

Name:	Assessment Policy
Approved by:	General Manager, Group Accreditation & Compliance
Date Approved:	16.06.2022
Approved by:	Academic Director - Technology & Design Division
Date Approved:	16.06.2022
Implementation Owner	Academic Director
Maintenance Owner	Group Accreditation & Compliance
Review Date	16.06.2023

Section 1 – Introduction	3
Purpose	3
Scope	3
Section 2 – Policy	4
Assessment Tasks	4
Quality Control	4
Principles of Assessment	4
Rules of Evidence	5
Basis of Assessments	5
Assessment Design and Development	5
How Students will be Assessed	8
When will Students be Assessed	9
Submission of Assessment and Late Submission	9
Assessment Regulations	9
Late Submission of Assessment	9
Examinations (Higher Education only)	10
Additional Assessment for a Subject (Higher Education only)	10
Grades (Higher Education only)	10
Grading Order	11
How Students will be Graded	11
Grading in a Course	12
Grading of Assessment Tasks in Subjects (VET & HE)	12
Appeals Against Results in Assessment Tasks or Subjects	13

Feedback	13
Final Evaluation of All Grades (HE) and Competency Outcomes (VET)	13
Moderation	14
Publication	16
Section 3 – Reference and Supporting Information	17
Definitions	17
Supporting documentation	17
Section 4 – Change History	19
Change History	19

Section 1 – Introduction

1) Purpose

The purpose of this Assessment Policy is to ensure that effective mechanisms are in place to monitor and manage assessment processes and outcomes, to ensure that they are conducted with fairness and transparently for all students of the Academy of Information Technology Pty Ltd (AIT), including its sub-brands Left Bank and Coder Academy Australia, and students taught under arrangement by the International School of Colour & Design Pty Ltd.

2) Scope

This policy applies to:

- i) All students (domestic and international) of Academy of Information Technology Pty Ltd, (including the Coder Academy and Left Bank brands),
- ii) All staff of RedHill Education including employees and contractors;
- iii) All courses delivered by the College including those delivered on their behalf by education providers with whom there is a licensing arrangement.

Section 2 – Policy

1) Assessment Tasks

The Teaching & Learning Committee's (TLC) are responsible for oversight and key decision making in relation to assessment. Assessment is aligned to subject/Unit of Competency outcomes and to course outcomes. There will be a minimum of 1 assessment per subject or course (including short courses).

2) Quality Control

Subject Coordinators will regularly hold subject committee meetings to validate assessment tasks against course delivery requirements, training package requirements and industry needs. All courses will be validated at a minimum of once yearly.

They will validate for:

- i) Appropriateness of the assessment type against the defined learning outcomes;
- ii) Appropriateness of criteria employed to measure learning outcomes;
- iii) Weighting of tasks;
- iv) alignment with AQF levels of tasks;
- v) Usability.

The committee will refer all changes to the TLC for approval; this may include a change in the:

- i) Type of assessment;
- ii) Assessment weightings;
- iii) timing of assessment
- iv) assessment instructions;
- v) assessor guides.

The subject committee may also recommend that a learning outcome be revised.

Subject committee's will be responsible for initial review of vocational qualifications in the case of transitions, and will provide the TLC with an overview of any/all required changes for consideration and the TLC's development of a transition plan.

3) Principles of Assessment

Fairness: The individual learner's needs are considered in the assessment process. Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments will be applied to take into account the individual learner's needs. AIT informs the learner about the assessment process, and provides the learner with the opportunity to challenge the result of the assessment and be reassessed if necessary.

Flexibility: Assessment is flexible to the individual learner by:

- i) Reflecting the learner's needs
- ii) Assessing learning outcomes, no matter how or where they have been acquired;
- iii) Drawing from a range of assessment methods and using those that are appropriate to the context, the learning outcome, and the individual.

Validity: Any assessment decision is justified, based on the evidence of performance of the individual learner.

