response was quite negative with only 27% rating the application form as good. Workplace personnel and educators responded similarly to this question. Forty two percent of those surveyed rated the application form as poor.

Responses were sought in the following categories in order to capture data on some of the issues associated with the application process:

- separation of ESL and literacy training for funding purposes,
- one year funding cycle,
- detail required about proposed participants,
- detail required about proposed program,
- opportunity to describe innovation,
- relevance of required data to program objectives and evaluation.

Evaluation of the application process

Survey personnel often found the requirement to separate ESL and literacy training 'problematic' and 'confusing' especially if they were attempting to integrate English language and literacy training with mainstream training. The separation created...
problems in reporting back. While recognising that there may be a pedagogical need to separate ESL and literacy learners, both workplace personnel and providers said it was an inappropriate separation for funding purposes. This is one of the main reasons that DEET has expended considerable funds to develop the National Reporting System for Adult English Language and Literacy Provision Project which will address English language and literacy outcomes in the same reporting mechanism.

Some workplace personnel found that the calendar year format of the WELL funding cycle inhibited adequate planning to integrate English language and literacy training with their business plans. Many providers, on the other hand, work in educational institutions which are organised around the calendar year.

There were several comments about the need for a longer funding period in order to plan more effectively from both educators and workplace personnel. They expressed concerns that there is often such a long lead in time and slow start for WELL projects due to organisational factors that there needs to be some flexibility with the timeline for enterprises.

Some informants stated that the level of detail about participants was very difficult to provide so far in advance of the project, especially in the current rapidly changing industrial environment without a need analysis. While they appreciated the DEET requirement to know numbers, they were concerned that they were only able to provide estimations which were not useful.

Similarly, many informants commented that they found it difficult and confusing to reconcile the precise and constricting details about training courses and hours required for the table summary in the application form, with the scope in the rest of the form to describe proposed innovative activity. Enterprises were able to estimate how much of their training budget in terms of hours they were able to allocate to formal English language and literacy training but said that this part of the application form ‘didn’t provide for an integrated model,’ didn’t fit with the rest of the form and ‘brought everything back to classroom training.’ There is a conflict here between the WELL Program’s objective to integrate with mainstream training and enterprise objectives, as outlined in the guidelines and confirmed in consultation with DEET personnel, and the message which the application form gives applicants regarding innovation and flexible delivery methods which might be part of this integration.

Program contractors said that in forcing their proposal to fit the application form in order to ensure competitiveness, they had not been able to fully explain their proposal. Informants said they were unable to judge whether WELL fully supported innovation or not, since the application form seemed to contradict the approach taken in the WELL guidelines.
7.2 The reporting and evaluation process

7.2.1 Reporting

The Program guidelines state that each program contractor should provide quarterly progress reports detailing activities and outcomes achieved against those planned and detailed in the submission to DEET in order to describe both the nature and progress of the project and to account for the project according to its stated objectives.

For training activities, further information such as number, by type, of new courses commenced, number, by type, of courses completed, number of workers interviewed for assessment, outcomes of workers’ assessments, numbers of workers who commenced, finished and are continuing training and outcomes achieved by workers for completed courses is required. These outcomes should be described in terms of competencies required for current and future employment and in terms of course objectives agreed between workers and providers. Aggregate data is required using the Australian Second Language Proficiency Scales (ASLPR) for workers receiving ESL training or the Australian Literacy and Numeracy Scales (ALAN) Scales for workers receiving literacy training.

The survey populations, workplace personnel and providers only, were asked to comment on the value of the following aspects of the current reporting process:

- quarterly reports,
- statistical data on courses, learners and assessments,
- reporting on ESL and literacy learners separately using ASLPR and ALAN scales and the relationship between outcomes as competencies and the ASLPR and ALAN scales.

Quarterly reports

Opinion from informants on quarterly reporting ranged from a small percentage who, recognising the accountability requirement, would not change the current process, to the majority who similarly recognising the accountability requirement found the present system inadequate for the following reasons:

- there was no standard reporting format provided by the WELL Program, and therefore it was unclear exactly what was required,
- three monthly reporting was too frequent to be able to record any worthwhile outcomes in the field of English language and literacy training,
- there was no follow-up on these progress reports from WELL Program personnel.
Several informants suggested the provision of clearer reporting guidelines and a change to six monthly progress reports which would be a more appropriate timeframe to report language and literacy outcomes. Some of their comments are:

*Standard ways of reporting would be useful - WELL should provide best practice model.*

*More guidelines and more standardisation required.*

*Need longer period (eg. six months) for reporting: outcomes in three months not good enough to report on.*

*It would be ideal if six monthly report, based on quality indicators, went to WELL.*

*Employer opinion is not systematically required nor represented in quarterly reports.*

**Statistical data on courses, learners and assessments**

The current reporting requirements are to provide data on numbers of learners, numbers of courses and numbers and results of assessment.

Informants made comments regarding the requirement to provide numerical data for reporting purposes which were similar to those regarding the requirement for numerical data in the application form. These comments hinge on the fact that the requirement for this data, in the current format, is in conflict with attempts to describe innovative programs which integrate with mainstream training, or which offer flexible delivery such as one-to-one training, open learning centres, on-the-job training or small group training. Courses are not always definable as courses, with a set length and number of participants, nor are workers always assessed in large groups, making the reporting on outcomes of these types of activities problematic within the current guidelines.

The nature and amount of numerical data required in these reports overshadows the other reporting requirements, such as the requirement to report against stated objectives.

Several respondents said that a descriptive report would be more relevant to their own needs. A descriptive report would also provide to the WELL Program useful data on the diverse activities occurring in the various projects.

Comments made include:

*Report requirements are too specific - narrative report would give more scope.*

*(In report) there is nowhere to represent things which go wrong.*

*Reports should be descriptive/informative stating aims and objectives and outcomes with less emphasis on numbers.*

*Too many details required; not enough opportunity for global comment.*
Reporting on ESL and literacy learners separately using ASLPR and ALAN scales and the relationship of these scales to competencies

Reporting separately on ESL and literacy outcomes, using the ASLPR or ALAN scales conflicts with attempts to report on outcomes or competencies achieved. The requirement to report on both presents a problem. Program contractors are increasingly working in competency based training environments, integrating English language and literacy training with this training, and attempting to integrate ESL and literacy training in the process. Some respondents strongly advocated the abandonment of the ASLPR and ALAN scales for reporting back to WELL. The nature of WELL projects requires reporting in descriptors and outcomes, which makes the separate reporting of ESL and literacy training more irrelevant. These were areas of considerable concern to the survey groups.

Some of their comments are:

*WELL needs a system to align both methods - ASLPR and CBT.*

*We need more consultation with WELL Program on reporting procedure especially regarding ASLPR.*

*Get rid of ASLPR/ALAN scales or at least make it relevant.*

*Reporting on outcomes would be more useful - for instance, quantitative data and case studies with examples of achievements.*

There are several accredited English language and literacy certificates and frameworks which attempt to describe English language and literacy gains as outcomes within context which are currently being reviewed as part of the *National Reporting System for Adult English Language and Literacy Provision* Project, coordinated by Sharon Coates. These are valid alternatives to the ASLPR and ALAN scales within the workplace context. Some WELL projects are using one or other of these frameworks to describe the outcomes of integration with mainstream training.

These competency based English language and literacy certificates and frameworks:

- can describe English language and literacy gains as outcomes or competencies,
- can facilitate the systematic integration of English language and literacy training with mainstream competency based training.

The continued use of the ASLRP/ALAN scales which provide English language and literacy proficiency ratings and are not based on performance indicators, maintains the exclusion of workplace personnel from the reporting process. The use of performance criteria would require consultation between all parties. For more detailed information about issues of assessment in English language and literacy and findings concerning the ASLPR and ALAN scales, see the recently completed Australian Language and Literacy Policy Project, *Assessment and Moderation Processes in Adult Literacy and Adult ESL in tendered Labour Market Programs.*
7.2.2 Data collection methods

The WELL Program was set up using the old Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs English in the Workplace model. The advantages of that model, the cross-cultural awareness raising for management, the customisation of training, the on-site delivery and the tripartite arrangements are advantages of the WELL Program. However, that model was constructed in an era which preceded the national training reform agenda and the movement towards competency-based training.

