

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| AUDIENCE | INTERNAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | EXTERNAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| POLICY ID | EDN-036-POL – VET Assessment Policy and Procedure | |
| RESPONSIBLE OFFICER | National Manager, Operations and Governance | |
| CONTACT OFFICER | National Manager, Operations and Governance or National Compliance Coordinator | |
| APPROVED BY | Continuous Improvement Committee | |
| ENDORSEMENT DATE | 24/08/16 | |
| EFFECTIVE DATE | 24/08/16 | |
| VERSION | 12 | |
| SUPERSEDES | 11 | |
| REVIEW DATE | 28/11/16 | |

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 2 |
| 2. Scope | 3 |
| 3. Legislative Context | 3 |
| 4. Definitions | 3 |
| 5. Policy Statement | 6 |
| 6. Related Policies & Procedures | 24 |
| 7. Implementation | 24 |
| 8. Responsibilities | 25 |
| 9. Attachments | 25 |

1. Introduction

1.1 Modification History

| VERSION | COMMENTS |
|---------|---|
| 3 | Policy revised in new policy format. Removal of grading system. |
| 4 | Minor grammatical and punctuation rectification |
| 5 | Updated footer to include updated CRICOS code |
| 6 | Minor Spelling change |
| 7 | Clear separation of policy from the procedure Combined Validation and Moderation Policy into the Assessment and Re-sit Policy. Alignment with the Standards for Registered Training Organisations 2015 Re-Named to Assessment Policy and Procedure |
| 8 | Added the \$50 re-sit/resubmit charge for campus based students after the initial three (3) attempts Rectified some minor grammatical and spelling mistakes. |
| 9 | Added the Assessment Resit Form to associated documents |
| 10 | Remove 'A' from the document ID |
| 11 | Deferred review date until second half of 2016 |
| 12 | eLearning Manager title removed |

1.2 Purpose

Vocational Training qualifications are the cornerstone of the national vocational training system, providing pathways to obtaining employment and further study. MEGT Education recognises well designed assessment plays an integral role in helping students achieve successful outcomes, and must therefore have a strong emphasis on how MEGT Institute's assessment is conducted, the methods used to assess students, how students can appeal and be reassessed. Emphasis must also be placed on validation and moderation of assessment tools as a process to ensure quality and consistency of assessment and as a basis for continuous improvement.

This policy and associated procedure has been developed to:

- i) inform students enrolled in MEGT Vocational Education and Training (VET) programs of the methods MEGT Education uses to assess.
- ii) make students aware of the re-sit opportunities available to them in the event they either missed or were unsuccessful in the initial assessment task/activity.
- iii) inform State/Campus Managers, Training Coordinators and Trainer/Assessors of the systematic validation of assessment requirements, the tools available to them and how validation is to be accomplished.
- iv) outline to those making assessment decisions why completed assessment samples need to be periodically moderated for a nationally consistent assessment outcome.

Assessment includes all forms of assessment including Skills Recognition (RPL), workplace and on-the-job assessments, simulated and classroom assessments, online assessments and all assessment approaches such as written assignments, projects, Q&A tests, evidence portfolios, oral presentations, role plays, written tests, practical demonstrations, simulations, (Refer to the Assessment Definitions list under Section 5.1.2 in this policy)

2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- All students enrolled in accredited VET programs with MEGT Education.
- All Trainers/Assessors, Coordinators, and Training Managers (State and Campus) employed at MEGT Institute and the National Compliance Team.
- All accredited courses offered within MEGT's scope of registration, as published on www.training.gov.au.

3. Legislative Context

This policy satisfies the requirements of the Standards for Registered Training Organisations 2015 (Clauses 1.8 – 1.12) and the National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2007 (the National Code).

4. Definitions

MEGT Education's Assessment Policy draws on definitions and guidelines provided in national regulatory publications and acknowledges these sources.

AQF: Australian Qualification Framework

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

“C”: means the person being assessed has demonstrated competence against all requirements detailed in the unit/s of competence. The person has been assessed as Competent.

Case Study: A documented written scenario which needs to be analysed and address via a series of related questions to demonstrate a students understanding of a principle and application knowledge and skills.

Competent: The consistent application of knowledge and skill to the standard of performance required in the workplace. It embodies the ability to transfer and apply skills and knowledge to new situations and environments.

Competency-Based Assessment: is the process in Vocational Education and Training (VET) courses of gathering evidence and making judgments about whether competency has been achieved against performance criteria and critical evidence requirements specified within the Units of Competence within Training Packages.

Different types of evidence can be provided to demonstrate competence (refer to the Institute’s Assessment Evidence table). Good practice is to adopt student-centered and workplace-centered approaches to the collection of evidence rather than a one-method-fits-all approach.

Assessment activities may be undertaken in work or project teams as well as individually. Where project team assessment takes place, additional questioning or third-party reports may be required to confirm an individual’s contribution and performance.

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

Demonstration in the workplace: Practical demonstration by the student which is observed by the assessor and recorded for evidence against a pre-determined benchmark through a checklist, contact record, workplace log, or any other means which is records the result for evidence, including video.

Fair: Ensure that the same assessment is used for each learner or situation while still being flexible.

Flexible: Able to assess using different methods – e.g. verbal, practical demonstration, role play, simulation, question and answer.

Independent Validation: Means that the validation is carried out by a validator or validators who are not employed or subcontracted by the RTO to provide training and assessment and have no other involvement or interest in the operations of the RTO.

Moderation: A quality assurance process of reviewing, checking and adjusting assessment decisions that have been made after assessment is complete to ensure that all assessors involved in making assessment decisions are consistent in their judgement of what is considered satisfactory and what in not. Moderation is essentially a form of feedback to assessors to assist in aligning marking standards with those of other assessors.

Not Yet Competent (NYC): Signifies the person being assessed has not yet demonstrated competence against one or more of the requirements detailed in the unit/s of competence/module. The person must have attempted or been provided with the opportunity to complete ALL of the assessment tasks for the unit to be deemed “NYC”. The person has been assessed as Not Yet Competent.

It is important to note that students who are absent for their assessment (In class and in the workplace) will have to justify their absence with evidence such as a medical certificate or other compassionate or compelling evidence.

