Assessment Procedures

1. Associated Policy

The Assessment Procedures were developed with the Assessment Policy. These procedures apply from term 2, 2020.

2. Introduction

CIT conducts assessment to meet the requirements of the relevant regulatory bodies and Standards:

- Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015, especially the Principles of Assessment (fairness, flexibility, validity and reliability) and the Rules of Evidence (validity sufficiency authenticity and currency)
- Australian Skills Quality Authority
- Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency
- Board of Senior Secondary Studies Act 1997
- Skills Canberra and the ACT Quality Framework.
- ELICOS Standards and the ESOS National Code

CIT results codes are detailed below. CIT Education Services staff are available to support quality assessment development.

These procedures provide additional clarification and guidance for consistency in application across CIT as well as procedural steps where appropriate to support the policy.

3. Procedures

3.1   National Requirements

3.1.1   All assessment must be student-focused and applied fairly and flexibly considering individual student needs.

3.1.2   The aim of VET assessment is to gather sufficient evidence of competency achievement by the student.

3.1.3   VET criterion reference requires specific statements against which assessments are conducted; marking with percentages is not acceptable.

3.1.3.1   Competency-based assessment is the process of collecting evidence and making judgements about whether a person has achieved competency. It is often described as a criterion-referenced process, because it involves people being assessed against fixed criteria or pre-determined benchmarks – such as those expressed in units of competency or accredited modules. (My Skills, Department of Education and Training)

3.1.4   Before creating or updating assessments, check the Training and Assessment Strategy (TAS) and collaborate with the teaching team and/or assessment co-ordinator.

3.1.5   Develop assessments for VET qualifications to meet the competency and Training Package or VET-Accredited Course requirements. Develop assessments for non-VET qualifications to meet the approved course requirements.

3.1.6   Complete all assessment development before delivery in line with ASQA scoping requirements.

3.1.7   Use the assessment templates for all assessment activities and, where possible,

develop all assessments online.

3.1.8   Map VET assessments to ensure full coverage of the unit of competency.

3.1.9   Seek internal validation by peers and/or teaching team (against Training Package/Accredited Course requirements).

3.1.10   Name or number and record individual assessment items in the subject/learner guide, online learning platform and the approved class roll/record (see Roll Procedures).

3.1.11   Provide students with a subject/learner guide containing information on assessment at/by the first session for the subject.

3.1.12   Provide students with assessment results and feedback within two weeks of the assessment date or due date.

   3.1.12.1   Set assessment due dates that ensure staff are available to assess within the required two weeks. Avoid setting assessment due dates on a day before staff leave. Complete all assessments before the mid-year and end of year breaks.

   3.1.12.2   If extenuating circumstances prevent teachers from completing assessments within two weeks, teachers to negotiate new date with Head of Department. Students to be advised within the initial two weeks that results and feedback will be delayed and advised the new date.

3.1.13   Enter a final grade in Banner using the approved CIT result codes within two weeks of the assessment date or due date.

3.1.14   Verify grades for accuracy before rolling into academic history on Banner.

3.1.15   Finalise and add grades to Banner as students complete; do not wait for whole class group to complete.

3.1.16   Ensure moderation of student work occurs to ensure consistency of assessment outcomes.

3.1.17   Validate Assessment tools (against Training Package/Accredited Course requirements) and completed student assessments externally with industry in line with the CIT validation schedule and the *Standards for RTOs 2015*.

3.1.18   A subject may be graded if:

   3.1.18.1   It is in a VET qualification at Diploma level or above, and evidence for one or more of the following considerations has been demonstrated:

   3.1.18.1.1   When industry uses evidence of assessment performance in employment selection processes and requests CIT to provide such evidence,

   3.1.18.1.2   Grading is important for a major piece or capstone assessment task,

   3.1.18.1.3   Where above 'competent,' a wide variation of student performance may occur,

   3.1.18.1.4   The result is required by a Higher Education articulation agreement that specifies a graded subject or;

   3.1.18.2   It is in a higher education qualification, an ACT BSSS Year 12 course, an ELICOS course or

   3.1.18.3   It was approved for grading during program development by the CIT Program Innovation Committee and was implemented on Banner with the correct grading mode.

3.2 Reasonable Adjustment

3.2.1 Reasonable adjustment contributes to meeting the Principles of Assessment of fairness and flexibility. While it applies particularly to students with disabilities, it is applicable to all students to improve outcomes and ensure flexibility and student-focus. Reasonable adjustment is a legitimate strategy for ensuring fairness in assessment. Learners who have been granted reasonable adjustment should not be seen as getting favoured treatment.

3.2.2 Reasonable adjustment does not mean lowering the standards. Reasonable adjustment allows the assessor to use flexible and creative ways to collect assessment evidence, while ensuring that the assessment decision meets the Principles of Assessment of validity and reliability.

3.2.3 Reasonable adjustments must ensure the intent of the subject or course is met. This includes the abilities, skills and knowledge students need to complete the course and removal would compromise the learning outcomes.