Vestiges of this old model, such as the requirement to estimate training hours per participant and to report in terms of the ASLPR or ALAN scales do not fit with the criterion-referenced training and assessment practices of competency-based training.

Especially when projects are attempting to integrate with a competency-based industry certificate, this mismatch is problematic, both at the application stage and the reporting stage. It does not encourage flexible delivery modes, which are, of their nature, not classroom based training patterns, but rather delivery modes aimed at achieving prescribed learning outcomes.

The current English language and literacy reporting methods and scales are not popular amongst the surveyed educators and do not work within the competency-based training agenda since they do not represent learning outcomes, measured against performance criteria.

7.2.3 Program monitoring and evaluation processes

The guidelines state that each project will be assessed by DEET against the objectives of the Program and the requirements of the MOA. Two months after the end of the funding period, each program contractor will provide the State Offices with an audited statement of receipt and expenditure of Program funds and a report on activities and services provided including the outcomes achieved against the Program's objectives.

Different states provide differing guidelines to program contractors on reporting requirements. Even within states, some program contractors send in very comprehensive reports, while others report mainly according to the statistical data required. As a result, if project data were to be entered into a WELL management information system, there would be a large amount of incomplete information, making evaluation difficult.

One of the questions which survey personnel were asked was whether there had been adequate consultation and feedback between parties involved in the project and WELL Program personnel.

Thirty five percent of surveyed personnel said they had not had enough access to DEET staff regarding WELL submissions and projects.
Sixty five percent said that they had had either adequate consultation, or no consultation but didn’t need any, knowing they could contact DEET for advice if needed.

A summary of comments follows:

- Program contractors needed
  - more feedback on projects and especially on reports,
  - to know about other projects ie types of activities, learners, enterprises,
  - a network with DEET representatives and other project personnel.

- DEET staff needed
  - to know more about the English language and literacy field,
  - to provide better guidelines for reporting,
  - to consult with project personnel more proactively and regularly,
  - to offer guidance with regard to the projects, especially project establishment.

The current deficiencies in the application, reporting, monitoring and evaluation and data collection processes within the WELL Program can be attributed to:

- a mismatch of reporting model in use with competency based training requirements,
- the lack of adequate resourcing of the WELL Program.

### 7.3 Infrastructure of the WELL Program

#### Resourcing of WELL National Office and Outposted National Offices

The WELL Program is administered from within the Vocational Education and Training Division of the Department of Employment, Education and Training. There are four personnel working within the WELL section; the Director, Assistant Director and two clerical support staff. Oversighting and strategic management of a national program of the size and complexity of the WELL Program requires a much greater commitment of resources than currently exists.

Staffing and support levels for the Program are under resourced not just at national level, but also at state/territories level. Only 1.1 personnel are distributed nationally in State WELL Secretariats to administer the WELL Program at State level.

State and Territory Program Managers’ responsibilities involve:

- promoting the Program within the state,
- advising and consulting with project personnel during submission writing process,
- reviewing, selecting and recommending submissions for funding, with the State Advisory Committee,
- monitoring projects during project implementation,
- consulting and liaison with National Office.
The workload of DEET officers managing the WELL Program is much higher than the staffing allocations allow, with very high peaks during submissions time, especially in Victoria and NSW. A considerable degree of background knowledge and specialist expertise is required to successfully manage this program at state/territories level.

Current staff in National Office and Victoria with long association with the Program are able to make judgment based on knowledge and experience of a range of projects over the three years of the Program’s operation. However, the structures required to document that knowledge are not in place. Reporting is still in terms of numbers of training hours and courses rather than in terms of descriptive outcomes.

There is much reliance on networks and committees to disseminate information about the WELL Program. There is, however, evidence that the end user requires more access to DEET staff. Several informants stated that they viewed the WELL Program personnel as the impartial party in this field.

The current restructure of DEET may provide the needed opportunity for more support and resources for the WELL Program.

7.4 Consultative arrangements of the WELL Program

National Consultative Group and State Advisory Committees

The Commonwealth consults at a national level through the WELL National Consultative Group on:

- outcomes of activities funded through the Program,
- national priorities and directions for the Program,
- revision of guidelines,
- basis of state and national funding allocations.

The National Consultative Group is a large group comprising representatives from the following groups:

- Australian Council of Trade Unions (up to 4),
- Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (1),
- Australian Chamber of Manufactures (1),
- Business Council of Australia (1),
- Metal Trades Industry Association (1),
- State Government (1 representative from each state/territory representing the department responsible for vocational education and training),
- Australian Language and Literacy Council (1),
- Vocational Employment, Education and Training Advisory Council (1),
- DEET (1),
- DIR (1),
- DIEA (1).
Each state and territory has a State/Territory Advisory Group. The function of the States/Territory Advisory group is to:

- provide advice to Commonwealth on state/territory priorities for workplace English language and literacy training based on the impact of training and industry reforms,
- consult at state/territories level with appropriate organisations on WELL Program direction and priorities,
- accept applications for funding and consult with industry representatives on relevance of applications,
- make recommendations on applications received according to specified criteria.

Evaluation of the WELL Program consultative processes

With its recent move into the Vocational Education and Training section of DEET, the WELL Program is well placed to establish strategic links with other industry-driven programs. The WELL Program needs to participate in national debate on major vocational education issues. It needs to have a stronger voice in major research forums such as the project Integrating of Language and Literacy and Numeracy Provision into Vocational Education, the Pilot study into the treatment of Language and Literacy within Industry Standards and to strengthen its involvement in the National Reporting System for Adult English Language and Literacy Provision Project. These projects are concerned with the same issues in the broader educational context that the WELL Program is concerned with in the workplace context, such as the integration of English language and literacy training with vocational training, the integration of ESL and Literacy, placing English language and literacy within industry competency standards, and the assessment of and reporting on outcomes of English language and literacy training. There is scope for enriching consultation between the WELL Program and the Australian National Training Authority.

The mechanism which the WELL Program already has in place for this dialogue is the National Consultative Group. However, several parties representing employer groups, unions, project personnel and DIEA, DIR, DEET with whom extensive consultation took place expressed considerable concerns about the current structure and function of the National Consultative Group. A summary of their opinion follows:

The National Consultative Group

- lacks a clear brief and structure,
- meets too infrequently,
- needs industry representation from enterprise level including training and development personnel,
- has an unclear relationship to the State Advisory Committees,
- should consult with the Australian National Training Authority.

The Group’s current membership is considered to be too large, with too many state systems representatives as current members.
8. Conclusions and recommendations

The findings of the review are that the WELL Program has had a considerable impact on the field of workplace English language and literacy training in the three years of its operation. This impact can be measured in terms of the reach of the program, the nature of the projects and the impact of the program on enterprises. It has reached enterprises of all sizes in a wide range of industries, across all states and territories, in metropolitan, non-metropolitan and remote areas, through a wide variety of program contractors. The Program has in place a policy to encourage strategic and innovative project development. It has had a positive impact on the development of a workplace culture which is aware of English language and literacy issues in training.

Reach of the WELL Program

The funding for the Program has increased each year and there have been consistently more applications for funds than funds available. NSW and Vic have had the main share of the funding each year. The proportion of funds in all states has not changed significantly over the three years.

The range of program contractors is broad, including government and private providers, unions, industry training advisory bodies, enterprises and community agencies. New program contractors have entered the field each year including non-metropolitan TAFES and enterprises.

The Program has reached a broad range of industries, with several new industries undertaking to place English language and literacy on their national training agenda through WELL funded National Projects in 1995.

While most enterprises which conducted WELL projects between 1992 and 1994 in the review sample have workforces of over 200 workers there was, a fair representation of medium and smaller enterprises conducting WELL projects.

The Program is increasingly reaching non-metropolitan industries. Promotional activity in regional areas in 1994, for instance, by the NSW Government Language, Literacy and Numeracy Taskforce has had a positive impact on the number of applications from non-metropolitan enterprises and providers for the 1995 funding round.

Recommendation 1

In order to further increase the reach of the WELL Program to industry especially to small businesses and non-metropolitan regions, in less populated, less industrialised States and the Territories, DEET should promote the WELL Program more vigorously in the following ways:
• conduct regular, strategic information seminars, in all States and Territories, especially in non-metropolitan regions, providing application advice and outlining WELL Program policy and best practice,

• consider development of a promotional video and accompanying brochure.