Not Yet Satisfactory (NYS): Signifies that the person being assessed has attempted but not yet demonstrated a satisfactory level of skills and/or knowledge against the requirements of a single assessment task for a part of a unit of competence. The person has been assessed as not yet satisfactory in that specific assessment task only, but may have been assessed as satisfactory in other assessment tasks for the unit of competence.

Projects: An individual or collaborative participation and tasks which are assessable against a stated criteria.

Questions and Discussions: Q&D's / Q&A's may also be referred to as 'competency conversations'. These are pre-determined questions from a question bank which are designed to draw out a breadth of knowledge and experience and inferences about a range of underpinning knowledge and skills. The responses are documented as a form of evidence.

Re-assessment: Refers to providing the student with another attempt at demonstrating competence. It may also include a review of the original assessment by an alternative assessor or resubmission of an assessment item.

Reliable: Assessment approaches which provide consistent results every time.

Re-sit: Refers to a student's opportunity to sit, re-sit or be reassessed, either after they have not met a satisfactory level on their first attempt or after they have recovered from circumstances or condition/s that prevented them from the initial attempt or which affected their performance in the assessment when it was first scheduled.

RPL: Recognition of Prior Learning (Refer to Skills recognition Policy)

Satisfactory: means the person being assessed has demonstrated a satisfactory level against the requirements of a single assessment task for a part of a unit of competence, but not yet all of the assessments used to assess a full unit of competence of cluster of units. The person has been assessed as Satisfactory in that specific assessment task. Once a student has gained a satisfactory result in all assessment tasks for a unit or cluster of units, the result converts to "C" or Competent.

Simulation/Role Play: Imitating the behaviour of a situation or process or acting out a particular role or scenario in accordance with an expected outcome in an alternative assessment environment which is recorded for evidence against a pre-determined benchmark through a checklist, contact record, peer and/or trainer review, trainer feedback, or any other means which is records the result for evidence, including video.

Skills Test: Formal structured practical test with specified measured outcomes which is recorded for evidence against a pre-determined benchmark through a checklist, contact record, peer and/or trainer review, trainer feedback, or any other means which is records the result for evidence, including video.

Standards: Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015 as administered by the national VET regulator - Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA).

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

Training Records: Workplace and other training records such as a student's workplace induction or attendance at relevant professional development training sessions and/or experiences and removal from regular duties for study time logs.

Third Party Report: Workplace supervisor feedback and verification that the student can perform specified tasks /duties to an acceptable standard over a period of time and under a range of conditions. This is documented on a checklist which is mapped against the benchmark set out in the unit/s of competence.

Validation: A process review of the RTO's assessment system and processes to check, find or test that assessment techniques assess what they claim to assess.

Valid: Assessment techniques assess what they claim to assess.

Work Samples: Documents completed by the student or used in the workplace. For example, it may be a spreadsheet created and populated by the student, or forms the student completes as part of their regular work.

Written Report: Hand written or electronically generated evidence such as an essay, report, assignment or completed workbook tasks which can be verified as the student's own work.

Written Test: Written responses assessed against suggested answers which are mapped against the benchmark set in the unit/s of competence. Usually written tests are made up of short answer responses, multiple choice selections and/or true/false responses.

5. Policy Statement

This policy and procedure aims to satisfy MEGT Institute's obligation to implement an assessment system that ensures that assessment, including recognition of prior learning (RPL):

- 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 Rules of Evidence
- is conducted by suitably qualified assessors
- are relevant to the needs of industry and informed by industry engagement
- are systematically validated and moderated

5.1 Conduct of effective VET assessment

5.1.1 Assessor requirements

As per Clause 1.13 of the Standards for Registered Training Organisations 2015, training and assessment is delivered only by persons who have:

- a) Vocational competencies at least to the level being delivered and assessed;
- b) Current industry skills directly relevant to the training and assessment being provided; and

- c) Current knowledge and skills in vocational training and learning that inform their training and assessment.
- d) The TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment or its successor or higher level qualification in adult education

For the delivery and assessment of AQF qualifications or skill sets from the Training and Education Training Package (or its successor) please refer directly to Clauses 1.21 – 1.25 and Schedule 1 of the Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015 for the Assessor requirements.

5.1.2 Assessment Methods

Competency is the consistent application of knowledge and skill to the standard of performance required in the workplace and embodies the ability to transfer and apply skills and knowledge to new situations and environments.

The purpose of competency-based assessment is to confirm that an individual can perform to the standard and conditions expected in the workplace, as expressed in the relevant endorsed industry or enterprise competency standards. The best way to assess this is through holistic assessment methods that focus on whole work activities rather than specific tasks or components of a work activity.

In short, competency-based assessment is the process of collecting evidence and making judgments on whether competency has been achieved by students in a methodical and consistent manner.

There are two general forms of competency-based assessment, as outlined below, however Summative assessment is ultimately the form used to make final decisions on overall competence.

Formative assessment is assessment for learning and is used for the purpose of providing students with ongoing feedback as part of their learning. It can also be used for diagnostic purposes to establish learning needs.

Summative assessment is the assessment of learning and relates to the tools and processes used to gather evidence to make the decision of a student's competence. It usually takes place over several events that can measure different aspects of competence. MEGT Education recognise that summative assessment should not be a single event on completion of a component of study, but rather several events as per the requirements of the unit/s of competence.

All assessment methods used for all units of competence must be clearly documented on the Learning and Assessment Strategy for each qualification and/or cohort (target market), and be consistent with the requirements of the training packages and VET accredited courses and enable each learner to meet the requirements for each unit of competency or module in which they are enrolled.

All assessment, including RPL, must comply with the assessment requirements of the relevant training package or VET accredited course and be conducted in accordance with the Principles of Assessment (fairness, flexibility, validity, reliability) and the Rules of Evidence (validity, sufficiency, authenticity and currency).

