

Assessment Policy and Procedures

The Australian Ideal College (AIC) Assessment Policy and Procedures establish the process of assessing student assessments, collecting relevant evidence and making informed judgements to evaluate student learning outcomes.

AIC has designed this policy and procedures to ensure that all student assessment tasks are appropriately designed to determine the extent to which students have met the learning and skills outcome requirements within a unit of competency and to assist trainers to make decisions about the performance of individual students within a unit of competency.

AIC will at all times comply with the Assessment Guidelines contained within the nationally endorsed Training Packages or the assessment requirements specified within accredited courses curriculum documents contained within the AIC scope of registration.

Competency

The courses offered by AIC incorporate competency based assessments. Competency involves the specification of skills and knowledge and their application to a particular standard of performance required in the workplace. The purpose of assessing competency is to confirm that students can perform to the standards expected in the workplace. Aspects of work performance included in this concept involve:

- Performance at an acceptable level of technical skill;
- Organising one's tasks;
- Responding and reacting appropriately when things go wrong; and
- Transferring skills and knowledge to new situations and contexts.

Assessments

Assessment is defined as the process of collecting evidence and making judgements on whether competency has been achieved, to confirm that an individual can perform to the standard expected in the workplace, as specified in a training package or VET accredited course.

AIC implements an assessment system that ensures that assessment:

- complies with the assessment requirements of the relevant training package or VET accredited course; and
- is conducted in accordance with the Principles of Assessment and the Rules of Evidence as detailed below.

The principles of assessment

Fairness

The individual learner's needs are considered in the assessment process.

Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments are applied by AIC to consider the individual learner's needs.

AIC informs the learner about the assessment process and provides the learner with the opportunity to challenge the result of the assessment and be reassessed if necessary.



Educating for Excellence

Australian Ideal College

Registered as Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd
RTO No.: 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code: 03053G

Sydney Campus: Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Adelaide Campus: Level 3, 21-23 Rundle Mall, Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

Hobart Campus: GRD Floor, 116 Murray Street, Hobart TAS 7000 Australia

T: +61-2-9262 2968 (Sydney) | +61-8-8123 5780 (Adelaide) | +61-3-6231 2141 (Hobart)

E: info@aic.edu.au | W: www.aic.edu.au

Flexibility

Assessment is flexible to the individual learner by:

- Reflecting the learner's needs;
- Assessing competencies held by the learner no matter how or where they have been acquired; and
- Drawing from a range of assessment methods and using those that are appropriate to the context, the unit of competency and associated assessment requirements, and the individual.

Validity

Any assessment decision of AIC is justified, based on the evidence of the individual learner's performance.

Validity requires:

- Assessment against the unit of competency and the associated assessment requirements covers the broad range of skills and knowledge that are essential to competent performance;
- Assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application;
- Assessment is based on evidence that demonstrates that a learner could demonstrate these skills and knowledge in other similar situations; and
- Judgement of competency is based on evidence of learner performance that is aligned to the unit/s of competency and associated assessment requirements.

Reliability

- Evidence presented for assessment is consistently interpreted and assessment results are comparable, irrespective of the assessor conducting the assessment.

The rules of evidence

Validity

The assessor is assured that the learner has the skills, knowledge and attributes described in the module or unit of competency and associated assessment requirements.

Sufficiency

The assessor is assured that the quality, quantity and relevance of the assessment evidence enable a judgement to be made of a learner's competency.

Authenticity

The assessor is assured that the evidence presented for assessment is the learner's own work.

Currency

The assessor is assured that the assessment evidence demonstrates current competency. This requires the assessment evidence to be from the present or the very recent past.

Assessors

The role of an assessor is to objectively assess and judge a student's evidence against a set of standards. In order to do this effectively, an assessor must be qualified, have a sound knowledge of, and be skilled in, the relevant industry area. In addition, the assessor must have acknowledged competency in assessment itself and hold an appropriate training and assessment qualification (Certificate IV in Training and Assessment) or equivalent.

An assessor must:

- Interpret and understand the criteria;
- Ensure that evidence meets the standards;
- Ensure that evidence is valid, authentic, reliable, consistent, current and sufficient; and



Educating for Excellence

Australian Ideal College

Registered as Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd
RTO No.: 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code: 03053G

Sydney Campus: Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Adelaide Campus: Level 3, 21-23 Rundle Mall, Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

Hobart Campus: GRD Floor, 116 Murray Street, Hobart TAS 7000 Australia

T: +61-2-9262 2968 (Sydney) | +61-8-8123 5780 (Adelaide) | +61-3-6231 2141 (Hobart)

E: info@aic.edu.au | W: www.aic.edu.au

- Use expertise to make fair and objective judgements.

