



Assessment System Policy and Procedure

1. Purpose

To ensure that Australian Ideal College's assessment practices are compliant, consistent, and promote valid, reliable, and flexible assessment outcomes that meet the requirements of training packages and accredited courses, while also supporting continuous improvement and strong industry alignment.

2. Rationale

Australian Ideal College is committed to providing high-quality, industry-relevant assessment services that support student achievement, meet workplace expectations, and comply with the Standards for RTOs 2025. Assessment is a central component of the training and assessment strategy and ensures students are assessed fairly and accurately, based on demonstrable evidence of competence in realistic contexts.

A documented and quality-assured assessment system enhances transparency and consistency in assessment decisions, safeguards integrity, and builds trust among students, employers, and regulators. This policy ensures that all assessments uphold the principles of assessment and rules of evidence, are informed by contextual factors and workplace relevance, and are validated and refined through regular consultation with industry and internal quality processes.

3. Policy Statement

Australian Ideal College ensures that all assessment systems, tools, and processes:

- Are aligned to the requirements of the relevant training product, including elements, performance criteria, foundation skills, range of conditions, and assessment requirements;
- Are valid, fair, flexible, and reliable, and consider the needs of diverse students, where required reasonable adjustments are identified and implemented;
- Are consistent with the level of difficulty, performance expectations and workplace relevance of the qualification being assessed;
- Are developed through structured processes that include tool review, trialling, and industry consultation;
- Are conducted by assessors who meet or exceed current vocational and assessor competency requirements;
- Include rigorous pre- and post-assessment validation processes to verify alignment and comparability of judgements;
- Include formal reviews of each tool prior to implementation, ensuring alignment with the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence;
- Use the outcomes of tool reviews and trialling to inform any necessary changes before use;
- Incorporate moderation activities between assessors to ensure consistent interpretation of assessment evidence and outcomes;
- Promote academic integrity and include safeguards against unauthorised assistance and plagiarism;
- Are reviewed regularly through validation, feedback mechanisms, and continuous improvement initiatives;
- Incorporate industry input to reflect current practices and workplace requirements.

4. Assessment System

The assessment system at Australian Ideal College includes structured processes for assessment development, implementation, and continuous review. All assessment tools are contextualised for the cohort and delivery mode. Commercial assessment tools are not used 'off-the-shelf' without adaptation. Each tool is developed and validated to

Sydney ● Adelaide ● Hobart

Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd | RTO 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code 03053G

Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia | (+61 2) 9262 2968 | info@aic.edu.au | www.aic.edu.au



ensure alignment with the training package and the principles of assessment and rules of evidence. Mapping documents and assessor guides are provided to ensure consistent application.

Assessment tools must undergo formal pre-use review using a structured review checklist. This review confirms that the tasks are fair, flexible, valid, reliable, and allow for the collection of evidence that is valid, sufficient, authentic, and current. The outcomes of each review are documented, and changes must be implemented prior to tool approval and deployment. A version history log records revisions.

Where possible, tools are trialled with a group representative of the student cohort, and reviewed by industry representatives to confirm workplace relevance. Trial feedback informs adjustments to the tools prior to delivery.

The assessment system includes provisions for digital and remote delivery, ensuring accessibility, version control, and secure submission protocols through LMS or equivalent systems. All digital assessment tools and LMS-based resources are subject to the same pre-use review, contextualisation, and version control processes as hard-copy materials, with updates recorded in the Assessment Tool Version History Log.

The assessment system accommodates recognition of prior learning and credit transfer where appropriate, enabling students to demonstrate competence regardless of how or where learning was acquired.

Australian Ideal College ensures that all assessments address the full range of competency dimensions:

- Task Skills – performing the actual work activity;
- Task Management Skills – managing multiple tasks and responsibilities;
- Contingency Management Skills – responding to irregularities and problems;
- Job/Role Environment Skills – fitting into the workplace and working with others;
- Transfer Skills – applying learning in new contexts or environments.