Validity requires:

- i) assessment against learning outcomes and associated assessment requirements

- ii) covers the broad range of skills and knowledge that are essential to the learning outcome
- iii) assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application;

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

4) Rules of Evidence

- i) **Validity:** The assessor is assured that the learner has the skills, knowledge and attributes as described in the learning outcomes and associated assessment requirements.
- ii) **Sufficiency:** The assessor is assured that the quality, quantity and relevance of the assessment
 - (a) evidence enables a judgment to be made of learning outcomes.
- iii) **Authenticity:** The assessor is assured that the evidence presented for assessment is the learner's own work.
- iv) **Currency:** The assessor is assured that the assessment evidence demonstrates current

5) Basis of Assessments

Grades and learning outcomes will comply with AIT's published grading system and designate a level of achievement or outcome. Constructive feedback will be provided to students for all assessment outcomes. Assessments are designed to measure a student's skills and knowledge from a developmental perspective and will be supplemented through activities and tasks allowing practice.

6) Assessment Design and Development

During assessment development, the size, mode and weighting of each assessment in a subject will be determined according to a number of factors:

- The AQF level of the subject (see table 1 below for AQF outcomes)
- The subject order (a first assessment will usually have a lower load)
- The equivalent word count required per subject.

Assessment submissions may include a range of formats, and require different expectations according to the AQF level of the related subject. To ensure consistency in weighting, size and format across subjects, the following guides have been established. Each of these inter-relates, and is presented in the order with which it should be considered.

- a) Total Word Count** (per subject, per AQF level): The total size of all combined assessments in a Higher Education level subject will equate to the following word count, depending on the AQF level of a subject.

AQF Level	Knowledge / Skill Outcomes	Words
Level 5 Diploma level subjects	Students should demonstrate a broad range of foundational skill and knowledge in a defined area, enabling them to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse information to complete a range of activities Provide and transmit solutions to sometimes complex problems Transmit information and skills to others 	5000
Level 6 Assoc Degree level subjects	Students should demonstrate an advanced level of skill and knowledge in a defined area, enabling them to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse information to complete a range of activities Interpret and transmit solutions to unpredictable and sometimes complex problems Transmit information and skills to others 	6000
Level 7 Bachelor level subjects	Students should demonstrate well-developed cognitive, technical and theoretical skills enabling them to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyse and evaluate information to complete a range of activities Analyse, generate and transmit solutions to unpredictable and sometimes complex problems Transmit knowledge, skills and ideas to others 	6000

- b) Assessment Type Equivalency** (per 1000 words): Not all assessments will long-form require written work. For each mode of submission, the table below provides a guide of the different assessment modes and their equivalent size related to 1000 words.

Assessment Type	Size equivalency per 1000 words
Structured Written Assessment	1000 words
Examination	1 hour
Group Assignment	750 words per member
Unstructured Reflective Journal	1500 words
Verbal Presentation	20 minutes
Verbal Group Presentation	10 minutes per member
Practical demonstration	20 minutes

Written / visual presentation	10-15 slides
Image submission	4 images and associated discussion notes
Code file or program	1 program and associated code
Film or recording	1-3 minutes
Animation or playthrough	30 sec - 1 minute

- c) Assessment Weighting:** When determining weighting for an assessment, the table below indicates the rough percentage to award based on the size of submission. While this may differ depending on the AQF level or the position of the assessment, it should be used as a guide during assessment planning. At the discretion of the academic leader involved in curriculum development, weightings may be adjusted at levels 6, 7 or 8 to reflect the complexity of a given task.

Size	Weighting Range
500 words or fewer	Less than 10%
750-1000 words	10-15%
1000-1500 words	15-25%
1500 - 2000 words	25-40%

As an example of how the table above may be used, consider a level 5 (diploma/1st yr) subject. Combining the total size of all assessments should be equivalent to no more than 5000 words. This may result in the below.

1. Assessment 1: 500 word project (10%)
2. Assessment 2: Visual Presentation of 15 slides (25%)
3. Assessment 3: 2000 word report (40%)
4. Assessment 4: 1.5 hour examination (35%)

These assessments combined would equal about 5000 words for the subject, based on the tables above.