The training and ongoing professional development of assessors must include such areas as:

- Roles, responsibilities and ethics;
- Procedural and administrative duties;
- Performance and knowledge evidence gathering and presentation;
- Interpretation and usage of standards;
- Selecting and using appropriate methods of assessment; and
- Requirements regarding processing and recording of results, progress and feedback.

It is crucial that assessors always understand and practise fair, objective, unbiased and flexible assessment processes.

Assessment methods

In general, assessment methods include, but are not limited to:

Methods	Examples of methods
Direct observation	Real work/real-time activities at the workplace, Work activities in a simulated workplace
Structured assessment activities	Role-plays, Projects, Reports, Presentations
Questioning	Written questions, Interviews, Self-evaluation, Verbal questioning, Questionnaires, Oral or written examinations
Evidence compiled by the candidate	Portfolios, Collections of work samples, Products with supporting documentation, Historical evidence, Journals/logbooks, Information about life experience
Review of products	Products as a result of a project, Work samples/products
Third-party feedback	Testimonials/reports from employers/supervisors, evidence of training, authenticated prior achievements, interviews with employers, supervisors or peers

Recognition of Prior Learning and Credit Transfer

Recognition of Prior Learning and Credit Transfer are recognized as assessment. The process has been addressed separately in RPL & Credit Transfer Policy and Procedures.

Assessment Information

All assessment information should be included in the unit outline/study guide which each student has the access on Moodle at the beginning of the unit.

All students who have enrolled any course in AIC will be informed of the assessments to be conducted at the course commencement and throughout the course. Students will be advised of general assessment tasks, criteria and requirements of each unit of competency they will need to attain to get the relevant qualification. They will be also provided with notice of when an assessment is to be conducted and provided with certain time for preparation and practice.

For the assessors, all trainers/assessors should be given the assessor guide, and they must mark the assessments by following the assessor guide.

Student Support

To maximize the chance of students successfully completing their studies, AIC will identify any support students need prior to their enrolment or commencement (whichever is the earliest) and provide access to that support throughout their study.

This may include providing

- Language, Literacy and Numeracy (LLN) support
- Additional tutorials
- Other mechanisms, such as assistance in using technology for online delivery components.

Assessment Submission:

Students are required to submit the assessment tasks by each submission due date specified on the Weekly Delivery Schedule. Assessment tasks submitted after the due date will be subject to a monetary penalty, i.e. reassessment fee unless the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager has given prior approval in writing for an extension of time to submit the assessment tasks, or mitigating circumstances apply.

All assessment tasks must be submitted online via Moodle submission portal on each unit assessment submission page, unless any special circumstance. The submitted assessment tasks must be accompanied by a signed and completed Assessment Submission Sheet (the Cover Page). Assessment tasks will not be accepted without a completed Assessment Submission Sheet (the Cover Page).

Assessment Result

All assessment results are treated as strictly confidential, and AIC will provide feedback to students about the outcomes of the assessment and provide further guidance on future options.

As students progress through a unit and complete the various assessment tasks, they are assessed on each task as “Satisfactory” or “Not yet satisfactory”, and if necessary, given an opportunity to resubmit the assessment at a mutually arranged time. Once all tasks of the unit have been completed satisfactorily, a result of “Competent” is granted, or otherwise, the result of “Not yet competent” is recorded.

Special consideration

Where a student anticipates that an assessment result will be impacted by special circumstances or the assessment outcome has been affected by any compelling or compassionate circumstances (e.g. ill health, bereavement etc.), they can apply for special consideration one (1) week before the due date to extend the date to submit assessment tasks or within two (2) weeks after the result is received. The supporting documents/evidence, such as doctor’s medical certificate, must be provided to support the extension request or the results affected.

Students may also contact Student Support Services for assistance with their application. Once the extension application is approved by the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager, students will be notified in writing.