3.2.4 Reasonable adjustment is individual and needs to be applied professionally in consultation with the student.

3.2.5 Reasonable adjustment may include: alternate assessments; verbal instead of written tasks; video capture instead of on-site; note-taker; Auslan interpreter; ergonomic equipment; ICT equipment; additional time. This list is not exhaustive. The adjustment must be consistent with the subject or unit of competency. Student Support and Education Services staff can assist with advice and other forms of adjustment.

3.2.6 Heads of Department need to ensure teachers are aware of their responsibilities and that appropriate professional development and support is accessed so teachers feel comfortable in negotiating and implementing adjustments.

3.2.7 A wide range of reasonable adjustments may be made within the limit of not causing unjustifiable hardship to CIT.

3.2.8 Teachers must retain complete records of all reasonable adjustments and document details on the student's assessment.

3.3 Assessment Attempts, Re-assessments and Extensions

3.3.1 Students (excluding higher education students) are entitled to at least two attempts to complete an assessment. Re-assessments may be in the form of a re-sit or re-submission.

3.3.1.1 All VET students are entitled to two attempts at assessments. More attempts may be allowed with Head of Department approval. Higher education students may be offered two attempts at assessments with Head of Department approval.

3.3.1.2 Teachers must clearly advise and document re-submission due dates, preferably online. Provide feedback to allow the student the best chance of success. Provide the student with sufficient time (at least 24 hours) to make the required changes.

3.3.1.3 Schedule re-sits to allow an agreed amount of time for learning by the student. Depending on the assessment topic and format, this may range from hours to a week. If more than a week is required for sufficient learning to demonstrate competence or pass, it may be recommended the student re-enrols in the subject.

3.3.1.4 ELICOS students who have attended less than 80% of the learning

© CIT—cit.edu.au
Policy Owner: Executive Director, Education and Training Services
Policy Contact Officer: Director, Education Services

Page 3 of 8
Approval Date: 27 May 2020
Next Review Due Date: May 2024

sessions may need to discuss participation in the assessment with the Head of Department. Participation in the assessment with less than 80% attendance may be refused as it is likely insufficient learning has occurred to successfully achieve the assessment outcome.

3.3.2 Students with extenuating circumstances (health, family, work, police, counsellor's advice, etc) who miss an assessment or assessment due date or re-assessment, may request a teacher for special consideration or an extension (any form of request is acceptable). If refused, students may request a review by the Head of Department; if granted, teachers will apply the conditions or extension as agreed by the Head of Department; if not granted, students may appeal under the Academic Appeals Policy.

3.3.3 Students without extenuating circumstances who miss an assessment or assessment due date or re-assessment may be assessed and re-assessed at the Head of Department's discretion.

3.3.4 Teachers must document extensions preferably online.

3.3.5 If extension is not suitable, students may need to re-enrol or apply for Skills Recognition. The Director or Education Manager may waive the fee.

3.4 Appeals

3.4.1 Inform students of their right to an appeal of any assessment decision and facilitate access as needed to the *Academic Appeals Policy* and resources.

3.4.2 Follow any appeal against assessment decisions according to the *Academic Appeals Policy*.

3.5 Students Registered with Student Support

3.5.1 Ensure all students are informed of the option to access services with CIT Student Support and the additional services available if they register with the CIT Student support Disability Education Advisors.

3.5.2 Ensure teachers are aware that registered students have the right to seek additional reasonable adjustments of assessment tasks or an extension. Disability Education Advisors and Education Services staff can advise.

3.5.3 Facilitate valid completion of subjects as much as possible. Only consider a modified grade in consultation with the Disability Education Advisor and meeting the *Disability - Provisions for Students Policy*. A modified grade does not meet the subject requirements and does not count towards qualification completion.

3.5.4 If a modified grade is agreed, advise the Manager, Awards and Programs, with written confirmation from the Disability Education Advisor.

3.6 Quality Assurance and Retention

3.6.1 Undertake Program Review and Improvement (PRI) at least each semester for all subjects and action continuous improvement items.

3.6.2 Directors and will provide an annual report on the outcomes of the previous year's Program Review and Improvement reports to the first meeting of Academic Council each year.

3.6.3 All completed student assessment items and the assessment judgement for each student must be securely retained according to ACT Government record retention requirements: seven years for apprentices, trainees and Skilled Capital students; and two years for all others. These documents must be able to be produced in full at audit.

© CIT—cit.edu.au
Policy Owner: Executive Director, Education and Training Services
Policy Contact Officer: Director, Education Services

Page 4 of 8
Approval Date: 27 May 2020
Next Review Due Date: May 2024

3.6.4   If the actual work completed by a student or evidence of that work, including evidence collected for an RPL is not able to be retained, a valid record of the assessment decision must be retained (may be digital or paper-based). This evidence must have enough detail to demonstrate the assessor's judgement of the student's performance against the required standard.