Nature of WELL projects

The WELL Program consists of several parts which inform and interrelate with each other to make a cohesive whole. These parts are characterised by several models of training which either integrate with industry and enterprise training, or which stand-alone, by resource development activities with broad application and by national strategies, which seek to include English language and literacy within industry training plans.

There are three main models of training emerging in WELL projects. Two of these models integrate English language and literacy training with industry endorsed or enterprise specific training, and the other is workplace English language and literacy training which stands alone.

One model of integration describes industry endorsed competencies only and does not specify English language and literacy outcomes, while the other describes both English language and literacy outcomes of training and industry endorsed competencies.

There was considerable debate focussing on the nature of integrating English language and literacy within mainstream training amongst the survey population, which is part of a wider debate in the national vocational education context.

Stand-alone English language and literacy training, which seeks to address the ESL and literacy needs of workers, is still the most common model of training. It was valued as a means of introducing new workplaces to English language and literacy training, and new providers to the workplace context.

In order to promote access to training for all and to facilitate the integration of English language and literacy with mainstream training, the WELL Program promotes the linking of ESL and literacy training. While the majority of projects surveyed provided ESL and literacy training separately, approximately 42% of projects had linked ESL and literacy training.

There were several examples of training provided in innovative and flexible mode in WELL projects. Several were designed to meet the needs of small and isolated businesses across the states and territories. In the majority of projects surveyed however, training was delivered in the classroom.
Enterprises and providers in several states and territories, through various WELL-funded and self-funded projects, are recognising the value of training trainers in English language and literacy awareness, and workplace personnel in the principles of plain English as a means of addressing English language and literacy issues at enterprise level in a more systematic and long-term way.

The WELL Program gives priority to resource development activities which have broad application eg. the provision of English language and literacy support for industry endorsed certificates such as the Engineering Production Certificate as self access modules. Resource development activity, while accounting for a relatively small percentage of WELL projects, is the key means to the provision of flexible delivery in the WELL Program.

The WELL Program’s strategy to place English language and literacy training within the training plans of an industry at national level through its National Projects has been implemented through major National Projects funded in four industries up to 1994. The WELL Program’s National Projects, through the appointment of National Literacy Coordinators in these industries, have contributed to consultation across industry regarding English language and literacy issues.

**Recommendation 2**

In order to encourage enterprises and providers to take up WELL Program priorities such as linking ESL and literacy training, and integrating ESL and literacy with industry/enterprise training, the WELL Program needs to demonstrate and promote good practice in this field. In order to do this, WELL Program personnel should:

- participate in industry forums and conferences, and educational conferences both in non-metropolitan and metropolitan regions, and nationally and internationally with presentations outlining the features of the WELL Program within these broad contexts,

- encourage project personnel, including personnel funded through National Projects to present and continue to present case studies of their projects in industry and educational conferences, nationally and internationally,

- take up the principles and strategies of the report, *Development of a Strategic Framework for the Effective Integration of Language, Literacy and Numeracy Provision into Vocational Education and Training Programs Drawing on an Investigation and Evaluation of Current Integration Models*.

**Recommendation 3**

In order to demonstrate commitment to the training needs and constraints of industry, the WELL Program should:

- encourage training which uses flexible delivery modes.
Impact of WELL Program within enterprises

The WELL Program was thought by a considerable majority of informants to have had a significant impact on enterprises. The nature of the impact ranged from benefits and professional development needs for all personnel concerned with WELL projects to a positive impact on workplace culture.

Data concerning the impact of WELL projects on enterprises has not been kept systematically by enterprises over long periods of time. As a result, any perceived links between English language and literacy training and benefits to participants, other than English language and literacy gains, or specific benefits to workplaces are not based on sound research.

The evidence workplace personnel were able to provide regarding benefits to participants was that participants achieved work-related credentials, increased in confidence and participation more at work and were promoted as a result of participation in English language and literacy training at work.

Increased confidence, as a result of work related English language and literacy training, was the most highly valued outcome by workplace personnel since it facilitated the implementation of workplace reform.

The benefit of WELL projects for workplace management and training providers was greater knowledge of the context. Workplace personnel gained knowledge of the context of English language and literacy while training providers gained knowledge of the context of the workplace and the training reform agenda.

Most personnel surveyed credited the WELL project with a role in facilitating reform in the enterprise. Two ways in which WELL projects facilitated reform were in the recognition that good communication practices are the responsibility of all parties and the promotion of the development of a training culture in the enterprise.

Many enterprises have made a considerable commitment to English language and literacy training, providing a venue and work release for participants as well as up to 50% of training costs in cases of enterprises entering their second year of WELL funds. Several enterprises have judged the English language and literacy projects established with WELL funds to be important in achieving organisational goals and have continued the training after WELL funds have stopped. Others have run full cost programs alongside WELL funded projects to supplement training.

There are many professional development needs for all associated parties resulting from the nature of the WELL Program and its policy directions. The WELL Program has taken some account of these needs, with the provision of English language and literacy awareness raising training for workplace personnel a feature of each project and the outcomes of some of its National Projects, such as guidelines and best practice models. There are on-going professional development needs associated with linking of ESL and literacy training and integrating with mainstream training.
Recommendation 4

In order to collect useful data on the benefits of workplace English language and literacy training, the WELL Program should:

- consult with industry to identify and describe their needs in terms of English language and literacy training,
  - for individuals, other than specific English language and literacy gains, such as credentials, increased participation at work and career opportunities,
  - for enterprises, such as facilitation of reform, development of training culture, shared responsibility for communication practices, other enterprise specific data.
- give guidance to industry on documentation of outcomes of English language and literacy training,
- participate in research into performance indicators including longitudinal action research in this field.

Recommendation 5

In order that professional development needs of all parties resulting from WELL Program policy and practice, can be identified and described, the WELL Program should:

- set up dialogue with higher educational institutions such as schools of adult education, schools of English language and literacy, schools of business administration and providers through the National Consultative Group, and in association with Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) on long-term and short-term professional development and vocational education and training implications of WELL policy,
- consider participating in the development of a collaborative model of professional development which addresses needs of all parties (providers, and workplace personnel and trainers) within the one context of the workplace such as:
  - integrating English language and literacy with mainstream training,
  - competency-based assessment and reporting,
  - multi-discipline program management.
- participate in the establishment and development of networks and interest groups among project personnel to share strategies and information with regard to specific types of projects,
  eg. small business projects, resource development projects.
Effectiveness and efficiency of program administration arrangements

Despite these positive outcomes, several of the Program's administrative arrangements were seen as not very effective and efficient. The application process was viewed as too inflexible to meet applicant's requirements. The reporting process was viewed as heavily weighted with numerical data requirements while not capturing outcomes and other descriptive data concerning the projects. Part of the ineffectiveness in the application and reporting process was due to the continued use of the ASLPR and ALAN scales to report English language and literacy gains.

The WELL Program was seen to be under resourced by representatives of all parties surveyed and consulted. Project personnel required more access to DEET staff for advice, consultation, guidance and feedback during all stages of the project. Information about the Program's policy, application requirements, outcomes and examples of best practice was not sufficiently disseminated. The Program did not have a strong enough voice in national debate on issues with which it is directly concerned, such as reporting outcomes, and integrating English language and literacy training with mainstream training. Consultative arrangements, such as the National Consultative Group were not well utilised.

The guidelines to the WELL Program were considered to cover the required information but were too long and bureaucratic in style, especially by workplace personnel surveyed.

Recommendation 6

In order to meet industry requirements for briefer and plainer guidelines, the WELL Program should:

- produce a shorter version of the WELL guidelines in plainer English and pitched to industry through consultation with enterprises and unions for use as a promotional tool, not as a replacement for current guidelines.

The application form was poorly regarded mainly because it constrained applicants to fit within its format of course numbers and participant numbers, limiting the scope for a full description of training plans. The requirement to estimate these figures before training needs analyses were adequately undertaken and to provide numbers of ESL and literacy trainees separately were listed as further inadequacies in the form.