Reasonable adjustment

Students seeking a reasonable adjustment in an assessment must discuss their requirements with their trainer or Director of Studies/Compliance Manager prior to the start of the component of study or at the



Educating for Excellence

Australian Ideal College

Registered as Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd
RTO No.: 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code: 03053G

Sydney Campus: Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Adelaide Campus: Level 3, 21-23 Rundle Mall, Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

Hobart Campus: GRD Floor, 116 Murray Street, Hobart TAS 7000 Australia

T: +61-2-9262 2968 (Sydney) | +61-8-8123 5780 (Adelaide) | +61-3-6231 2141 (Hobart)

E: info@aic.edu.au | W: www.aic.edu.au

earliest possible time once the class has commenced. Students may be requested to provide documentation to support their request for reasonable adjustment. Any reasonable adjustments to assessment during the period of teaching must be communicated with the student in writing by the trainer. A record of the reasonable adjustment must be documented and a copy kept in the student file.

Plagiarism

AIC will not tolerate plagiarism or cheating, and a penalty may be imposed if student is accused of either.

If a student is suspected of cheating, the trainer will investigate to establish evidence to support the suspicion. The trainer will notify the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager if there is evidence to support the suspicion and request a time to discuss the matter. The student will have the opportunity to counter the allegations made against him/her.

Once the student has provided the information, the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager will determine the seriousness of plagiarism and come to the following decisions:

- Resubmitting the assessment tasks; or
- Issuing a warning letter to the student for academic misconduct plus receiving "Not yet competent (NYC)" grade in that unit; or
- In very serious cases of plagiarism, student may be expelled from the College or refused re-enrolment in the course.

The affected student will be advised of all penalties in writing.

Assessment Feedback

Where students are assessed as "Not yet competent", they will be provided with the additional feedback on their assessment outcome to assist in achieving the required performance standard on reassessment. The feedback should be provided within 2 weeks by the trainer/assessor after marking.

Students should contact their assessor in the first instance if they are not satisfied with the result of an assessment item or the feedback provided.

After communicating with the assessor if they are still not satisfied with the assessment feedback and or result, they have the right to appeal.

Assessment Appeals

Students can appeal the recording of an "NYC" for any competency unit or learning outcome. If a student is not satisfied with the "NYC" decision, he/she needs to see the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager within 10 days of receiving the assessment result and feedback and requesting a review of evidence. The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager may organize a re-assessment for the student, depending on the circumstances, this may be with an independent assessor.

Reassessment

In a situation of an assessment task being marked as "NYC", students will be provided with an opportunity to resubmit the assessment ("the 2nd attempt") without paying the reassessment fee – on the conditions that students have submitted the 1st attempted assessment tasks by the original submission due date and students have demonstrated certain efforts, knowledge and skills about the unit of competency in the assessment tasks - normally within 1 week after reassessment opportunity is given. If the assessment is



still graded as “NYC”, a reassessment fee \$150 for each unit will apply for attempting the reassessment (“the 3rd attempt”).

Procedures

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this procedure is to outline the system used to plan, conduct and validate assessments.

2.0 Responsibility

- 2.1 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager is responsible for the implementation of this procedure and to ensure that staff are aware of its application and the staff implement its requirements
- 2.2 Trainers will inform students of the requirements for assessments and will ensure that they have every opportunity, consistent with the AQF, the AQTF, policy and procedures, to complete all assessments for a unit of competency.
- 2.3 Students are responsible for:
- undertaking scheduled assessments. If the student is unable to undertake the assessment at the scheduled time, the student must notify the trainer prior to the date of the assessment.
 - initiating the appeal process within the required time frame if are not satisfied with the assessment process and/or outcome.
 - applying for a special consideration or reasonable adjustments for assessment/reassessment.

3.0 Requirements

- 3.1 The method section defines the procedures used for planning, conducting and validating assessments. The method applies to assessments for the purposes of national recognition in both institutional and workplace contexts. Equally it applies to assessment only pathways, training and assessment pathways or Recognition of Prior Learning.
- 3.2 All assessment tasks must:
- comply with the Assessment Guidelines included in the applicable nationally endorsed Training Packages or the assessment requirements specified in accredited courses;
 - lead to the issuing of a Statement of Attainment or qualification under the AQF when a student is assessed as competent against nationally endorsed unit(s) of competency in the applicable Training Package or modules specified in the applicable accredited course;
 - comply with the Principles of Assessment and the Rules of Evidence;
 - provide for students to be informed of the context and purpose of the assessment and the assessment process;
 - where relevant, focus on the application of knowledge and skills to the standard of performance required in the workplace and cover all aspects of workplace performance, including task skills, task management skills, contingency management skills, job role environment skills, etc.;
 - involve the evaluation of sufficient evidence to enable judgements to be made about whether competency has been attained;
 - be provided feedback to students about the outcomes of the assessment process and

guidance on future options;

- be equitable for all students, taking account of cultural and linguistic needs; and
- provide for reassessment on appeal.