© CIT—cit.edu.au
Policy Owner: Executive Director, Education and Training Services
Policy Contact Officer: Director, Education Services

Page 5 of 8
Approval Date: 27 May 2020
Next Review Due Date: May 2024

4. CIT Result Codes and Grading Modes

All subjects have a Grading Mode on Banner

1	Not assessable
2	Final Examination - Ungraded
5	Ungraded
6	Graded to Distinction
7	Graded to High Distinction
8	External Examination
A	Final Examination Graded to High Distinction

Final Result Codes within each Grading Mode

Mid-term and recognition codes (as below) also apply to all except Grading Mode 1

Grading Mode 1: Non-assessable subjects

X
WA
WW

Grading Mode 2 and 5: Ungraded subjects

UP
WA
WW
F

Grading Mode 6, 7, 8 and A: Graded subjects

HD (not applicable for grading mode 6)
D (grading mode 6 includes D^ signifying D is the highest grade)
CR
P
F
WA
WW

Final Result Definitions

UP	Ungraded pass
WA	Evidence of engagement*/attendance; all assessments and re-assessments not completed (with/without formal withdrawal) #
WW	No engagement* (with/without formal withdrawal)
F	Outcomes not achieved after all assessments and all re-assessments completed #
HD	High Distinction
D	Distinction (D^ Distinction where D is the highest grade)
CR	Credit
P	Pass/All outcomes achieved
X	Non-assessable subject/module
MG	Modified grade; does not meet the subject requirements; only to be used with approval of Disability Education Advisor

Refer below for more information about WA, WW and F including case studies

© CIT—cit.edu.au
Policy Owner: Executive Director, Education and Training Services
Policy Contact Officer: Director, Education Services

Page 6 of 8
Approval Date: 27 May 2020
Next Review Due Date: May 2024

Midterm Result Definitions (Not Final Result)

These temporary grades may be entered in the *Banner midterm grade column only*. When completed, teachers to update to final result using codes above.

EG Extension granted: provides additional time for students to complete

AP Academic Progress: off-the-job assessment satisfactorily completed with work placement assessment still to be undertaken

Recognition Codes

Credit Transfer

CT Credit Transfer: granted where the Unit of Competency code and title are identical or where the national VET register (training.gov.au) identifies the units to be equivalent. Industry regulations apply in regard to currency (for example: CPR unit will not be granted as a Credit Transfer if older than 12 months)

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

RG Recognition Granted: successful RPL assessment of an individual's skills and knowledge (can be in combination with other formal study evidence such as Australian University or overseas qualification); formal study from an Australian RTO, Unit of Competency code is not identical, or when using many UOCs/ subjects for a UOC/subject

NG Recognition not granted: unsuccessful RPL assessment (not yet competent)

WL Recognition pending for work/life experience (final grade will be RG or NG)

Additional Information: WW, WA and F

* **Selection of WW or WA** relates to evidence of engagement: either evidence of recorded attendance at a session including learning (not an introductory session without learning) or recorded completion of an activity (learning or assessment) within the online learning platform.

WW: no evidence of engagement (did not attend; did not engage online)

WA: evidence of engagement (attended at least one session or engaged in at least one online activity)

\# **Selection of WA or F** relates to demonstration of competence that can only occur by completing all assessments:

WA: student **did not** complete all assessment and all re-assessments

F: student completes **all** assessments and **all** re-assessments but does not demonstrate competence

Case Studies: WA and F

In the following examples**,** the subject has two assessments**:**

1 Student engages in learning but does not submit any or attend any assessments
Teacher contacts student who declines to submit; result = WA

2 Student engages in learning, submits and is successful in assessment one but only submits name on page for assessment two
Student attends re-assessment but leaves after ten minutes (did not complete)
Student does not attend any other re-assessments despite multiple offers; result = WA

© CIT—cit.edu.au
Policy Owner: Executive Director, Education and Training Services
Policy Contact Officer: Director, Education Services

Page 7 of 8
Approval Date: 27 May 2020
Next Review Due Date: May 2024

3   Student engages in learning, submits and is successful in assessment one
    Student requests extension with valid reasons for assessment two which is granted
    Teacher adds EG to mid-term and confirms new due date to student
    After due date, teacher contacts student who advises unable to complete, will focus on other subjects and will re-enrol in this subject next semester; result = WA

4   Student engages in learning and submits assessments one and two; successful in assessment one only
    Student does not submit or attend re-assessment for assessment two
    Teacher attempts to contact student multiple times and using multiple formats but cannot contact student
    Teacher requests admin/Student Services to contact student
    Student cannot be contacted; result = WA

5   Student engages in learning and submits assessment one and two, successful in assessment one only
    Student submits/attends re-assessment for assessment two, but again does not meet requirements
    Note: more attempts may be allowed with Head of Department approval
    Teacher requests colleague or Head of Department to check student's work; colleague confirms that requirements not met; result = F