The VET assessment and evidence gathering methods utilised by MEGT Education and their associated definitions are as follows:

| Code | Method | Description |
|------|--------------------------------|--|
| D | Demonstration in the workplace | Checklist, contact records, workplace Log |
| S | Simulation/Role Play | Checklist, contact records, peer review feedback |
| ST | Skills Test | Formal structured test with specified measured skills outcomes |
| WR | Written Report / Response | Essay, reports, and completed workbooks tasks |
| T | Training Records | Workplace and other training records eg Induction |
| 3P | Third Party Report | Third Party Checklist and Supervisor Feedback |
| QD | Questions and Discussion | Q & A checklist, quizzes, discussion - documented. |
| WT | Written Test | Written responses assessed against suggested answers |
| W | Work sample | Documents completed or used in the workplace |
| P | Project | Project participation and tasks which is assessable |
| CS | Case Study | Examination & analysis resulting in written document |
| RPL | Recognition of Prior Learning | Structured assessment of prior learning using the developed RPL assessment tool. |

5.1.3 Assessment procedure

The following procedures document and outline the processes that are to be followed across MEGT Education in order to implement the policy statements documented in EDN-036-POL – Assessment Policy.

Whilst each of the following defined assessment principles and rules of evidence are important factors in their own right to ensure assessment activities are based on achieving quality outcomes, assessment activities should reflect all principles and rules and not place more emphasis on one at the expense of others.

The following technical principles are to be used to guide assessors to develop and undertake assessment that meets the four assessment principles:

i) **Validity:**

Validity is both a principle of assessment and a rule of evidence. It requires the assessment process to be sound and justified and assess what it claims to assess for each individual learner. For example, does the evidence cover the range of knowledge and skills, and the application of such knowledge and skills, as specified in the competency standards?

Validity of assessments can be enhanced when:

- the student is assessed against the unit/s of competency and the associated assessment requirements which covers the broad and sufficient range of skills and knowledge that are essential to competent performance;

- the assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application (if applicable);
- the assessment is based on evidence that demonstrates that a learner could demonstrate these skills and knowledge in other similar situations;
- judgement of competence is based on evidence of learner performance that is aligned to the unit/s of competency and associated assessment requirements;
- the assessment tasks resemble those encountered in the workplace; where practical;
- evidence of performance is obtained over time rather than on a one-off occasion to support predictive validity;
- the assessment procedure documents the links to workplace performance;
- multiple approaches to assessment are used;

ii) Reliability:

Reliability refers to the degree and consistency of the interpretation of evidence and the assessment outcomes irrespective of the assessor conducting assessment. This can only be achieved when assessors share a common interpretation of the expected assessment requirements, usually through a moderation process (described in a later section of this procedure document).

Some areas that must be explored when analysing assessment include making a judgement of the assessment methods and procedures used can be relied upon to apply consistently from person to person, context to context, and time to time and if there consistency in interpretation of evidence between assessors.

To make reliable assessment judgements, trainers/assessors must be competent, have the relevant technical/specialist competencies or have access to a subject matter expert who can advise on the relevant competencies at least to the level being assessed.

Applying the following practices enhances reliability:

- Systematically compare the results of two or more assessors (moderation);
- collecting evidence via a number of different assessment methods;
- collecting evidence across different locations and times;
- providing clear and careful instructions when a student is requested to provide their own assessment evidence;
- specifying clearly the competencies to be attained;
- detailing clearly the assessment criteria and processes for self/peer/supervisor assessment;
- use of consultation in the development of assessment tools, and
- providing professional development opportunities for assessors.

iii) Fair:

A fair assessment will take into consideration an individual learner's needs and characteristics in the assessment process and not disadvantage any person. Reasonable adjustments, where appropriate, should be applied to take into account the individual learner's needs. Fair

assessment requires clear communication between the assessor and the student to make sure that the student is fully informed about, understands and is able to participate in the assessment process, and provides the learner with the opportunity to challenge the result of the assessment outcome and be reassessed if necessary.

An assessor should consider if:

- the assessment practices and methods are equitable for all persons being assessed;
- there has been opportunity for reasonable adjustment;
- the assessment requirements have been made clear to all persons being assessed;
- persons being assessed are given opportunities to provide feedback in regard to the process of assessment;
- there is provision for a review and an appeal of assessment decisions;
- there is provision for reassessment.

iv) Flexible:

Flexibility in assessment requires that assessment reflects the student's needs; assesses competencies held by the learner no matter how or where they were acquired; draws on a range and variety of methods appropriate to the context, the unit of competency and associated assessment requirements, and the individual; supports continuous development.

Flexibility also allows for students to seek skills recognition through Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL).

In addition, flexible assessment should also:

- cover both workplace and classroom based competence of training where applicable;
- be made accessible to the person(s) being assessed so that they can proceed readily from one competency standard to another.

The following four (4) rules of evidence must also be applied to all assessment processes:

i) Validity:

The assessor must be both satisfied and assured that the learner has the skills, knowledge and attributes as described in the unit/s of competency and associated assessment requirements.

ii) Sufficiency:

The assessor must be assured that the quality, quantity and relevance of the assessment evidence enables judgment to be made of a learner's competency. This requires the collection of enough appropriate evidence to ensure that all requirements of the unit/s of study have been satisfied, without over assessing.

iii) Authenticity:

The assessor must be assured that the evidence presented for assessment is the learner's own work and not derived from other means or persons.

iv) Currency

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

All students must have undertaken sufficient participation in the learning process and be considered 'ready for assessment' prior to undertaking any assessment tasks or activities.

If an assessment outcome has an impact on subsequent assessments within a unit of study, results and feedback will be made available in a time frame which will not disadvantage performance in the subsequent assessment.

5.1.4 Ensuring assessment tools are fit for purpose

Pre-developed assessment tools

When utilising 'off-the-shelf' assessment tools, being those prepared by resource developers, it is essential that the tools are independently mapped against the requirements of the unit/s of competence to ensure that collectively they meet what is required, including the Critical aspects for assessment, Content of specific resources for assessment, Methods for assessment, Range statement, Required skills and knowledge, Elements and performance criteria, principles of assessment, rules and dimensions of evidence and either Employability Skills or Foundation Skills.

It is not acceptable to simply refer to the mapping documents prepared by the developer, as MEGT as the RTO hold full responsibility for ensuring assessment tools used meet the requirements of the training package.