4.0 Method

4.1 Planning Assessment

- 4.1.1 The master copy of all training packages to be delivered is retained by the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager.
- 4.1.2 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager provides staff teaching a unit of competency with access to the relevant sections of the correct version of the training package and ensures that copies of training packages no longer delivered are withdrawn from circulation and marked obsolete. A master copy should be retained for RPL purposes.
- 4.1.3 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager confirms that industry and/or academic consultation and validation is undertaken in the preparation of assessment strategies.
- 4.1.4 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager, in consultation with trainers, determines forms of assessment (including RPL) and validation to be used for a unit of competency prior to inducting students into the course, ensuring sensitivity to cultural differences and special needs, and considering flexible and blended approaches to delivery and assessment.
- 4.1.5 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager, in consultation with trainers, ensures that assessment proposed is consistent with accredited learning outcomes/competencies, satisfies the principles of assessment and the rules of evidence and meets workplace and, where relevant, regulatory requirements.
- 4.1.6 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager, in consultation with trainers, ensures consistency of assessment/reassessment through agreed moderation processes, e.g. when different trainers are teaching the different classes by using same materials.
- 4.1.7 Moderation processes will be developed by the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager in consultation with trainers. This includes assessment through RPL.

4.2 Designing Assessment Tools

- 4.2.1 When developing assessment tools, assessors must follow the four-step process that produce quality outcomes:
 - Clarify the evidence requirements.
 - Choose the most appropriate assessment methods.
 - Design and develop the assessment tools.
 - Trial, refine and review the tools.
- 4.2.2 In order to decide what evidence assessors need to collect, they must be sure of the competency requirements by examining a number of sources of essential information including:
 - the elements of the unit(s) of competency, the performance criteria, required skills and knowledge, the range statement, the evidence guide, and assessment guidelines;
 - the employability skills;
 - the language, literacy and numeracy skill levels;

- the relevant Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) descriptor; and
 - related workplace processes, procedures and systems that help assessors to contextualise the activity they are required to assess. Be sure to include any legislative, WHS or legal requirements that may need to be considered when conducting assessment.
- 4.2.3 When choosing the assessment methods, assessors need to refer to the specific unit of competency and use them as a guide. To determine which methods will be used to gather the evidence, assessors need to collaborate with students as well as other trainers and industry representatives.
- 4.2.4 Assessment tools should provide clear guidance and support for students so that there is no ambiguity about what is required of them or the basis on which assessors will make decisions. Assessment tools generally make provision for the following requirements:
- the student's name;
 - the assessor's name;
 - the submission due date of assessment;
 - the title of the unit;
 - the context of the assessment;
 - the procedures of the assessment;
 - the list of knowledge/skills to be assessed;
 - the competence achieved/outcomes of the assessment tasks;
 - feedback to students;
 - the student's signature and the date;
 - the assessor's signature and the date;
 - the instructions to the student, the assessor or other evidence gatherer; and
 - the resource requirements of the assessment.
- 4.2.5 The tools must comply with the rules of evidence, for instance, the tool must facilitate the gathering of evidence that is:
- valid (covers all requirements of the unit of competency);
 - sufficient (enables you to make a decision about competence over time and in different situations);
 - current (competent performance is contemporaneous); and
 - authentic (is the student's own work).
- 4.2.6 To ensure that assessment tools are consistent with the requirements of the training package and training and assessment strategy, assessor must review the tools using the Assessment Design Checklist. Also inviting feedback from peers, students and industry will confirm that the tools enable effective collection of evidence and that the level of difficulty is appropriate to the qualification level.