1. A1 = 500 words
2. A2 = 1000 words
3. A3 = 2000 words
4. A4 = 1500 words

7) How Students will be Assessed

- i) **Written submissions:** This includes essays, reports, reviews, reflections and code. Academic and reflective writing is an essential part of the learning process in Higher education subjects where the core teaching is theoretical. The ability to effectively condense knowledge, assimilate and communicate using a structured written medium is an important skill set for future employability. Reports and reviews provide opportunities for students to consolidate and contextualise knowledge. Furthermore, when programming, the ability to write correct, succinct code is essential for employment in an IT environment.
- ii) **Examinations (HE only):** Many subjects have an examination component. Exams vary in length but are typically between 1.5 and 3 hours. Exams may use any combination of: practical work; multiple choice; short- answer; short essay and essay questions, depending on the particular subject.
- iii) **Presentations:** Some subjects and units of Competency require students to give presentations. These are used to evaluate and improve students' abilities to effectively communicate (persuasion and exposition) to an audience, undertake research, construct reasoned arguments, and draw information from a range of sources.
- iv) **Project & case study submission:** Project based subjects usually have the production of a single output as their final result. However, there are significant project milestones which are evaluated in the course of the entire project subject, through the course of a term.
- v) **Small project submission:** Lab and studio based subjects concentrate on the production of a series of small outputs. Small project submissions allow the quality of output to be regularly evaluated, through the course of a term.
- vi) **Practice tasks:** This may vary between subjects and Units of Competency, but generally consists of a range of small tasks. Typically, these tasks might include: participation in class and online discussions, involvement in lectures, short presentations, small projects, small practical tutorials, short tests/quizzes, brief research tasks.
- vii) **Tests & quizzes:** Many higher education subjects have periodic test components. These are used to evaluate ongoing progress in a particular subject. Tests are normally brief in duration and occur within class for on campus students. Quizzes are often used in vocational Units of Competency to provide progressive feedback in relation to the development of more complex skills, particularly where there is specific underpinning knowledge.
- viii) **Tutorial or online engagement:** Some subjects or units of Competency require students to regularly participate in discussions, whether in tutorial groups or through online social media platforms. The participation rate and nature of engagement is used to evaluate the student's ability to effectively communicate in small groups regardless of the format employed. Guidelines are provided to students and checklists are developed for educators to support the measurement of engagement/participation and to ensure reliability, fairness and validity.

8) When will Students be Assessed

Subject outlines for Higher Education courses provide the following information about assessments:

- i) Name of assessment
- ii) Form of assessment
- iii) Learning outcomes
- iv) Due date
- v) Weighting

The “training plan” provides vocational students with a summary of Units of Competency and assessment requirements. Assessment briefs and the Assessor Guidelines provide the following information to students and assessors:

- i) name of assessment
- ii) nature of assessment
- iii) Unit(s) of competency and elements covered
- iv) assessment guidelines/instructions
- v) skills and knowledge outcomes
- vi) Unit(s) of Competency outcomes
- vii) due date
- viii) submission requirements

9) Submission of Assessment and Late Submission

Submission of work must be made on or before the due date and in the form indicated on the assessment brief.

It is the responsibility of individual students to ensure that any assignment submitted in electronic form is readable and generally accessible by the assessor. Accidentally un-copied data, OR corrupt data, OR data copied in an unreadable format OR the use of defective disks or other storage media is not acceptable as a submission. In these cases, assessors will be obliged to treat the assignment as un-completed. Students are required to keep a copy of all assessments submitted.

Where a student seeks an extension a formal written request along with supporting evidence must be submitted in accordance with Assessment Appeals Policy and Procedure.

Late submission of work: See the relevant sections of the Late Submission Policy

10) Assessment Regulations

Plagiarism and cheating of any kind is not allowed and may result in a fail/Not yet Competent outcome (refer to Academic Integrity Policy).