Assessment mapping is to be undertaken by more than one qualified assessor to ensure a range of opinion and interpretation is applied to the assessment tool. For consistency, all assessment mapping should be documented on the MEGT Institute Assessment Mapping template, found on the intranet. If assessment gaps are identified in the assessment mapping process, the validating trainers/assessors are required to supplement the assessment tools (additional written or verbal questions, demonstration/observation points, worksheet questions, etc.) in order to close the assessment gap/s.

Once assessment mapping has been completed and assessment gaps have been closed and documented on the mapping tool, an electronic copy (or scan) of the mapping document is to be sent to the National Compliance Officer to ensure it is saved in the appropriate location on the intranet.

MEGT development of assessment tools

When assessment tools are developed by MEGT trainer/assessors, there are some simple steps that should be followed to ensure the assessment tools are designed to achieve quality outcomes and meet the requirements of the unit/s of competence from the training package, including the Critical aspects for assessment, Content of specific resources for assessment,

Methods for assessment, Range statement, Required skills and knowledge, Elements and performance criteria, principles of assessment, rules and dimensions of evidence, language, literacy and numeracy skills and either Employability Skills or Foundation Skills.

As with the design of all aspects of training, the quality of an assessment tool will depend heavily on the time and effort that go into the research and development phases of its construction, and the ongoing testing and refining of prototypes.

If, or when called upon to develop assessment tools, there are five simple steps in the design process to guide you in the design of the assessment tools to produce quality outcomes:

Step 1 – Familiarising yourself with the mandatory requirements of the assessment task(s)

Assessment developers must first study the unit of competence so you are clear of the evidence requirements and the tasks the student will need to perform and manage, the contingencies that might arise, and in what contexts they are likely to apply their skills. The knowledge components the student must know should also be considered. This step includes the formation of a picture profile of a competent worker. Once this is clear, you are then in the position to move on to the second step in the process.

Step 2 – Using your understanding of the specified competencies, choose appropriate assessment method/s

The selection of appropriate assessment/evidence-gathering methods is crucial, which involves weighing up a range of methods in order to decide on the ‘best fit’ method/s for the unit of competence and the target student cohort. Other considerations that will influence the choice of assessment methods and evidence gathering process is the assessor’s capacity to manage the assessment. Areas that must be considered are the mix of students, the size of the group, the location of the student (on-campus, online, workplace), access to equipment and facilities, costs and the stress placed on students and staff by the assessment requirements.

Step 3 – Getting down to designing and developing the assessment tool/s;

Assessment tools contain both the instrument and the instructions or procedures for gathering and interpreting evidence. Where possible or practical, gather other trainer/assessor’s ideas for suitable assessment methods for the unit, as they may have different, yet beneficial approaches you had not considered. Assessment tools should be designed to serve the assessor’s needs for objectivity and transparency, and the student’s need for clarity and structure. 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 (decision making rules). They can also be used for recording and reporting purposes.

Assessment tools generally make provision for:

- the student’s name;
- the trainer/assessor’s name;
- the date/s the assessment was conducted;
- the code and title of the unit/s;
- the context of the assessment;

- the procedure for the assessment;
- the list of knowledge/skills to be assessed;
- the competence achieved/outcomes of the assessment;
- the provision of feedback for the student;
- the student's signature and the date;
- the assessor's signature and the date;
- the workplace supervisor's signature and date (where applicable);
- the instructions to the student, the assessor or other evidence gatherer; and
- the resource requirements of the assessment.

Your assessment tool gives shape and form to the chosen assessment method. It must, therefore, be fit for purpose. Consideration must be given to the language, literacy and numeracy skill level of the students and the requirements of the units of competency when you design your tool.

Step 4 – Map the Assessment tool to ensure it does what it is intended to do

Once the initial development phase is complete, it is critical that the tools are independently mapped against the requirements of the unit/s of competence to ensure that collectively they meet what is required, including the Critical aspects for assessment, Content of specific resources for assessment, Methods for assessment, Range statement, Required skills and knowledge, Elements and performance criteria, principles of assessment, rules and dimensions of evidence and either Employability Skills or Foundation Skills.

Assessment mapping is to be undertaken by more than one qualified assessor to ensure a range of opinion and interpretation is applied to the assessment tool. For consistency, all assessment mapping should be documented on the MEGT Institute Assessment Mapping template, found on the intranet. If assessment gaps are identified in the assessment mapping process, the validating trainers/assessors are required to supplement the assessment tools (additional written or verbal questions, demonstration/observation points, worksheet questions, etc.) in order to close the assessment gap/s. Once assessment mapping has been completed and assessment gaps have been closed and documented on the mapping tool, an electronic copy (or scan) of the mapping document is to be sent to the National Compliance Officer to ensure it is saved in the appropriate location on the intranet.

Step 5 – Trial, refine and review the tools to help maximise confidence that the tool/s can be used flexibly and assist in making valid, reliable and fair judgements.

To ensure the developed assessment tools are consistent with the requirements of the training package and maintain their currency, sufficiency and effectiveness, they must be reviewed by fellow trainer/assessors and trialled before they are used, where possible and/or practical.

Inviting feedback from your peers, students and industry will confirm that the developed tools enable effective collection of evidence and that the level of difficulty is appropriate to the qualification AQF level. Differences of opinions provide an opportunity to discuss and resolve any ambiguities or misunderstandings before the tools are in use with the wider student population. Trialling the tools before they are used formally with students helps provide feedback on how user-friendly they are, the appropriateness of the literacy and numeracy levels, the clarity of the instructions, and the practicality of the format for recording assessment evidence and judgements and how adaptable it is. It will also enable you to

evaluate the suitability of the times allowed for assessment tasks and the tool's overall cost-effectiveness.

Reviewing of assessment tools can be done in a number of ways, ranging from sharing with fellow lecturers, through to industry-wide validation by a panel of assessors. Working with others often sheds fresh light that leads to continuous improvements.

5.1.5 Assessment mapping

Each assessment task must be directly mapped and aligned with Units, including Elements, Performance Criteria, Range Statement, Required Skills and Knowledge, Critical Aspects of Assessment and either Employability Skills or Foundation Skills (Competency Standards).

When assessment tools are utilised from 'off-the-shelf' resource developers, in-house mapping against the Competency Standards must take place before the assessment tasks are administered to ensure they meet all requirements of the unit or cluster of units.