4.3 Conducting Assessment

- 4.3.1 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager advises all staff and students, prior to the commencement of the course, of the following information:
- RPL process;
 - withdrawal procedure;
 - special consideration ;

- support for students with special needs;
- assessment misconduct process e.g. Plagiarism or cheating
- appeals process

4.3.2 Trainer advises students in the first week's classes of each unit of (where applicable) as follows:

- the context and purpose of assessment and assessment process;
- the methods of assessment e.g. essays, presentation, role play, a project, group discussion, evidence portfolios, written test ;
- conditions and options for submission of work;
- the (evidence) requirements, including assessment/performance criteria;
- Required facilities, equipment and materials available;
- timelines for assessment, including the submission due dates and the dates by which assessment is to be finalised;
- results categories to be used, e.g. Competent/Not yet competent;
- any attendance requirement;
- details, if relevant, of the penalties for the assessments submitted after the stated submission due date;
- relevant information concerning what is considered acceptable in terms of essay, assignment and/or report formats, as applicable;
- details of materials and equipment that may be used in assessment tasks, e.g. calculators for accounting students, or dictionaries for translating students;
- alternative approaches to the assessment process;
- the advisability of retaining a copy of submitted materials, where appropriate;
- re-assessment options.

4.3.3 Students will have every opportunity to complete all assessment tasks for a unit of competency during the enrolled period. Students experiencing difficulty in completing assessment tasks may be invited to participate in tutorials in addition to their scheduled class. This may be initiated by the trainer or requested by the student. This tutorial will provide the student with an appraisal of their performance, strategies for improvement and a timeframe for a subsequent performance appraisal.

4.4 Marking Assessment Process

- 4.4.1 Trainers/assessors will be given the assessor marketing guide before delivering the unit. Trainers/Assessors will access and study the assessor marking guide prior to teaching and assessing the unit of competency. Assessment must be conducted as set down in the assessor marking guide
- 4.4.2 Trainers/assessors will use the assessor marking guide to make the judgement of evidence for every assessment task. This means there will be consistent assessor decision-making across the assessors teaching the same unit.
- 4.4.3 Trainers/assessors should check the assessment authenticity by making sure that each student has signed and dated on the assessment cover sheet.
- 4.4.4 A student will be deemed to have not successfully completed an assessment attempt if he/she:
- doesn't demonstrate the required level of competency in the completion of the task; or

- doesn't present in class for a scheduled assessment without a compelling or compassionate reason; or
 - doesn't submit an assessment by the due date without a compelling or compassionate reason; or
 - has been excluded from the assessment activity due to a disciplinary action.
- 4.4.5 If a student does not demonstrate the required level of competency on his/her first attempt, he/she must be provided with:
- timely feedback on his/her performance, and
 - information about options for further assessment (the student must be clearly informed that he/she carries the responsibility to make arrangements with the assessor for a 2nd assessment attempt).
- 4.4.6 Competency Record Sheet must be completed and signed by the student and the assessor at the completion of the assessment process
- 4.4.7 As a student progresses through a unit and completes the various assessment tasks, they are assessed on each task as 'satisfactory' or 'not satisfactory', and, if necessary, given an opportunity to resubmit the assessment at a mutually arranged time. Once all tasks for the unit have been completed satisfactorily, a result of 'Competent' or 'Not yet Competent' is recorded.
- 4.4.8 All assessment results are treated as strictly confidential and AIC will provide feedback to students about the outcomes of the assessment and provide further guidance on future options.
- 4.4.9 Student (s) has opportunity to dispute assessor's decision and request remark according to AIC's complaints and appeals policy.
- 4.4.10 If the assessment is marked Not Yet Competent, student (s) won't get the qualification certificate and/or statement of results.

4.5 Reporting Assessment Results

- 4.5.1 Trainers/assessors record assessment results by exporting the Grade Reports on Moodle unit page and the results will be uploaded to the RTOManager system by each trainer.
- 4.5.2 Trainers/assessors submit the signed and dated Grade Reports to the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager on the completion of the unit.
- 4.5.3 Assessment Grade Reports will be saved and kept in an electronic folder according to the class, which should be securely retained.
- 4.5.4 All academic result will be approved by the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager onto the RTOManager system

4.6 Assessment appeal

- 4.6.1 Students are able to appeal the recording of an "NYC" for any competency unit or learning outcome and need to fill in the Assessment/Reassessment Appeal Form with all relevant supporting documents (such as class notes, class activities, etc.). The student will take all documents to see the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager to discuss the appeal. The Assessment/Reassessment Appeal Form can be collected from the reception or downloaded via <https://aic.edu.au/pre-enrolment-information/useful-downloads>.



- 4.6.2 If the student and Director of Studies/Compliance Manager come to an agreement in relation to the “NYC” grade, the appeal is complete. An agreement could be but is not limited to a remarking of the previously submitted assessment or an understanding of the student why he/she was not declared “Competent” in that unit/subject.
- 4.6.3 The appeal has to be lodged within 10 days of receiving the assessment result and feedback.