Assessment Tools

Australian Ideal College does not use commercial assessment tools “off the shelf” without thorough review. Where third-party resources are adapted, they are mapped against the unit of competency, validated for contextual relevance, and modified to meet the needs of the delivery mode and student cohort. Evidence of mapping and contextualisation is maintained.

All new or substantially revised assessment tools undergo a mandatory pre-use review and where possible the assessment tools are trialled with trainers and assessors prior to implementation. The purpose of trialling is to ensure clarity, usability, and appropriateness for the target cohort. Further, where possible, tools are also reviewed by an industry representative to confirm relevance and contextual alignment. Trial feedback informs tool adjustments and is documented in the Continuous Improvement Log.

Types of Assessment

Assessment practices incorporate two levels of evaluation:

- Formative assessment to monitor learning progress and provide feedback;
- Summative assessment to make the final judgement of competence based on the full range of evidence gathered through structured assessment tasks.



Workplace Assessment

Where assessment occurs in a workplace or simulated workplace, Australian Ideal College ensures the environment meets training package requirements and provides access to industry-relevant tools and tasks. Workplace supervisors may contribute third-party reports which supplements other evidence, but final competency decisions remain the responsibility of a qualified assessor. Australian Ideal College ensures workplace arrangements are documented, and students and supervisors are aware of their responsibilities.

All training products will be validated at least once every five years, and more frequently where training products are updated, risks to quality are identified, or feedback indicates assessment issues. See Moderation Policy and Procedure and Validation Policy and Procedures

Assessment tools are tracked using version control documentation, and updates are recorded in the Continuous Improvement Register.

Simulated Work Environment

Where assessments are conducted in simulated environments, Australian Ideal College ensures that the conditions replicate the workplace to the extent required by the relevant training package or accredited course. Simulations must reflect:

- Realistic performance expectations, including productivity and safety standards;
- Access to tools, equipment, and documentation commonly used in the workplace;
- Conditions that allow demonstration of all required dimensions of competency (task, management, contingency, job role, and environment).

These simulations are developed with input from industry stakeholders and validated to confirm their appropriateness.

Validation Program

Validation processes are risk-based and prioritised according to the training product's risk profile. Validation is scheduled after each term, and samples are selected based on assessor, product, and student cohorts. Where possible, an independent validator or a second assessor with relevant vocational and TAE credentials participates in the review. Results are recorded in the validation register, and any non-compliances trigger immediate review and rectification actions.

While moderation is not mandatory, Australian Ideal College implements it as a quality assurance strategy, particularly when qualifications are newly added to scope or when new assessors are engaged.

Academic Integrity and Authenticity

Australian Ideal College upholds authenticity through direct assessor observation, student declarations, and, where appropriate, use of tools to detect plagiarism and unauthorised assistance. Assessors are trained to identify inconsistencies in student submissions and may conduct follow-up interviews to verify knowledge. Australian Ideal College applies its Academic Integrity Policy to guide the handling of breaches. See Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures.

To further support authenticity, Australian Ideal College verifies student identity prior to assessment using photo ID checks, digital platform access controls, or assessor confirmation of enrolment. See the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure.



Assessor Code of Conduct

Australian Ideal College assessors agree to a code of conduct that includes: making evidence-based, impartial decisions; maintaining confidentiality; avoiding conflicts of interest; participating in professional development; and upholding the principles of assessment and the rules of evidence. Assessors must also ensure that the safety, dignity, and rights of students are respected throughout the assessment process.

Student Assessment Submission

- Must be submitted by due date specified in the Weekly Delivery Schedule on or before the Due Date to avoid penalty.
- Submission must be on Moodle Platform (unless prior approval has been gained) and must include,
 - A signed and completed Assessment Submission Sheet (cover page).
- Penalty for late submission or reassessment of submission may incur a fee if prior approval in writing has not been granted by the Academic Manager

Assessment Result

- Confidential feedback is given to students on assessment outcomes including guidance for reassessment if necessary
- Tasks are assessed as 'Satisfactory' or 'Not Yet Satisfactory' with options to resubmit.
- If all tasks are Satisfactorily completed a result of 'Competent' is granted.
- If all tasks are Not Satisfactorily completed a result of 'Not Yet Competent' is recorded.