The above paragraph remains the case, even when the resource and assessment tool developer has provided assessment mapping, as ultimately the us as the RTO is responsible for ensuring an independent check/assessment is conducted. Where gaps are identified, supplementary assessment must be developed to fill the identified assessment gaps. It is good practice to notify the resource developer, where practical, of the identified gaps and provide documented evidence to allow them the option of closing the assessment and/or knowledge gaps in their resources in subsequent editions or releases.

Assessors are required to utilise all of the assessment tools indicated on the assessment matrix of the Learning and Assessment Strategy for each unit of competence for each cohort because each assessment tool has been mapped to the requirements of the unit of competence. If any assessment tasks are skipped or modified, there is a genuine risk that some of the explicit requirements of the unit are not met or assessed.

When making reasonable adjustments to assessments for individual student's needs, the assessment mapping must be consulted to ensure that the required adjustment still meets the requirements of the unit/s of competence being assessed. See 2.1.10 of this policy for specific information and examples of reasonable adjustments in assessment.

5.1.6 Assessor Guides

In line with standard VET assessment practices and ASQA requirements, each assessment tool used for each unit of competence must have a trainer's guide/suggested answers/marker's guide and/or clear critical points of evidence that determines whether the result is "Satisfactory" or "Not Yet Satisfactory". Decision Making Rules, such as *'All questions must be answered correctly to be deemed satisfactory in this assessment task'* must also be included on each assessment task so there is transparency for both the person attempting the assessment task and for the person assessing the task.

All mapped assessment tasks must be administered to students, be attempted and be assessed as 'Satisfactory' by a suitably qualified trainer, as previously specified, before a student can be deemed Competent in the Unit of Competence.

5.1.7 Achieving competency

Where several assessments are required for complete assessment against the Unit of Competence, there is clear indication to trainer and student that a "Satisfactory" is required in all assessments for an overall "C" or 'Competent' in the Unit. A signed, dated and completed Competency 'sign-off' Cover sheet must accompany all assessment evidence for each unit of competence to clearly show that all assessment tasks were deemed 'Satisfactory', culminating in the final 'Competent' result.

Students must have undertaken sufficient participation in the learning process and be considered 'ready for assessment' prior to undertaking their assessment.

5.1.8 Assessment turnaround requirements

Timely assessment outcomes are critical. Students rightly expect to receive both results and assessor feedback from assessment tasks they have undertaken in a timely manner and while the instance of assessment is still fresh in their mind. All MEGT Institute Assessors are required to correct assessment tasks and provide students with relevant feedback within 5 days for workplace delivery and assessment and within 10 days for campus based delivery and assessment, from the date the assessment was conducted. It is also expected that student assessment results will be provided to the administration team within the same time period.

Once student results are provided to the administration team, they are required to process the results onto the student management system within 5 days.

5.1.9 Monitoring academic misconduct in assessment

Academic honesty is an essential foundation for all student assessment. MEGT Institute does not tolerate nor condone cheating of any kind. Therefore all VET assessors must monitor the evidence submitted to ensure that the evidence students submit is their own and/or that they acknowledge the work of others appropriately. Copying the work of others without acknowledging the source is plagiarism and is a form of cheating.

Any assessor that detects or suspects any form of cheating in the assessment process, must investigate the matter. If evidence is found, the assessor is required to notify the Program Leader or State /Campus Manager (as appropriate), setting out their concerns, as per the procedure below.

MEGT Education does not tolerate nor condone cheating of any kind, which includes, but is not limited to the following:

- handing in someone else's work as your own (with or without that person's permission),
- using any part of someone else's work without the proper acknowledgement, including breaches of copyright,
- submitting a completely duplicated assignment,

- allowing someone else to hand up your work as their own,
- copy sentences or paragraphs from one or more sources, present substantial extracts from books, articles, theses, unpublished work such as working papers, seminar and conference papers, internal reports, computer software, websites, lecture notes or tapes, without clearly indicating their origin,
- using notes or other resources without permission during formal testing,
- having several people write one computer program or exercise and hand up multiple copies, all represented (implicitly or explicitly) as individual work,
- stealing an examination or solution/suggested answer guide from a lecturer.

If a student believes that their work has been plagiarised or copied, they must report the matter at once to the appropriate trainer/assessor or appropriate staff member.

If an assessor suspects cheating, they are required to investigate the suspected breach further to establish evidence. If evidence is found, the assessor is required to notify the Academic Manager, Course leader, or State/Campus Manager (depending on the situation), setting out their concerns. The student is to be notified of the concerns in writing, requesting a time to meet with the assessor and appropriate manager to discuss the matter further.

The purpose of the meeting is to formally outline the concerns, giving the assessor and student/s the opportunity to provide relevant information and any additional evidence or extenuating circumstances, if appropriate. On conclusion of the meeting the student/s are to be advised in writing of the outcome of the discussion, including how the Institute will deal with the problem. This will be done in one of the following ways:

- If the suspicion proves to be unfounded, no further action is taken.
- For a minor or unintentional offence the student will be required to undertake an alternative form of assessment to provide evidence of attaining the requirements of competence.
- If it is a serious or deliberate offence, the student will fail the assessment and be required to re-enroll in the unit/s at their own cost, if they wish to complete their qualification.

In either of the second two scenarios, the misconduct is to be recorded in the student's file. If there are repeated occurrences of minor or serious cheating with the same student/s, the student/s involved will be failed in the unit/s of study and will be subject to further disciplinary action, including being expelled from further studies at MEGT Institute in serious cases.

Students are entitled to appeal against a decision related to cheating in line with EDN-008-POL Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.

5.1.10 Re-assessment/Re-sit

In the spirit of competency-based training, campus based domestic and overseas students who are assessed as 'Not Yet Satisfactory' or 'Not Yet Competent' are to be provided (free of charge) the opportunity for re-assessment/re-sit or the opportunity to show evidence of competence, as specified for each cohort below. If after the appropriate re-assessment/re-sit attempt/s specified

below, the student remains unable to meet the requirements of the assessment, further training is required before further attempts. For campus-based and fee-for-service courses, this may entail re-enrolling in the unit, at an additional cost to the student, if the unit is still being offered by the institute, at the student's expense, or apply for Skills Recognition at a later time and pay the relevant RPL fee.