4.7 Reassessment

- 4.7.1 If a student is not competent after the appeal, it is necessary for the student to do a reassessment. Additionally, students who decide not to appeal will have to address their NYC subject by attempting a reassessment. The following process shall be followed:
- (a) Student should discuss the circumstances with their trainer and/or the Director of Studies/ Compliance Manager within ten (10) working days of notification of the assessment result;
 - (b) The Director of Studies/ Compliance Manager will initiate a review with the trainer and student together to determine if a reassessment is warranted. The review should include giving the student access to marked scripts or other assessment materials, where relevant;
 - (c) The review is to be conducted within five (5) working days of the student approaching the trainer/Director of Studies/Compliance Manager;
- 4.7.2 If a reassessment has been agreed to and completed, it is the responsibility of The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager to amend the result within five (5) working days of the reassessment being conducted.
- 4.7.3 Students who got NYC due to any of the following circumstances should pay \$150 for attempting the reassessment of a failed unit.
- Student missed the due date or has not submitted the assessment by the original submission due date;
 - Student has submitted the assessment by the original submission due date, but it is marked as “NYC”. The student is given another attempt to resubmit the assessment but fails to resubmit the assessment by the 2nd given due date or get “NYC” again after the 2nd attempt;
 - Student got NYC from the auto notification sent by Moodle but choose not to appeal or the appeal date has passed;
 - Student appeals the result but the marking of NYC remains unchanged
- 4.7.4 Once the result of each unit is submitted by the trainer, trainer cannot give another chance to students but should advise them to contact the DoS/CM;
- 4.7.5 A reassessment fee spreadsheet for payment will be created to follow up with accounts
- 4.7.6 Students will be notified in writing that the submission portal on Moodle is re-opened or any other submission options are provided to them once the reassessment fee is received;
- 4.7.7 A spreadsheet for reassessment will be prepared for each unit, each term and sent to trainers to check and mark;
- 4.7.8 DoS/CM will follow up on reassessment results with trainers
- 4.7.9 Trainers to update RTO, Moodle and the spreadsheet as per the reassessment results and the sheet to be sent back to DoS/CM;
- 4.7.10 At the end of the term students’ progress will be monitored and warnings to be sent

4.8 Repeating Units

- 4.8.1 Students who do not have satisfactory attendance and/or have not had reasonable participation in assessments and/or have failed all attempted units in one study period will be required to repeat the units for that particular term.
- 4.8.2 Any student who is not granted for doing the reassessment by the Director of Studies/Compliance Manager will be required to repeat the term(s) and relevant term fee will be applied. The student's Confirmation of Enrolment (CoE) will be extended, if required.

4.9 Moderation and Validation of Assessment

- 4.9.1 For validation and moderation purposes, The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager arranges for the retention of a representative sample of completed assessment materials. Completed student assessment tasks are the actual pieces of work completed by a student or evidence of that work, including evidence collected for RPL. An assessor's completed marking guide, criteria and observation checklist for each student should be securely retained.
- 4.9.2 Arrangements for moderation and validation are to be documented in the Assessment Moderation and Validation Form. In addition, Assessment Validation and Moderation Policy and Procedure provides a guide to developing and implementing strategies and some tools to use.
- 4.9.3 Validation may be undertaken through a 'team' approach where, collectively, team members hold the required qualification, skill and knowledge. Trainers and assessors can be involved in validation activities.
- 4.9.4 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager will ensure that assessment strategies are validated by:
 - reviewing, comparing and evaluating the assessment processes, tools and evidence contributing to judgements made by a range of assessors against the same unit, at least annually. These may be internal processes with stakeholder involvement or external validations with other providers and/or stakeholders.
 - documenting any action taken to improve the quality and consistency of assessment.
- 4.9.5 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager ensures that strategies for improvement, in accordance with the above, are implemented, reviewed and followed up.

4.10 Retention of Assessments

- 4.10.1 To meet the retention requirements of completed student assessment items to demonstrate the compliance with the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015 (the Standards), marked copies of students' performance on the assessment materials/marketing guide are to be securely retained on Moodle or/and other electronic folders for:
 - the duration of AIC's assessment appeal period; or
 - a period of six months from the date on which the judgement of competence for the student was made; or
 - the duration of the student's enrolment – whichever is the longer period.