The timeframe for applications was viewed by many as too short and inflexible. The funding cycle based on the calendar year was not always convenient to industry.
Recommendation 7

In order to provide more scope for applicants to describe their proposed WELL projects more fully, and to reflect the WELL guidelines and the relevant features of competency based training more accurately, the WELL Program should:

- design a new application form in consultation with industry, union and providers.

Recommendation 8

In order to meet applicants’ need for more flexibility in the application process, the WELL Program should:

- strengthen its information campaign so that prospective applicants are aware of the scope to apply for responsive funds throughout the year,
- investigate the introduction of funding cycle tied to financial year,
- provide small grants, in on-going cycle, up to $5000 to enable short investigations of training needs in enterprises.

Informants supported the requirement to report to DEET on project outcomes, but said that three monthly reports were too frequent in the context of English language and literacy training. The lack of a standard format was poorly viewed. The emphasis on statistical data requirements in reporting meant there was not enough scope to describe outcomes of the project. The requirement to report in terms of proficiency rating scales and competencies was confusing as was the requirement to separately report on ESL and literacy gains.

Current data collection methods were part of an older model based on quantitative methods and not consistent with the features and requirements of competency-based training in workplaces.

Current data collection is mainly quantitative rather than qualitative, resulting in the loss of very useful information on all aspects of WELL projects. The lack of systematically collected descriptive information inhibits thorough program evaluation.

There is little program monitoring taking place, mainly because of lack of resources in the states and territories. Project personnel had little access to DEET staff and wanted more consultation with and guidance from them.

Recommendation 9

In order to enable project personnel to report on outcomes more systematically against stated aims and objectives, the WELL Program should:
• consider competency based reporting which reports in terms of outcomes rather than numbers of courses and training hours, in preparation for the National Reporting System for Adult English Language and Literacy Provision.

This can be achieved by encouraging project personnel to trial the use of existing competency based English language and literacy certificates and frameworks (as is already the case in some projects) as replacements for the ASLPR and ALAN scales in order to feed into the National Reporting System for Adult English Language and Literacy Provision project.

• consider the introduction of six monthly descriptive progress reports to replace current three monthly reports,

• consult with project personnel, the National Consultative Group and State Advisory Committee members to design a standard report format to enable contractors to report the outcomes of projects as stated in the application form and to enable the WELL Program to collect data on outcomes of the Program for participants and enterprises through use of performance measures and milestones.

Recommendation 10

In order to monitor and evaluate individual projects and the Program as a whole, the WELL Program should:

• establish a format for internal and external monitoring and evaluation of individual projects,

• put in place now a strategy for a comprehensive review in two or three years of the Program’s effectiveness, including longitudinal studies of workplaces and individuals,

• consider funding data collection and monitoring procedures through a levy taken from current employer contributions.

With four personnel at National level and 1.1 personnel distributed nationally, staffing and support levels in the Program are under resourced at both national and state/territory level. Workloads of DEET officers managing WELL Programs are much higher than staffing allocations allow and their roles, especially at the time of submissions, require specialised knowledge and considerable consultation with project personnel. Systems and structures to collect and organise useful data are not in place. There is considerable reliance on networks and committees to disseminate information about and promote the Program.
Recommendation 11

In order to promote and disseminate information about the WELL Program, and to enable staff to carry out the current requirements of their role, and to provide the consultative role required of them by project personnel, DEET should:

- allocate more resources to manage and monitor the WELL Program at both state and national level in order to:

  - increase levels of advice and feedback, especially to enterprises during application process,

  - increase consultation with program contractors throughout the duration of the project. This can be achieved through case management of group of projects by DEET staff, and should include site visits to enterprises where projects are in progress and should be tied closely to new reporting process,

  - provide new staff at state level associated with the WELL Program with professional development appropriate to the specialist nature of the job, in areas such as project management, industrial relations, principles of workplace English language and literacy training, principles of competency-based training and ethical issues associated with assessment in field of English language and literacy.

The main consultative body of the WELL Program is the National Consultative Group which consults on outcomes of activities and determines national priorities and directions for the Program. State Advisory Committees, which function at state and territory level provide advice to the Commonwealth on state/territory priorities and make recommendations on applications for funds received.

A summary of opinion on the National Consultative Group is that its membership is too large; it has no clear brief and structure; it meets too infrequently; and it does not have a clear relationship with the State Advisory Committees.

The WELL Program is well-placed to establish strategic links with other industry-driven programs with its move into the Vocational Education and Training section of DEET, and to participate in national debates and research forums on vocational education issues, since WELL projects are concerned with the same issues in the workplace context.

Recommendation 12

In order to better reflect industry perspective and make the National Consultative Group’s (NCG) contribution to the WELL Program more relevant and proactive, the WELL Program should:
• restructure the National Consultative Group in the following ways:

1. Develop a short and longer-term strategic plan for NCG, incorporating:
   - input to and awareness of ANTA developments,
   - input to and awareness of National Projects impacting on WELL such as the joint ANTA and DEET National Reporting System Project for Adult English language and literacy Provision the ALLC Pilot study into the Treatment of English Language and Literacy Competence within Industry Competencies and other projects of significance to the field of workplace English language and literacy,
   - consultation on priorities for funding on yearly basis,
   - advice and feedback on establishment of new data collection processes.

2. Increase the number of meetings to at least two per year to enable members to play more useful and proactive role.

3. Set up process for on-going consultation between Commonwealth and State/Territories Government Vocational Education and Training Departments through States and Territories Advisory Committees, through existing mechanisms such as MCEETYA Language and Literacy Taskforce.

4. Alter composition of membership of NGC:
   - reduce State/Territories Government Vocational Education and Training Department representation,
   - invite an industry representative working at enterprise level, preferably in training and development to become member of the group,
   - consider inviting a representative of workplace English language and literacy training field to become member of the group,
   - invite ANTA representation on National Consultative Group.

The Program is moving from its establishment phase into a stage of maturity, with increasing industry commitment and awareness of the outcomes which are possible from this training.

There is considerable evidence and opinion that the WELL Program has already made a significant contribution to the field of workplace English language and literacy training in Australia in the first three years of its operation. Industry is increasingly taking up the challenge to integrate English language and literacy training with mainstream training initiatives. The Program is entering this stage with sound policies and strategies in place. Good variety among its enterprise level projects, the strategic direction of its National Projects, the opening of the training market, the linking of
English language and literacy training, and the integration of English language and literacy training with mainstream objectives are some of its current successful initiatives.

The WELL Program is well placed to achieve excellent results for its initiatives over the next three to five years of its operation.

**Recommendation 13**

In order to enable the WELL Program to enter its mature stage and to achieve the outcomes it is set to achieve for the initiatives it currently has in place, it is recommended:

- that the WELL Program be funded to continue at least at the present level of operation, for the next three to five years.
TERMS OF REFERENCE
THE WORKPLACE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERACY (WELL) PROGRAM

PURPOSE

This brief provides information about the proposed post implementation review of the Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) Program, funded under the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP), to enable potential prospective evaluators to submit a detailed and fully costed proposal for the Review.

BACKGROUND

The Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) Program has been administered jointly by the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) and the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (DIEA) in consultation with the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR). The joint program combines funds from the Workplace Literacy Program (funded by DEET) and the English in the Workplace Program (funded by DIEA).

The Program assists workers with low English literacy or English as a second language to develop appropriate English language and literacy skills to meet employment needs and to enable them to participate in training opportunities in the workplace. The Program guidelines are attached.

The English in the Workplace Program was an allocation, made since 1985, out of the Adult Migrant English Program which is administered by DIEA. The Workplace Literacy Program (WLP) was announced in the March 1991 Industry Statement and supplemented in the 1991-92, 1992-93 budgets.

It was intended that the Program fund different approaches for delivery of literacy assistance to workers to ensure that the best possible results were achieved by matching the delivery method to the requirements of the workplace. The methods to be adopted were to be determined in consultation with relevant employee/employer groups, government, education agencies and community and adult education groups with demonstrated expertise. It was acknowledged that the training providers used to deliver the training in any particular circumstance would vary from TAFE, SkillShare, private providers and adult and community education groups.