In relation to re-assessment and re-sit, the following applies:

- For all campus-based VET students (domestic and overseas students) who are assessed as 'Not Yet Satisfactory' or 'Not Yet Competent' are to be provided (free of charge) the opportunity for one (1) re-assessment/re-sit or the opportunity to show evidence of competence. If after the second attempt the student remains unable to meet the requirements of the assessment, further training is required before further assessment attempts are made in the unit of competence. A charge of \$50 per subsequent re-sit or resubmit applies.
- Campus-based Children's Services students who are absent from their work placement assessment must notify the Child Care Centre, MEGT Institute and /or Trainer. Should they fail to do notify the host centre and the Institute, a fee of \$50 will apply for a revisit.
- Domestic students enrolled in online courses delivered under VET FEE-HELP funding arrangements are provided with two (2) re-submission/re-sit opportunities. The student is given a due date within a reasonable time-frame for the re-assessment, and they must comply with this or be marked "NYC", requiring the student to re-enroll in the unit/s not completed at the student's expense.
- For students, including trainees and apprentices, undertaking government funded workplace training and assessment; they may require several attempts at assessment tasks to demonstrate a satisfactory level. These must be provided, free of charge as long as they are conducted within the time-frame of their training plan/training contract. Where a workplace student (trainee or apprentice) does not meet a satisfactory level after the second attempt, the workplace supervisor must be informed of this and appraised of the area/s where the student requires further skills development so they can be provided with additional coaching, mentoring and access to opportunities to assist them in further skills development in preparation for assessment.
- In situations where individual learners (campus-based, fee-for-service, on-line, VET FEE-HELP, trainees and apprentices, domestic and international) have either self identified or have been identified by MEGT Institute's LLN or foundation skills assessment may require additional customised support throughout their training. This may include language, literacy, numeracy or physical support. This support should also be extended to making reasonable adjustment to assessment tasks, when required, as long as the assessment adjustment still meets the requirements of the unit of competence. Examples of 'reasonable adjustment' of an assessment may include, but is not limited to:
 - extra reading or writing time for a written test, case study, etc.
 - short breaks during assessment
 - a reader or writer for paper-based assessments
 - enlarged text, Braille, audio questions for those that are visually impaired
 - interpreter (signing aid) for those with hearing impairment
 - access to a bilingual dictionary for those with English as a second language
 - adapted equipment for a physical disability

- Campus-based (non-apprentice), fee-for-service and VET FEE-HELP students who are absent from the first assessment opportunity, but have a medical certificate or other form of documented evidence such as jury duty, may apply for special consideration to be provided with the ‘first attempt’ assessment opportunity at a new time negotiated between the student and the assessor. This does not apply to students who were absent for their assessment and have not provided a medical certificate. However, this does not prevent them from formally making an application for special consideration, which will then be at the Course Leader, Academic/Campus/State Manager’s discretion, based on merit.
- There are four main forms of re-assessment used where a student’s assessment is assessed as “NYC”, these are:
 - i. a re-submission of work or product as per the original assessment task evidence
 - ii. a re-sit of the exam/written assessment
 - iii. a repeated demonstration where a practical demonstration was required to meet evidence of a criteria checklist.
 - iv. other form of evidence agreed to by the assessor and student.

This does not apply to students who were absent for their assessment and have not provided a medical certificate.

5.1.11 Appeals against assessment

Any students who believe there has been a procedural or factual error in the assessment of their evidence (written test, assignment, work samples, etc.) or believe they have been unfairly assessed have the right to make a complaint or appeal. In line with the EDN-008-POL – Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure, in the first instance the complaint should be an informal complaint, which involves speaking to the assessor outlining their concerns. If, for whatever reason, the student does not feel comfortable speaking to the assessor, they should make the informal complaint to the relevant State, Campus or Academic Manager or Program Leader, as appropriate. The intent of informal complaint is to provide a platform for the parties to try to resolve any matters informally and is the process all parties can take as the first mechanism seek resolution.

If the student still believes that the procedural or factual errors have not been resolved and has affected their assessment outcomes, they should lodge a Formal Complaint or Appeal (See EDN-008-POL – Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure). A formal complaint overrides the Informal Complaint process.

If the student decides to lodge a formal complaint or appeal, they must submit a completed Complaints and Appeals Form that should include a description of the matter, who is involved, and appropriate evidence in support of their complaint or appeal. The Complaints and Appeals Form is available at the Student Support Services Office desk at each MEGT Education campus and is made available on MEGT Education (MEGT Institute or Ability English) websites.

Upon receipt of the complaint, all complaints and appeals will be dealt with in accordance with the Complaint and Appeal Policy and Procedure and process map found in its procedure.

5.1.12 Special consideration – campus-based courses

Assessment is deemed to be late if it is handed in after the due date unless the submission has been approved for **special consideration**. Special consideration is only considered if illness or misadventure has prevented the student from submitting an assignment or sitting an assessment.

- Special Consideration is the use of professional and academic judgement to determine whether a student whose performance has been affected by illness or misadventure should be:
 - a. given an extended deadline for an assessment task, or
 - b. given an alternative assessment task, or
 - c. assessed, based on suitable alternative evidence, to have achieved the objectives of one or more assessment items within a unit, or
 - d. assessed, based on suitable evidence, to have achieved the objectives of an entire unit, or
 - e. given withdrawal from a unit, subject or cluster
- Special consideration simply means only that MEGT recognises that illness or misadventure occurred; a pass in the unit/s or qualification is definitely not to be an automatic consequence. The student is still required to demonstrate evidence competence.

Students may apply for special consideration if they:

- a. have suffered from illness or misadventure which has severely affected their ability to perform in assessment,
 - b. attend a scheduled written test, simulation, role play, etc, but are forced to leave before the end of the allocated time due to illness or misadventure.
 - c. finish a scheduled written test, simulation, role play, etc., but believe their performance was affected by illness or circumstances beyond their control.
- Applications for special consideration must include medical certificates or other relevant supporting documentation and be submitted to Student Services or the Academic Coordinator no later than 24 hours after the scheduled assessment.