Assessment Feedback

- Where students are assessed as Not Yet Competent, they are provided with additional feedback on their assessment outcome within 2 weeks of marking to assist in achieving the required standard on reassessment.
- Students are encouraged to contact their assessor in the first instance if they are not satisfied with the assessment outcome or feedback provided.
- After communication with the assessor if they are still not satisfied with the assessment outcome and/or result, they have the right to appeal.

Assessment Appeals

- The student may appeal through the Appeal form on the website or, contacting the Academic Manager within 10 days of receiving the NYC result. The Academic Manager may organise reassessment using an independent assessor depending on circumstances.

Reassessment

- In the situation of an assessment task being recorded as 'NYS' students will be provided with the opportunity to resubmit the assessment (the 2nd attempt) without paying a reassessment fee based on the condition that the student has submitted the 1st attempted assessment tasks by the scheduled submission due date and the student has demonstrated effort, knowledge and skills about the unit of competency in the assessment tasks – normally within 1 week after reassessment opportunity is given.

If assessment outcome for attempt 2 is 'NYS' a reassessment fee of \$150 for each Unit will apply for attempting the reassessment (3rd attempt).



5. Scope

This policy applies to the design, implementation, monitoring and continuous improvement of the RTO's assessment system, including assessment tools, assessor qualifications, validation, moderation, and quality assurance mechanisms to ensure compliance with the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence.

6. Definitions

Assessment – A process of gathering evidence and making judgements about a student's competence against unit requirements.

Assessment System – The coordinated policies, processes, and tools that support the consistent and compliant implementation of assessment.

Assessment Mapping Template – A structured document that maps each task and evidence requirement to the relevant unit of competency elements and performance criteria.

Assessment Tool – A structured process undertaken prior to the implementation of an assessment tool, to verify alignment with unit requirements, the Principles of Assessment, and the Rules of Evidence. Reviews are documented and used to inform improvements before use including instructions, tasks, benchmarks, and decision-making criteria.

Assessor – An individual who meets the training and assessment and vocational competency requirements to assess competency.

Authenticity Tools - Systems or methods used to confirm that submitted assessment evidence is the student's own work. May include ID checks, plagiarism detection, follow-up questioning, or observation.

Competency-Based Assessment – An approach that determines whether a person can demonstrate the skills and knowledge required to perform to a defined standard.

Contextualisation - The process of adapting assessment materials to suit the characteristics of the learner cohort, the mode of delivery, and the specific workplace or vocational context, while maintaining the integrity of the training product.

Fit-for Purpose Assessment - An assessment approach that is valid for the context, delivery mode, and student cohort, and enables accurate and consistent assessment of competence in accordance with the training product.

Moderation - the process of bringing assessment judgements and standards into alignment. It is a process that ensures the same standards are applied to all student assessment results within a unit of competency or module. Moderation is generally conducted after assessment and is focused on making valid assessment decisions.

Post-Assessment Validation – Validation of assessment decisions and tools after use, to confirm consistency and effectiveness.

Pre-Use Review – Assessment tools are reviewed prior to use to ensure they are appropriate and meet the rules of evidence and the principles of assessment.

Reasonable adjustments include any adjustments for a VET student with a disability made by an RTO in a manner consistent with the Disability Standards for Education 2005.

Validation – A quality review process that confirms assessment tools and practices are aligned with unit requirements and produce quality evidence.

Sydney ● Adelaide ● Hobart

Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd | RTO 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code 03053G

Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia | (+61 2) 9262 2968 | info@aic.edu.au | www.aic.edu.au



7. Responsibilities

Academic Manager: Leads the implementation, review, and quality assurance of the assessment system.

Trainers and Assessors: Deliver and manage assessment processes and participate in validation and continuous improvement.

Director of VET and Compliance: Oversees assessment records, monitoring reports, and quality assurance outcomes.