All industries and workers demonstrating a need for workplace literacy intervention were eligible although priority was given to proposals where there was strong support from both employee and employer representatives; key industries were involved; and there was significant contribution in funding or in kind by employers or an equitable State/Territory distribution of assistance.
The WLP was expanded under the ALLP umbrella in 1991-92. As stated in *Australia’s Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy*, the Program will assist industry "to assess literacy competencies and literacy training needs in specific workplaces, and to develop, deliver and evaluate training modules for workers needing assistance. DEET and DILGEA will jointly manage this program with DILGEA's English in the Workplace program from 1 January 1992, in consultation with DIR, and in cooperation with individual employers and employee groups and their peak bodies. DEET and DILGEA will share data on courses and clients' training needs, with due consideration to privacy, and ensure their programs are coordinated with State provision."

The White Paper *Working Nation: Policy and Programs* maintained funding levels for the literacy component of the WELL Program because it is designed to assist workers who are most at risk of displacement from industries requiring more highly skilled and literate workers. Without WELL, workers with English language and literacy difficulties often fail to respond to changes, particularly retraining, required of them by employers and displacement of this group typically leads to periods of long term unemployment. Since 1992, more than 1500 companies have taken part in the WELL Program and over 46,000 workers have participated in the training.

The 1994-95 Budget transferred the EWP funds from DIEA to DEET. This was agreed to by both Departments in order to simplify the interdepartmental administrative arrangements which were extremely cumbersome (2 delegates, 2 payment systems, 2 monitoring systems etc) although DEET provided most of the management of the WELL Program in order to ensure a consistent and targeted Program approach.

**AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**

The objective of the WELL Program is to provide workers with literacy and ESL skills that are sufficient to enable them to meet the demands of their current employment and their future employment and training needs, particularly in the context of award restructuring and workplace reform.

The Post Implementation Review of the Program should address the following questions:

1. Is the Program meeting its objective effectively?
2. What are the outcomes of the Program? Are they consistent with the Program objective?

In addressing these questions you should also consider the following issues:

3. Are there overlaps with other Programs?

---

2. *Working Nation: Policy and Programs* was released on 4 May 1994
4. Has the integration of workplace literacy and ESL training activities been effective? Has the integration of workplace literacy and ESL training activities into the framework of mainstream workplace training provision been successful? What is the nature of this integration?

5. Has the WELL program improved and facilitated links within enterprises and across industries in terms of workplace language and literacy training?

6. Has the WELL program increased awareness of the value of workplace training within industry and the training community?

7. What have been the outcomes for workers who participate in WELL funded literacy and ESL training?

8. Has WELL Program funding acted as a catalyst for other English language and literacy activities in the workplace either during or after funding has ceased?

9. Are the administrative arrangements for the Program effective and efficient; and

10. What changes could be made to the Program to improve its efficiency and effectiveness?

These questions should be addressed in the context of the evolution of the Program.

RESEARCH DESIGN FOR THE POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

The Post Implementation Review comprises three research elements (A to C below) and a fourth component which involves the production of a final report. The four elements include:

A. a desk audit of a representative sample of the projects which have been funded;
B. surveys of project personnel, industry and union representatives;
C. face to face consultations with members of the National Consultative Group, the State and Territory Advisory Committees, selected project personnel (including enterprises, training providers, and course participants) and staff in DEET, DIEA and DIR, and representatives of peak industry and union bodies; and
D. production of a final aggregated report which ties together in an analytical and comprehensive manner the results of the three research elements of the Post Implementation Review.

OTHER RELEVANT ACTIVITIES

- The impact of the transfer of the English in the Workplace (EWP) component of the WELL Program, currently $3.8 million per annum, to DEET.
- The impact of the Services and Structures Review on State/Territory Office WELL Secretariats.
- The Department of Industrial Relations Best Practice program.
• The Department of Industry, Science and Technology's Food Industry Language and Literacy Initiative Program (FILLIP).

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The Review should result in a comprehensive report based on qualitative, and where possible, quantitative data which assess the impact and effectiveness of the WELL Program. In particular, it should provide information to the Commonwealth as to the contribution which the Program has made to the field, the need for continued or expanded funding, and possible changes which might need to be made to Program administration, including data collection and reporting methods.

The final report (Element D) should link with the other areas of the ALLP under review (including Adult Literacy, National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia, Asia Education Foundation and Special Intervention Program).

The final report is to contain an Executive Summary of the evaluation's findings together with a detailed report of findings of the evaluation in line with the objectives set out in this brief.

PRINCIPAL AUDIENCE

• Cabinet
• DEET Executive
• Program Managers
• Program Consultative Groups

ADVISORY COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

An Advisory Committee will be established to provide advice on the evaluation. This final report must be approved by this Committee.

TIME SCALE

The Report must be completed no later than 30 November 1994 and preferably earlier to inform 1995-96 budget processes.

SELECTION CRITERIA

The successful applicant will be selected on the following grounds:

• experience and expertise of project staff with the conduct of program evaluation in the public and private sectors;
• experience in undertaking the type of research activity detailed in this proposal;
• the extent to which the consultant's proposal reveals an understanding of the Department's requirements;
• knowledge of adult literacy, English as a second language and workplace training;
knowledge of workplace reforms;
ability to deliver within the specified time frame;
ability to provide a detailed budget;
value for money;
ability to provide timely and accurate progress reports to the Advisory Committee and/or the Department;
ability to meet Commonwealth accountability requirements;
ability to guarantee confidentiality;
ability to establish a productive working relationship with the proposed target organisations and individuals, in order to maximise the usefulness of information obtained from the consultation process; and
awareness of national needs and priorities for adult literacy and ESL in the workplace.

FURTHER INFORMATION

If further information is required, please contact:

Ms Robyn Bergin on Telephone: (06) 240 8880
Facsimile: (06) 240 9202

SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS

Three copies of the application should be submitted to

The Director WELL Section
Language and Literacy Branch
DEET
GPO Box 9880
CANBERRA ACT 2601
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DESK AUDIT DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT
### Project sum (ESL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Tick</th>
<th>(1) ITAB</th>
<th>(2) Company</th>
<th>(3) Private training provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Govt Provider</td>
<td>(5) Union</td>
<td>(6) Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact person:**
(Contractor)

Mr/Mrs/Ms

Phone no: ( )

Fax no.: ( )

**Contact person:**
(Company)

Mr/Mrs/Ms

Phone no: ( )

Fax no.: ( )

**The Project:**

**Date:** 1992 (1) / 1993 (2) / 1994 (3)

**Scale:** National (N) / QLD (1) / NSW (2) / VIC (3) / TAS (4) / SA (5) / WA (6) / NT (7) / ACT (8)

**Type:** Resource development (R) / Training delivery (T)

**Workplace size:** Number of employees (S/M/L)

**Industry type:** (Free and open-ended response)

**Location:** Urban (U) / Rural (R)

**Training:**

**Nature:** Stand alone (S) / Integrated with enterprise objectives (E) / Integrated with industry objectives (I)

**Delivery type:** Classroom based (C) / Individual learning (I) / Distance learning (D) / Team teaching (T) / Flexible learning (F) / Peer tutoring (P)

**Teacher assignment:** F/T enterprise based (F) / Course based (C)

**Participant type:** ESL only (E) / Literacy only (L) / integrated (I)

**Company contribution (%):**

**Project Objectives:**
1.
2.
3.
4.
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PHONE SURVEY
WELL REVIEW
TELEPHONE SURVEY

Project Code..............................................e.g. 93/28034

WELL running for 2 or 3 years Y/N

Interviewer 1/2

Name of Interviewee........................................ (Confidential)

Type of Interviewee...........................................

Date...........................

Time/Time Taken...........

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Introduction

Unisearch UNSW has been commissioned by DEET to conduct a major Review of the WELL Program which includes a phone survey of project personnel ie, managers, training providers (teachers) and course participants.
Q1 Were you involved in the preparation of the 1992, 1993 or 1994 WELL submission?

(If YES continue to Q2; If NO go to Q 5 next page)

Q2 How would you rate the WELL guidelines in terms of clarity and comprehensiveness? Most recent year completed:

Good- indifferent - poor
(Prompt for change over time)

Q3 How would you rate the WELL application form in terms of ease of use and appropriateness to your workplace? Most recent year completed:

Good- indifferent - poor
(Prompt for change over time)

Q4 A number of issues have been raised about the guidelines and the application process. Do you have comments on any of the following

• the function and value of the tripartite agreement
• role of the WELL Consultative Committee
• the separation of funding for ESL & Literacy
• the one year funding cycle
• level of detail required about participants
• program detail required
• opportunity to adequately describe innovation in the application form (eg flexible learning arrangements)
• relevance of some of the required data to program objectives and evaluation

Program Character

As you know, the WELL Program was designed to help employees to meet workplace demands in the context of award restructuring and workplace reform.