5.1.13 Special needs

Student with temporary or permanent disabilities or ongoing illnesses that impact upon their ability to undertake assessment tasks, including written tests, may lodge a special consideration form to their Trainer/Assessor or Student Services. The Campus, State, Academic Manager or Program Leader (depending on the situation) will consider each application on its merit and may permit a student with a disability or special needs to undertake modified learning and reasonably adjusted assessment arrangements in order to ensure that the assessment is on the basis of academic merit and has parity with the assessment of other students.

Applications for special needs should be lodged as soon as possible after they have identified that their special need may impact on their training and assessment outcomes.

Conditions may be set to make the reasonable adjustment arrangements comparable to the current standard practices and any such conditions must be strictly observed by the student and

assessor and all other relevant parties to ensure they are neither advantaged or disadvantaged the student as compared to the other students undertaking assessment in the unit/s.

Where an application for special needs has been rejected, the student has the right to appeal the decision (refer to EDN-008-POL – Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure). In this eventuality, the State, Campus or Academic Manager or Program Leader (depending on the situation) will reassess the request and make a decision based on merit and if the student deems this second outcome to be unfair or disadvantages them, they can appeal the decision to a relevant independent body (The Overseas Ombudsman for overseas students or ASQA for domestic students).

5.2 Validation and moderation of VET assessment

Validation and moderation are two distinct and separate processes designed to improve course and assessment design and practices and enhance student learning which is consistent with the principles of assessment and rules of evidence provisions of the Standards for Registered Training Organisations 2015.

5.2.1 Validation

Validation is a process to check that assessment tasks are aligned with and reflect course learning outcomes and standards and are set at an appropriate level, as specified in each unit of competence.

All assessment tools are required to be systematically validated at least once every 5 years, with at least 50% of tools validated within the first three years of each 5 year cycle. Tools being validated must take into account the relative risks of all units of competence/qualifications on scope, including those risks identified by ASQA. The validation must be benchmarked against the training package using the MEGT developed Validation Tool template (EDN-036-FORM – Validation Tool or EDN-036-FORM – Validation Tool [New format Training Packages]).

Note: From 1st January 2016, the delivery and assessment of any AQF qualification or skill set from the TAE Training and Education Training Package (or its successor) must undertake independent validation of the assessment system, tools, processes and outcomes, as per Schedule 2 of the Standards for Registered Training Organisation (RTOs) 2015.

All MEGT Institute assessment processes and tools need to be systematically validated to check:

- assessment tools, including those used from 'off-the-shelf' purchased resources and assessment tools and tools used to assess Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), are appropriately aligned to Training Package units of competence and to the learning outcomes being assessed in accordance with industry expectations. (All assessment tools are to have an accompanying Assessment Mapping Matrix)
- that evidence of competence adequately covers all of the relevant information such as the critical aspects of assessment, required knowledge and skills, performance criteria and employability skills or foundation skills;
- that the evidence collected meets the rules of evidence (validity, sufficiency, currency and authenticity);

- that the participants are assessed against the appropriate level of competence required by AQF level criteria;
- that participants are being assessed taking into account language, literacy and numeracy skills and special needs of the student
- assessment guidelines support consistent assessment practices by all assessors and for all participants completing the assessment task
- that there is an agreed understanding by assessors of the criteria being used to arrive at an assessment of “competent”;
- that the agreed criteria are being used consistently by all those assessing competency.
- feedback is provided to and obtained from participants, facilitators and assessors;
- clients, industry and industry bodies are consulted (where possible) in developing and reviewing assessment tools and activities.

Initially, assessment strategies will be developed through consultation with industry (where appropriate) to ensure that they are consistent with industry needs. This will include the development of assessment mapping.

Validation should take place soon after an assessment tool has been identified or developed and before it is administered to students (pre-assessment), however due to the fast paced nature of continual change and transitioning of students to superseding qualifications within the VET sector, may also be performed after it has been administered (post-assessment).

Validation should be conducted with a close focus on:

- the design of assessment tools and activities in line with the unit of competency;
- the instructions provided to the intended participants that will be undertaking the assessment tasks;
- assessment methodologies that are planned to be used;
- the benchmarks and criteria against which each participant will be assessed;
- the decision making rules used to clearly identify what is satisfactory (competent) and what is not satisfactory (not yet competent).

In order to ensure that post assessments are reliable across a range of assessors, over a range of contexts and over time, the team undertaking the validation should collect a sample of assessment records to measure them against the following key questions:

- Do the assessment tools or activities address the performance criteria for the competencies being assessed?
- Do the strategies allow participants the best opportunity to succeed?
- Are the assessment strategies chosen appropriate for all target groups?
- What assessment tools or activities worked best for specific target groups?
- What assessment instruments or activities did not work?
- Have all relevant stakeholders (i.e. participants, trainers/assessors, employers, industry and other RTOs) given feedback on the assessment processes and tools used so that they might be improved?

MEGT Institute uses a Validation Schedule, located on the intranet, to lists all units of competence contained in the Learning and Assessment Strategies for all of the qualifications on MEGT Institute's scope of registration.

Input for proposed dates of validation and completed validation is provided to the National Compliance Officer – Operations and Governance by the Course Leaders or Academic Managers. Course Leaders or Academic Managers are also responsible for assembling and facilitating appropriate Validation Meetings and ensuring the meetings occur to schedule, are appropriately documented and all identified improvements are made to the assessment tools, Learning and Assessment Strategies and all other associated documentation.

The Validation Teams assembled by the Course Leaders or Academic Managers must consist of at least one (or more) persons who are not directly involved in the particular instance of delivery and assessment of the training being validated.

The one or more persons not directly involved in the particular instance of delivery and assessment of the training being validated may consist of, but is not limited to, the following:

- Trainers and Assessors from other AQF levels within the discipline,
- Trainers and Assessors from other private or public RTO's
- Trainers and Assessors from other disciplines or industry sectors,
- State and/or Campus Managers
- Academic Managers
- Members of the MEGT Education Compliance Team.

Industry experts and/or industry representatives may be involved in and are highly valued in the validation process to ensure there is a combination of both expertise and current industry practice.

Collectively, validation teams must have:

- a) Vocational competencies and current industry skills relevant to the assessment being validated;
- b) Current knowledge and skills in vocational teaching and learning; and
- c) The training and assessment qualification (TAE40110 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment or its successor, or a Diploma or higher level qualification in adult education) or assessment skill set (TAESS00001 Assessor Skill Set or its successor).