Validation Panel / Assessment Lead / Director of Vet and Compliance – Co-ordinates structured reviews of assessment tools prior to implementation, ensures documentation of review outcomes, and confirms incorporation of required revisions. Compliance Officer or delegated Assessment Lead reviews and approves all validation reports and ensures recommended actions are implemented across AIC's delivery sites

8. Legislative and Regulatory Requirements

Outcome Standards for RTOs 2025

Standard 1.3: The assessment system is fit-for-purpose and consistent with the training product

Standard 1.4: The assessment system ensures assessment is conducted in a fair and appropriate way and enables accurate judgements of VET student competency.

National Principles for Assessment Integrity – although not mandatory it supports fair, valid, and reliable assessment practice across the VET sector.

National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011

Australian Qualifications Framework

Relevant Training Package or Accredited Course Requirements

9. Procedure:

Australian Ideal College maintains a robust and comprehensive assessment system to ensure that assessment judgements are consistent, valid, reliable, fair, and based on the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence. The system supports the delivery of high-quality assessment outcomes and provides assurance that student competency is determined with integrity.

Assessment practices are underpinned by documented policies and procedures that guide tool development, assessor qualifications, and ongoing quality assurance. All assessment tools are validated prior to use, mapped to training package requirements, and contextualised to meet the needs of the student cohort. These tools include clear instructions, benchmarks, and marking guides to ensure consistency of judgement across assessors.

Assessment is conducted by assessors who possess the vocational competencies, training and assessment credentials, and current industry skills required under the Standards. Australian Ideal College verifies and records these credentials as part of its workforce planning and induction processes. Assessors are supported through ongoing professional development and access to clear guidance on the use of assessment tools.

Sydney ● Adelaide ● Hobart

Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd | RTO 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code 03053G
Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia | (+61 2) 9262 2968 | info@aic.edu.au | www.aic.edu.au



Educating for Excellence

Prior to assessment, students are informed of the assessment process, criteria, available support, and academic integrity requirements. Where required, reasonable adjustments are implemented in consultation with the student and documented using the Reasonable Adjustment Record Form, ensuring assessment outcomes are not compromised.

Assessments are conducted using validated tools in conditions that reflect real or simulated workplace contexts. A variety of methods are used to collect evidence, which is assessed against defined benchmarks. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is available and assessed in accordance with relevant policy and the Rules of Evidence.

Post-assessment, students receive timely and constructive feedback. Assessment decisions are recorded clearly in the Student Management System, and evidence is stored securely in accordance with the records management policy. Where students are not competent, structured opportunities for reassessment, including support and gap training, are provided.

Assessment quality is monitored through scheduled validation of assessment tools and completed assessments. Moderation may also be used to confirm consistency of assessor judgements, particularly when new qualifications or assessors are introduced. Continuous improvement is supported through analysis of validation outcomes, student and industry feedback, and assessor input.

Students have the right to request a review of their assessment outcome and may access the Complaints and Appeals process where required.

Procedure as step-by-step approach is below.

Procedure Step	Action	Responsible	Timeframe
1. Develop Assessment Tools	Design tools mapped to unit requirements, with clear benchmarks and marking guides.	Training Product Developer / Lead Assessor	Prior to training product delivery
2. Validate Assessment Tools	Conduct pre-use review to ensure alignment with unit requirements, Rules of Evidence, and Principles of Assessment.	Quality Assurance Officer / Validation Panel	Before first use
3. Schedule and Prepare Assessments	Schedule assessments and inform students of requirements, academic integrity, and support options.	Trainer/Assessor	Start of each unit/module
4. Conduct Assessment	Use validated tools to assess under realistic conditions. Collect and document evidence.	Trainer/Assessor	During or end of unit/module
5. Make Assessment Judgement	Assess evidence against benchmarks. Ensure decisions meet Rules of Evidence.	Trainer/Assessor	Within 10 working days
6. Provide Feedback	Offer clear, constructive feedback and explain reassessment or appeal options.	Trainer/Assessor	Within 10 working days
7. Record and Report Results	Record outcomes in SMS and ensure records are accurate and retained according to data requirements	Trainer / Admin	Within 5 working days
8. Implement Reasonable Adjustments	Identify and apply adjustments without compromising competency. Record on appropriate form.	Trainer/Assessor	As required