Q5 What sort of language and literacy training are you/is/has your organisation run(ning)?

(If program participant, go to Q8)

Q6 Have you been able to deliver your WELL project as flexibly as you would like?
Q7 In what ways is your delivery flexible?

Selective Probe; Is delivery becoming more flexible? Examples

- Open learning Centres,
- Peer tutoring, small group,
- One-to-one,
- On-the-job
- Multimedia

If manager or training provider go to Q9

Q8 Was it easy for you to join and participate in the WELL program?

Probe reasons especially if no

Q9 Does your WELL Program have both ESB and NESB participants?

( ) ESB only
( ) NESB only
( ) Both
( ) Don’t Know

Probe on advantages/disadvantages of selected model and its rationale.

Q10 How do/did WELL Program activities connect with other training in your/the organisation?

Probe How well does this happen?

(If program participant, go to Q15)

Q11 Were you able to integrate language and literacy training with mainstream training?

Probe on how they did it and what was the success

Q12 Did/will your project result in a product which can be readily shared or re-used eg training programs; self-access learning materials?

Probe: Could there be unresolved copyright/dissemination issues;

Professional Development

Q13 Does WELL pose any specific challenges to trainers, in relation to both mainstream and language/literacy training needs?

Please specify
Q14  In relation to the linking of language and mainstream training, has this led to any outstanding professional development needs in areas of curriculum design and training?

*Please specify*

**The Change Process**

Q15  Have you noticed any changes in the way WELL has been operating at your organisation over the past two or three years?

*Prompt nature of change*
*Level of success/acceptance*
*Degree of integration*

Q16  Has the WELL Program helped to promote workplace reform in your organisation?

*Prompt How?*

Q17  Has the WELL Program provided specific benefits to you?

*Give details.*

*Credential(s) e.g. statement of competency, certificate, ticket*
*Improved language & literacy competency*
*Increased confidence and orientation to work*
*Increased participation in enterprise e.g membership of OHS Committee; Consultative Committee*
*Promotion*

Q18  Did the WELL Program turn out as you expected? *Probe: give details*

Q19  Has the WELL Program influenced other communication practices in your workplace such as the development of a Plain English approach

*Prompts*
*Rewriting of manuals, Standard Operating Procedures*
*Development of communication strategy,*
*Training of management/trainers,*
*Other language and literacy activities.*

Q20  Has the WELL Program contributed to an increased awareness of the value of training in your workplace? *Prompt any definable outcomes e.g. development of Training Plans?*
Q21 Has/will the WELL Program have a lasting impact on your organisation after the funding stops?

(If program participant, go to last question)

Q22 Has the WELL program encouraged effective links between your organisation and the following:

- Other enterprises within your industry?
- Other industries?
- Training providers?

Reporting & Evaluation

Q23 Have you been involved in the reporting process for WELL?

Q24 Is the current reporting process of value to you?

- **Probe**
- *Quarterly Reports; statistics; ESL Literacy split; ALAN Scales/ASLPR*
- *Lack of relationship with CBT outcomes oriented approaches*
- *Indications of materials developed; copyright of materials*

Q25 What would you change to make the reporting process easier and better?

Q26 Has there been adequate ongoing consultation and feedback between all parties involved in your project and the WELL program personnel in DEET?

Importance of Well Funding

Q27 Has it been difficult to meet the language and literacy training needs resulting from workplace reform in your workplace with the funding you have received from WELL?

Give details

Q28 In the most recent year in which you’ve received funding, would you have conducted WELL style programs without WELL funds

Q29 If you could make one change to the WELL Program what would it be?

Thank you for your time and your contribution.
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DISCUSSION PAPER
INTRODUCTION

This discussion paper reports on the emerging findings of the first two stages of the Post Implementation Review of the Workplace English Language and Literacy (WELL) Program (an element of the Australian Language and Literacy Policy) currently being conducted by Unisearch Ltd, University of New South Wales on behalf of the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET).

The paper is intended to provide a basis for further discussion on issues relating to the WELL Program.

OBJECTIVES OF THE WELL PROGRAM

The objective of the WELL program is to:

- provide workers with literacy and ESL skills that are sufficient to enable them to meet the demands of their current employment and their future employment and training needs, particularly in the context of award restructuring and workplace reform.

OBJECTIVES OF THE WELL REVIEW

The main objectives of the review are to assess:

- the impact and effectiveness of the WELL program;
- the contribution which the WELL program has made to English language and literacy in the workplace;
- the nature of the contribution including integration of WELL activities into the framework of mainstream vocational training; and
- the efficiency of the Program administration including data collection and reporting methods.
METHODOLOGY

The research design for the Post Implementation Review of the WELL program comprises three elements. These elements are:

- a desk audit of a sample of funded projects
- a phone survey of project personnel, industry and union representatives
- face-to-face consultations with members of the National Consultative Group, State and Territory Advisory Committees, selected project personnel, staff in DEET, Department of Immigration, and Ethnic Affairs, and Department of Industrial Relations and representatives of peak industry and union bodies.

To date, data has been collected through two of the three research elements:

- a desk audit of a representative sample of funded projects, and
- phone surveys of project personnel and industry and union representatives.

DESK AUDIT

The desk audit involved analysing a sample of existing data collected by DEET.

This information was analysed according to the following features of a wide range of projects across the three years of the WELL program's operation:

- the type of program contractor ie Industry Training Advisory Board, Company, Private or Government Provider or Union
- the range of industries in which WELL is operating
- the size of participating enterprises
- the proportion of regional to capital city projects
- the nature of the training model, whether integrated with mainstream training or stand alone
- the participant type, ie whether ESL only, literacy only or both.
- the delivery modes.

THE SURVEY

The survey has comprised comprehensive phone interviews with a sample of project personnel and participants representing the range of program contractor types in the states and territories, taking into account other variables such as size and location. Fifty one project personnel, including industry, enterprise and union personnel, provider managers and deliverers and course participants have been surveyed in the phone survey to date.

The phone survey has sought information about the following.

- the character of the WELL project ie
  - the degree of integration with mainstream training
  - the flexible delivery arrangements
  - the types of participants (non English speaking background or English speaking background)
- the impact of the WELL project on the enterprise ie
  - the impact on workplace reform
  - the outcomes for participants and other personnel
  - the influence on communication practices in the enterprise the effect on workplace training general lasting impact
- the resulting skills requirements of all parties
- the process of applying for WELL funds
- the reporting process
- the importance of WELL funding
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The Desk Audit
The desk audit has sought to capture a sense of the scope and penetration of the WELL program over the three years of its operation, from a representative sample of projects. This data is currently being processed for inclusion in the final report and will not be included in this paper.

The Phone Survey

Overview of Findings
The data collected during the phone survey is in the preliminary stages of analysis. The survey populations consist of:

- enterprise, industry and union personnel
- provider managers and deliverers
- project participants.

The preliminary findings indicate a strong commitment to the WELL program and a conviction of its value at individual, enterprise and industry level among all survey groups.

The general sense among the respondents from the three main survey populations is that the WELL program is achieving its objectives satisfactorily, and that many projects in specific enterprises have turned out better than was at first anticipated.