All validation activity, changes and action items are to be recorded on the [Validation Tool template](#). The Assessment Mapping Matrix must also be updated as required.

The Validation Tool template is to be used to record the validation process, including who was involved. Validation should also identify all problematic or insufficient areas detected, how these will be rectified, who is responsible for the rectification and a date the rectification is expected to be completed by.

If the validation relates to commercially available 'off-the-shelf' resources and/or assessment tools, it is beneficial to contact the vendor with information about where problems such as inadequate instructions to the students, poorly worded questions, directions or deficiencies were identified. Resource vendors generally welcome feedback and constructive criticism in order for them to continuously improve their product offerings.

On conclusion of each validation session, a digital copy of the completed Validation Tool is forwarded to the Administration Assistant – Operations and Governance to be electronically filed and the Validation Schedule to be updated to record that the validation for the unit or cluster of units has taken place and has been finalised.

5.2.2 Moderation

Moderation is the process of reviewing, checking and adjusting assessment decisions/professional judgements that have been made after assessment is complete to ensure that all assessors involved in making assessment decisions are consistent in their evaluation of what is considered satisfactory and what is not. Moderation outcomes must be documented using the MEGT developed Moderation Tool template (EDN-036-FORM – Moderation Tool).

Moderation provides feedback which assists assessors to aligning marking standards with those of other assessors. The moderation process supports assessors in the development of confidence that their decisions align with those of their peers and where there is mis-alignment, allows them to closer align with agreed judgements made by other trainers.

Moderation for all units of competency is to be conducted at least once every 5 years, with at least 50% of tools moderated within the first three years of each 5 year cycle. Judgements being moderated must take into account the relative risks of all units of competence/qualifications on scope, including those risks identified by ASQA. The moderation must be conducted using the MEGT developed Moderation Tool template (EDN-036-FORM – Moderation Tool).

Moderation should be undertaken by members of the training/assessing staff, but also include those who are not directly responsible for setting or marking assessment tasks in the assessment of units being moderated.

Moderation sessions need to be planned in advance so that assessment samples can be collected. Samples should include assessment instruments that have been completed by students and marked by a wide range of assessors. Samples should also include a range of results such as poor/not satisfactory, medium/meets the minimum requirements and excellent/over and above the stated requirement, and be from various states (city and regional) and from a range of delivery modes including workplace assessment, campus based and online, so the Moderation Panel can collectively focus on getting a consistency of assessment outcomes across all courses and student cohorts, regardless of which assessor makes the assessment decision or how and where the assessment occurred.

Using a systematic approach, sometimes during the validation process, completed assessment tasks needs to be moderated and reviewed in order to:

- maximize consistency, fairness, accuracy and reliability in assessment;
- bring assessment standards and judgements into alignment nationally, regardless of where they are administered;
- ensure the same standards are applied to all assessment results within the same program, course or unit of competency, regardless of how they are delivered (workplace, online, campus, etc);
- align trainer/assessor judgements to overcome differences and difficulty of the assessment tool and/or the severity of competency decisions;
- make sure the characteristics of assessment is well defined and aligns with program capabilities;

- ensure students have the same opportunity for fair and accurate assessment regardless of who is marking, where the marking takes place and mode of delivery (workplace, campus, distance, etc);
- provide beneficial feedback to assessors of the experience gained through moderation, allowing them to better align to the standard marking scheme.

It is important that sufficient information is stored about assessment so that there is consistency across a period of time by keeping samples of participant work and assessment with records of evidence and comments which clearly indicate reasons for assessment judgements.

Moderation will focus on:

- the assessment tasks and the assessment process;
- participants' performance;
- the assessment decisions/judgements made by a cross-section of assessors;
- reporting and record keeping;
- Consistency of post assessment feedback provided to students;
- consistency and equivalence of assessment outcomes from different assessors.

The Moderation Tool provides clear step by step process for the facilitator and the panel members in relation to the preparation of a Moderation session, conducting the session, accurately documenting the session and post session requirements. It also provides the templates for the recording of the process and the findings.

The National Manager, Operations and Governance and the National Compliance Officer have the overall responsibility to ensure that validation and moderation take place in line with the Validation Schedule, however it is the responsibility of the Moderation and Validation Committee participants, State and Campus Managers, Academic Managers, Course Leaders and subject matter experts (trainers/assessors) to conduct the scheduled validations and moderation of assessment as per the requirements of this policy.

6. Related Policies & Procedures

EDN-036-PRO – Assessment Procedure

EDN-010-POL – Monitoring Course Progress Policy and Procedure

EDN-032-POL – Learner Support Policy and procedure

EDN-008-POL – Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure

EDN-020-POL – Continuous Improvement Policy and Procedure

7. Implementation

EDN-036-POL – VET Assessment Policy and the associated procedure is made available to all MEGT staff via the MEGT Intranet internally and to all students via the MEGT Institute website at www.megtinstitute.edu.au

8. Responsibilities

State, Campus and Academic Managers and Course Leaders hold the overall responsibility for the selection, development, implementation and administration of quality of assessment instruments that meet the stated requirements of the qualification.

The National Manager, Operations and Governance and the National Compliance Coordinator hold the overall responsibility to ensure that Validation and Moderation take place in line with the Validation Schedule, however it is the responsibility of the State, Campus and Academic Managers and Course Leaders and subject matter experts (trainers/assessors) to conduct the scheduled validations and moderation of assessment as per the requirements of this policy.

The National Manager of Operations – Operations and Governance and the Education Board will review this policy annually, or in case of legislative changes requiring amendments.

9. Attachments

EDN-036-FORM – Validation Tool [\[LINK\]](#)

EDN-036-FORM – Validation Tool (Foundation Skills) [\[LINK\]](#)

EDN-036-FORM – Moderation Tool [\[LINK\]](#)

EDN-036-FORM – Assessment Mapping Tool Template : [\[LINK\]](#)

EDN-036A-FORM – Assessment Resit Form [\[LINK\]](#)

Validation Schedule: [\[LINK\]](#)

Validation Register: [\[LINK\]](#)