Sydney ● Adelaide ● Hobart

Australian Ideal College Pty Ltd | RTO 91679 | CRICOS Provider Code 03053G

Level 7 & 8, 75 King Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia | (+61 2) 9262 2968 | info@aic.edu.au | www.aic.edu.au

9. Conduct Post-Assessment Validation	Validate completed assessments to confirm judgement consistency in accord with Validation Program.	Validation Panel / Compliance Officer	Every 5 years per unit or when triggered
10. Store Assessment Evidence	Securely retain completed tools, outcomes, and supporting evidence.	Admin / Compliance Officer	As per retention schedule
11. Continuous Improvement	Analyse data from validation, feedback, and complaints to improve assessment practice.	RTO Manager / QA Officer	Ongoing; each validation cycle

Detailed Procedure for Conducting Assessment

- The Academic Manager advises all staff and students, prior to the commencement of the course, of the following information:
 - RPL process.
 - withdrawal procedure
 - reasonable adjustment and other support available
 - assessment misconduct process e.g. Plagiarism, cheating inappropriate use of AI
 - appeals process
- 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.
 - 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.
- 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 in the task, strategies for improvement and a timeframe for subsequent review.



Assessment appeal

- Students can 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 Academic 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>.
- If the student and Academic 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.
- The appeal must be lodged within 10 days of receiving the assessment result and feedback.

Reassessment

- If a student is not competent after the appeal, it is necessary for the student to complete 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:
 - Student should discuss the circumstances with their trainer and/or the Academic Manager within ten (10) working days of notification of the assessment result;
 - The Academic 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;
 - The review is to be conducted within five (5) working days of the student approaching the trainer/academic manager;
- If a reassessment has been agreed to and completed, it is the responsibility of Academic Manager to amend the result within five (5) working days of the reassessment being conducted.
- Students who receive NYC due to any of the following circumstances must pay \$150 for attempting the reassessment of a not competent 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 receive 'NYC' again after the 2nd attempt.
 - Student receives NYC from the auto notification sent by Moodle but chooses not to appeal or the appeal date has passed.
 - Student appeals the result, but the marking of NYC remains unchanged
- 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 Academic Manager;
- A reassessment fee spreadsheet for payment will be created to follow up with accounts
- 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
- A spreadsheet for reassessment will be prepared for each unit, each term and sent to trainers to check and mark.
- Academic Manager will follow up on reassessment results with trainers
- Trainers to update RTO, Moodle and the spreadsheet as per the reassessment results and the sheet to be sent back to Academic Manager.
- At the end of the term students' progress will be monitored and warnings to be sent.



Repeating Units

- Students who do not have satisfactory attendance and/or have not had reasonable participation in assessments and/or have been NYC in all attempted units in one study period will be required to repeat the units for that particular term.
- Any student who is not granted for doing the reassessment by the Academic 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.

10. Policy Implementation

This policy will be referenced in the Staff Handbook and disseminated to all training and assessment personnel. Assessors will participate in ongoing professional training to ensure consistent understanding and implementation of the policy.

11. Recordkeeping Requirements

- Assessments are retained securely on the Moodle Platform student's file
 - The duration of the College assessment appeal period; or
 - for a period of two (2) years from the date the student is assessed as competent

12. Monitoring and Evaluation:

Assessment practices will be monitored through:

- Annual internal audits
- Complaints and appeals outcomes
- Feedback from students, employers, and industry representatives
- Internal validation and moderation activities
- Professional development participation and competency mapping

See the Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Procedures for further details.

Document Control

Document Title	Assessment System Policy and Procedures		
Approved By	CEO		
Date Approved	2/10/2025		
Next Review Due	2/10/2026		
Standards/Legislation	SRTO's 2025 1.3 and 1.4 NC 2,6,8		
Version	5.0		
Version #	Changes	Approval By	Approval Date
1.0	Initial version	CEO	10/06/2011
2.0	Update format and wording	CEO	10/01/2013
3.0	Major updates in wording	CEO	01/06/2023
4.0	Update to add AI	CEO	01/05/2025
5.0	Update SRTO's 2025	CEO	02/10/2025