Typical findings of groups surveyed

Enterprise and Union Personnel Perspective
- Enhanced understanding of the role of language and literacy in the successful implementation of reform

Provider Perspective
- Enhanced understanding of the reform agenda
- Greater acceptance of workplace language and literacy and therefore easier access to enterprises

Participant Perspective
- Improved confidence and participation at work
- Better reading and writing skills to document use of particular equipment
- Membership of OH&S committee
- Appointment as leading hand

General Comments
- The tripartite arrangements and consultative committee are valued by respondents from all survey populations, as a key element in the successful outcome for participants and workplaces.
- The WELL program is considered to be developing most successfully in projects running for more than one year.
- All projects surveyed were attempting to integrate language and literacy training to some degree either with enterprise level goals, or with industry level accredited training.
- The split between ESL and literacy for purposes of funding and training activities met a broad range of responses. It was seen by some respondents as irrelevant to the proposed and eventuating outcomes of their projects. Others however had formulated their training plans within the model and were satisfied with the results.
- The WELL program was generally considered to be having an influence on the communication practices in workplaces moving them towards a more consultative style and involving such changes as Plain English approaches to enterprise documentation.
- The WELL program was seen to have significantly contributed to a greater awareness of the value of workplace training in enterprises, including the awareness of the need for professional development of workplace trainers.
- Funding levels for training were generally thought to be adequate.
- Respondents said that they could not have provided this training without seed funding such as the WELL program provides.
ISSUES EMERGING FROM THE PHONE SURVEY DATA

Overview
Some of the factors which were perceived by respondents as having a strong impact on the achievement of successful outcomes for a WELL project in an enterprise are:

- The 'readiness' of a workplace, in terms of its reform process and strategic planning to conduct a WELL project
- The undertaking of skilled workplace research, through on-going consultation between enterprise personnel and providers to identify the real nature of training issues in enterprises
- Readiness and skills on the part of training providers to be flexible and to customise training to the very specific needs of an enterprise

Comments from Respondents
Some of the comments from respondents across the range of survey questions are:

Character of the Program
- Early programs were much less sophisticated, more ESL and literacy trained teachers available now, much greater acceptance by companies, much more integration.
- There have been massive changes (over three years) - it has broken down resistance, and focuses on underpinning skills, developing training culture and breaking down prejudices.
- Good program; turned out better than expected ... expected participants to have more difficulty .... They have more enthusiasm than expected.
- The WELL program has removed the glass barrier between language and literacy training and the real things in the workplace.
- The separation of ESL and literacy funding
  - ..........is an inappropriate division which slows down funding
  - ..........is a bureaucratic issue mainly ...its not (useful) for reporting but for pedagogy.
- Need to make sure that there is time for a thorough research phase ... better results
- Priority should be given to resource development, as opposed to training, for lasting impact

The Application Process
- (In application form), focus on bums on seats was inappropriate... creates wrong impression of what language and literacy programs are about.
- Greater scope is needed to move between what is in the submission and what happens at set up time.
- Different application forms are needed for different types of contractors.

Administration
- More specific direction in early stage would have been useful- some dead ends were explored
- WELL needs to think of a process that allows reporting on what people can do
- Would like feedback from WELL on quarterly reports
- Quarterly reports - not enough scope for global comment to explain how WELL has made a difference
- DEET needs someone who knows about literacy to visit, network and monitor WELL sites

WELL Program Planning and Funding
- Availability of response funds throughout the year would be better
- Longer funding cycle to allow strategic planning and fit with enterprise planning cycle
CONSULTATIONS

The following questions are designed to facilitate responses for the next stage of the review, the consultation process.

- Is the WELL program meeting its objectives effectively?
- What are the outcomes of the program? Are they consistent with the WELL Program objectives?
- Has integration of workplace language and literacy training with mainstream training been successful? What are the reasons for this outcome? How is integration happening?
- Has the integration of workplace ESL and literacy training activities been successful? What are the strengths and weaknesses of this integrated model in achieving the objectives of the WELL program?
- Has the WELL program increased awareness of the value of workplace training within industry and the training community?
- Has the WELL Program funding acted as a catalyst for other English language and literacy activities in the workplace either during or after funding has ceased?
- Has the WELL program improved and facilitated links within enterprises and across industries in terms of workplace language and literacy training?
- What have been the outcomes for workers who participate in WELL funded language and literacy training activities?
- Are the administrative arrangements for the WELL Program efficient and effective?
- What changes can be made to the WELL Program to improve its efficiency and effectiveness?

If you would like to participate in the consultation process please contact or send your submissions no later than 23 November to:

Attention: Ms Che Katz
Unisearch Consulting and Research
The University of New South Wales
SYDNEY NSW 2052
Fax: (02) 662 4265

or contact
Ms Pauline Baylis (02) 665 5994
or
Ms Che Katz (02) 385 5511 or 385 5555
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LIST OF INDIVIDUALS SURVEYED AND CONSULTED
List of Individuals who participated in telephone survey

Anderson Marie
Attard Joanne
Avcı Muammer
Baudinette Neal
Benfell Bill
Bennetts Mark
Bolton Christine
Brewer Vinga Cathy
Burton Ruth,
Collins Malcolm
Collins Robbie
Conner Ken
Cornel Chris
Crompton Lilian
Daley Virginia
Duffy Judy
Duggan Anne
Farrell Kevin
Fielding Hugh
Gashi Kastriot
Gates Mary
Gillespie Jill
Gundert Maggie
Guo Zhao Wei
H Brian
Hamilton Lynda
Hovey Peter
Hulusi A.
Josip Belusic
Karanfil Mehmet
Kelly Anne
Kooperman Michael
Kotevski Lilly
Lachlan Rees Simone
Lu Louei
Macdonald Kerry
Macer Peter
Mack Colleen
Mal M.
McBriarty Mark
McKell Megan
Minh Anh Le
Morris Ambrose Shirley
Morris Bert
Nash Murray
Navara Debbie
Norton Marion
O'Donahue Julie
P Robert

NSW AMES
Nestle Confectionery Ltd Vic and NSW
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
Canberra Institute of Technology ACTITA FE
Carlton and United Breweries Vic Pty Ltd
Workplace Education Services South East Region SA
TAFE Qld
Linda Wise and Associates Vic
WA DEVET
CCA Beverages NSW
Community Access Training Scheme NSW
Email Cooking Products Division SA
Melbourne College of Textiles Vic
AMES Vic
TAFE Qld
NSW Food Industry Training Council
Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union, Victoria
Lend Lease Learning Pty Ltd NSW
AMES Tasmania
ALCATEL NSW
Swinburne University of Technology Vic
AMES Vic
Qld DEVETIR TAFETEQ
WA DEVET
AMES Victoria
Southern Riverina Electricty NSW
Caloundra City Council Qld
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
Carlton and United Breweries Vic Pty Ltd
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
Di ana Ferrari, Vic
Southbank Institute of TAFE
George Watson WA
Diana Ferrari, Vic
Qld DEVETIR
Sydney Hilton Hotel NSW
Community Access Training Scheme NSW
Sydney Electricity NSW
Bert Morris and Associates Qld
Southern Riverina Electricity and Water Supply NSW
NSW AMES
NSW AMES
Argyle Diamonds, WA
Southern Riverina Electricity NSW
Park Penny
Pedler Linda
Peterson Alicia
Priotta George
Raftos Peter
Reith Ann
Ritchie Laurie
Robertson Steve
Sherring Margot
Shi Dong Wang
Shield Lause
Stapleton Peter
Stathopoulos Tina
Stenzel Anne
Stesanelli Julia
Tout Smith Jeff
Tutumlu Gunes
Wallace-Clancy Lynn
Wanstall Joan
Warne Peter
Watson Jacqui
Werrin Doug
Whittaker Annette
Wighcert Bert
Wignell Peter
Wyse Linda
Younan Nader

Southbank Institute of TAFE Qld
Air International Vic
Southbank Institute of TAFE Qld
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
Carlton and United Breweries (NSW) Pty Limited
NSW Local Government Industry Training Council
Woden Valley Hospital ACT
Diana Ferrari, Vic
Lismore College of TAFE NSW
Diana Ferrari, Vic
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
Tubemakers Vic
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
South Burnett College of TAFE Qld
WA Plastics, Rubber, Chemical Industry and Employment Training Council
Holmsglen College of TAFE Vic
Holden’s Engine Company, Vic
AMES Victoria
Dandenong College of TAFE Vic
AMES Victoria
NSW AMES
NSW AMES
Sunnraysia College of TAFE, Vic
Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union Qld
NT University
Linda Wise and Associates Vic
Holden's Engine Company, Vic
List of Individuals Consulted