Educating for Excellence

Australian Ideal College

Registered as Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd

RTO No.: 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code: 03053G

Sydney Campus: Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia

Adelaide Campus: Level 3, 21-23 Rundle Mall, Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

Hobart Campus: GRD Floor, 116 Murray Street, Hobart TAS 7000 Australia

T: +61-2-9262 2968 (Sydney) | +61-8-8123 5780 (Adelaide) | +61-3-6231 2141 (Hobart)

E: info@aic.edu.au | W: www.aic.edu.au

- 4.10.2 The Director of Studies/Compliance Manager should refer to specific regulatory requirements regarding records retention for qualifications, courses or units of competency that lead to regulated/licensed outcomes.



Educating for Excellence

APPENDIX A

AI Use Policy

Purpose

Australian Ideal College (AIC) acknowledges that Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools—such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, and others—can positively support student learning and creativity when used responsibly. This policy outlines the appropriate and ethical use of AI by students to ensure that assessment submissions remain an authentic reflection of their individual work.

AIC believes AI tools can enrich the student learning experience when used with integrity and intention. By placing the student's voice and understanding at the centre of all assessment tasks, AIC ensures that education remains meaningful, fair, and future focused.

Acceptable Use of AI

Students are permitted and encouraged to use AI tools in ways that enhance learning, creativity, and academic development—provided the final work submitted is their own. Acceptable uses of AI include:

- Brainstorming ideas or structuring an outline
- Rephrasing or refining a student's original writing
- Summarising difficult concepts for better understanding
- Improving grammar, vocabulary, or sentence flow in a written draft

When used in this way, AI acts as a learning assistant—not a replacement for a student's thinking.

Unacceptable Use of AI

AI use is considered inappropriate when it compromises the authenticity of a student's work. Unacceptable uses include:

- Submitting responses that are mostly or entirely generated by AI tools
- Copying AI-generated content without personal contribution or understanding
- Using AI to answer assessment tasks that are intended to evaluate the student's own knowledge or skill
- Failing to acknowledge AI use when required

Such use may be treated as plagiarism or academic misconduct under AIC's Academic Integrity Policy.

Declaration of AI Use

When AI tools have been used to support the development of a submission (e.g., for rewording or grammar checking), the student is expected to include a brief declaration. An example may be:

“ChatGPT was used on 10 May 2025 to help rephrase the introduction and correct grammatical errors.”

This ensures transparency and demonstrates academic honesty.

How Inappropriate AI Use Is Detected

Trainers and academic staff at AIC are trained to identify signs of inappropriate AI use through both qualitative and technical means. Common detection methods include:

- Sudden shifts in writing style, structure, or vocabulary that do not match a student's known ability
- Responses that lack understanding, where the student cannot explain what they wrote
- Content that appears overly generic, vague, or padded, often a sign of AI generation
- Unusual formatting or inconsistent referencing, such as invented citations or unverified sources



Educating for Excellence

- Use of AI-detection tools, which flag probable AI-generated text

For example: A student who has previously struggled with grammar submits a polished 1,500-word essay using advanced terminology and academic phrasing. When asked, the student cannot explain key points from their own submission. This triggers a review and reminder process.

Detection is always followed by verification. Students will be given a chance to clarify and explain their work.

Process for Addressing Inappropriate AI Use

AIC uses a staged process to support students in understanding responsible AI use, while upholding academic integrity:

Step 1: First Instance – Reminder and Guidance

If inappropriate AI use is detected for the first time, the trainer will provide a verbal or written reminder to the student (i.e. by email or comments on Moodle).

The trainer will explain why the AI use was inappropriate and provide guidance on proper usage for future tasks.

Step 2: Second Instance – Assessment Marked Not Yet Competent (NYC)

If a breach is repeated, the trainer is directed to mark the student's assessment as Not Yet Competent (NYC) and indicate on Moodle of inappropriate AI use.

The student may be given the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment following corrective advice.

Step 3: Ongoing or Serious Breaches – Escalation to Academic Department

Continued misuse across multiple units or a serious breach will result in escalation to the Academic Department.

The Academic Department may:

- Issue a formal written warning
- Require the student to attend counselling or academic support sessions
- In extreme or repeated cases, proceed with revocation of the student's Certificate of Enrolment, in accordance with AIC's misconduct procedures

Support and Clarification

Students who are unsure whether their intended use of AI is appropriate should be encouraged to speak with their trainer or course coordinator prior to submission. AIC staff are available to provide clarification and support.