Joe Moore  NSW Chamber of Manufacture
Virginia Hilliard  NSW Literacy Taskforce
Jill Gillespie  NSW Food Industry Advisory Board
Judy Duffy  NSW Food Industry Advisory Board
Ann Reich  NSW Local Government Industry Training Advisory Board
Helen Tierney  National Building and Construction ITC
Marie Persson  Australian National Training Authority Qld
Nick Lewocki  Labour Council of NSW
Helen Campbell  Department of Industrial Relations, Canberra
Sue Sadauskas  Department of Industrial Relations, Canberra
Nina Craven  Department of Industrial Relations Canberra
Rhonda Kassis  Electrical Trades Union
Heather Meredith  Department of Ethnic Affairs, Canberra
Rosemary Latimer  Australian Chamber of Manufacturers
Sue Naylor  Ajax Fasteners
Cheryl Downie  National Food Industry Training Advisory Board
Simon Wallace  National TCF Industry Training Advisory Board
Anne Duggan  Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union
Bernard Reed  National Union Workers
Marion Norton  TAFE TEQ Policy and Curriculum
Anne Whyte  National Office Skills Formation Advisory Board
Eugena Hills  SA Trades and Labour Council
Robyn Sefton  National Automotive Industry Training Board
Paul Brock  Australian Language and Literacy Council
Elinor Crossing  The Smith’s Snackfood Company
John Nichols  DEET Victoria
Paul Tweddell  DEET NSW
Pat Whistance  DEET National Office WELL Secretariat
Mark Hilton  DEET ACT
Karen Atherton  DEET VET SA
Bronwen Blight  DEET Strategic Support VET Secretariat SA
Sharon Coates  National Reporting Project
Gary Ferris  Ajax Spurways Fasteners
Nicole Gilding  SA DETAFE
Andrew Purtell  Fillip Department of Industry, Science and Technology
Joyce Hitchen  NSW Local Government Industry Training Advisory Board
Nicky Solomon  NSW Local Government Industry Training Advisory Board
Carmel Darling  VET NT Government
Terry Selwood  DEET Canberra
Shirley Martin  AMES Victoria
Robyn Bergin  WELL Secretariat DEET Canberra
Jim Hopkins  NSW AMES
Julie McQueen  National Food Industry Training Advisory Board
Robyn Archer  National Food Industry Training Advisory Board
Vic Margan  TAFE NSW
Robert Bean  NLLIA
Rhonda Stewart  TCF Union Australia
Anna Russell  TAFE NSW
Robyn Paul  Sunraysia Trades and Labour Council
Rosemary Rainer  Holmsglen College of TAFE, Victoria
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TRAINING MODEL INTEGRATING WITH INDUSTRY
ENDORSED TRAINING SPECIFYING LANGUAGE AND
LITERACY OUTCOMES
APPENDIX 6

Training model integrating with industry endorsed training specifying English language and literacy outcomes

Example 1: CFMEU Vic Project

The CFMEU Project in Victoria is an example of this model. It has received $329,518 to develop and implement this model over the past two years in the Building and Construction Industry. Four competency based modules have been designed to meet the National Building and Construction Industry Training Council Competency Standards and the related requirements of the Certificate in General Education for Adults.

These training modules are:

- Plan reading
- Occupational Health and Safety
- Safe Work at Heights
- Enterprise Bargaining

In these modules English language and literacy competencies achieved are described in terms of the Certificate in General Education.

Example 2: Automotive Manufacturing Engineering Union Project

Provider: AMES VIC

The AMEU - Vehicle Division project is another example of this model. The project received $55,000 in 1994. One of the stated aims of the project is to integrate English language, literacy and numeracy skills development into the framework of mainstream union competency-based education provision. The outcomes of this project are documented in terms of mainstream competencies in such fields as enterprise bargaining and systems of work organisation, as well as Mayer Key competencies and English language and literacy competencies.
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Training models integrating with enterprise goals

*Ajax Spurways Fasteners Project, NSW, 1993*
*Program contractor: Swinburne University of Technology, Victoria*

The project was undertaken in 1993. The company has been working towards Australian Standard 3902 which requires employees to write down work instructions for operating machinery. With the guidance of English language and literacy teachers, the operators:

- wrote three work instructions,
- rewrote several work instructions into the plainer English language used on the floor,
- reinterpreted several others into their job specific contexts.

From the workplace personnel perspective, this project was successful because:

- it started by identifying a task which operators needed to be able to do then it moved to working out what the training needs were to achieve this task,
- it operated through the healthy consultative committee on site,
- it provided all managers with a train the trainers course which assured their commitment to and understanding of English language and literacy issues.

*Argyle Diamonds Project, WA, 1994*
*Program contractor: Argyle Diamonds. Provider: NT University.*

The project received $39,665 from the WELL Program in 1994. Some Aboriginal civil works crew at Argyle Diamond Mines in Western Australia are unable to access required training packages in job procedures. Due to the nature of the work, these training packages are accessed exclusively through self access means, i.e. reading the packages. The provider is rewriting some of these training packages so that they are more accessible. The training will still be self access training. As a result, the trainees will improve their reading skills through access to more reader friendly training materials as well as improving their work related knowledge and skills.
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Stand-alone training models

Mildura Fruit Co-op
Program Contractor: Sunraysia Trades and Labour Council

The small project in Mildura Fruit Co-op has consisted of general literacy skills courses located off site so that employees from a range of worksites can attend. The WELL Program gave $15,203 for this project in 1994. It is not tied to a restructuring program within the company. Because it involves employees going off site to training, it has not had high visibility with supervisors and therefore does not have their understanding and support. The tripartite arrangements between management, union and educator, however, are in place. It is strongly supported by the participants according to the program contractor and teacher, however the project has not been a catalyst for any other development in the company at this stage.

Diana Ferrari Shoes Manufacturing Company, Fairfield Vic
Program contractor: Melbourne School of Textiles

This is a small project for non-English speaking employees which commenced in late 1994 at the Diana Ferrari shoe manufacturing company which received $12,875 from WELL in 1994. The contractor is relatively new to the field of workplace English language and literacy training and the factory is planning to introduce a mainstream training program in 1995. At present the English language and literacy classes, held after shifts, are built around general English topics for employees whose English language skills are quite low. These classes are appreciated by the participants as improving their English and as a demonstration of goodwill on the part of the enterprise. The company’s longer term aim is to gradually introduce support for mainstream training for these employees through the current English language and literacy training project.
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Small business projects

1. WELL on Wheels

Program Contractor: Southbank Institute of TAFE Qld, 1994

Queensland Building Services Authority makes a 25% employer contribution and training are free to self-employed clients. A pilot small business strategy for domestic sector of building industry, commenced in September 1994. The domestic sector of the building industry is non-unionised and firms range from sole operators to firms of up to thirty irregular employees and subcontractors. This new project has been marketed through cold calling, direct mail out with monthly accounts, advertisements in trade journals. Two examples of current training are:

- letter writing, quotes and reading minor works contracts in one-to-two capacity in husband-and-wife team tiling firm’s home office,

- a one-to-one literacy support program to assist a sole operator plasterer access mainstream self paced small business course for licensed contractors.

2. Small Business Strategies

Program contractor: NSW AMES operating in 1994

Small Business Strategies are run in two locations, Wollongong and Sydney. Clients are from small businesses or from larger enterprises where only a few require training across industries. So far the program has assisted clients from eleven industries. The strategy markets itself as fast, focussed and flexible, teaching core values with elastic strategies. It features an on-site needs analysis and customised program design, and a multimode delivery pattern consisting of one face-to-face training hour to three hours of training delivered through other means, such as phone/fax consultations, learning contracts, mentor tutoring and access to other centres of learning such as participating libraries and AMES Individual Learning Centres etc. A fee of $349 is charged to the small business with which the client works, which represents the employer contribution. A very specific program of English language and literacy competencies required to drive taxis was designed for a taxi driver requiring English language and literacy skills to retain his licence. A specific literacy program was designed for a pharmacist’s assistant, in which the pharmacist acted as mentor and continued in the role after the forma training was completed.
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Reaching the WELL target group through indirect means

Containers Packaging Project QLD, 1994
Program contractor: Southbank Institute of TAFE

A Train the Trainers program which reached 36 NESB and ESB trainers to raise awareness of English language and literacy issues in training, and to enable trainers to deliver more effective training was conducted at Containers Packaging in Brisbane. The program consisted of two days of training and a review workshop at a later date. It was delivered four times with WELL funds and once with company funds. Company response was extremely positive. It was evaluated as the beginning of a move towards competency based training in the company.