Students may have a maximum of 2 attempts of assessments where the nature of assessment permits.

Students have the right of appeal for an assessment outcome (refer to Assessment Appeals Policy).

11) Late Submission of Assessment

If a deadline is missed due to circumstances beyond the control of a student, an application may be made to submit at a later date. This applies to all forms of assessment.

Applications for special consideration must be made in writing. Special consideration will be determined by the nature of the circumstance. Applications must be made within five days of the initial due date or where a student is hospitalised upon release, (medical certificates are required as part of the application).

Applications for special consideration will result in one of the following outcomes:

- i) rejection
- ii) extension granted
- iii) extension granted and alternate assessment to be assigned
 - (1) includes examinations for higher education students

12) Examinations (Higher Education only)

See Examination Policy and Procedure

13) Additional Assessment for a Subject (Higher Education only)

Students may, on occasion, fall within the margin of failure for a completed subject, in the range of 46-49%. At the sole discretion of the subject coordinator or the Academic Director, the student may be asked to submit further assessable material or to resubmit previously submitted material after modification.

The completion of the additional assessment will result in one of the following:

- i) No change to the previous assessment
- ii) Modification of a grade, from Fail to Pass, final percentage score 50%.

Students undertaking assessment for vocational Units of Competency may resubmit an assessment once only. They will be advised in the original assessment feedback of the process and due date.

14) Grades (Higher Education only)

Grades measure students' performance against the learning outcomes and indicate the level of achievement in accordance with AIT's criterion-based grading. This approach is informed by AQF level, nature of the task and industry needs.

Responsibilities

Action	Responsibility	Timing
Grade Assessment tasks and enter into AIT's marking system	Educator	No less than once per term for EVERY assessment item, for each student
Final evaluation of all grades	ARC*	Once per term
Evaluate anomalous grades	ARC*	Once per term
Report anomalous grades to CC and AB	ARC*	Once per term
Review grades across all subjects	ARC*	Once per term
Review of a subject's assessment and grading practices	ARC*	Annually (to be completed within six working weeks)

*Assessment Review Committee

All grading must be against the approved rubric for that assessment
Grades must be entered into AIT's internal marking system.

Grades are monitored for consistency within:

- i) Classes
- ii) Subjects (between classes)
- iii) Courses (between subjects) and over time (between cohorts)
- iv) delivery mode
- v) The organisation (across campuses)

Significantly anomalous grades will be reviewed by the Academic Director.

Significantly anomalous grades constitute:

- i) Failure rates within a subject of more than 30%;
- ii) More than 100% over target Grade Distribution in any of the bands from P - D and more than 300% in the HD band;
- iii) Where, during the moderation process, there is a discrepancy of greater than 2 marks for a student's assessment.

The Academic Director may:

- i) recommend changes to the marks of individual students represented in anomalous subjects to the ARC;
- ii) recommend that the TLC authorise the substantial grading up or down of a subject's results to correctly reflect AIT standards;
- iii) recommend the review of a subject and the assessment and grading practices used within that subject.

15) Grading Order

Grading is given in the order:

- i) Assessment tasks are graded in subjects
- ii) Completed subjects result in a final grade, aggregated from the results for Assessment tasks
- iii) An entire course results in a final average grade and total GPA, aggregated from the results for completed subjects.

16) How Students will be Graded

Students will receive a final grade for each subject in which they are entitled to be enrolled and for which they have completed their enrolment without withdrawal. The following is a list of all the grades which students may receive on the completion of an individual subject:

- i) High distinction ($\geq 85\%$);
- ii) Distinction ($\geq 75\% < 85\%$);
- iii) Credit ($\geq 65\% < 75\%$);
- iv) Pass ($\geq 50\% < 65\%$);
- v) Fail ($< 50\%$);
- vi) Incomplete;
- vii) Withdrawn;
- viii) Pass Conceded.

These grades will be entered into the student's Academic Transcript. Students will receive a grade for each assessment item they submit, complete or are otherwise credited for, within each subject for which they are entitled to be enrolled.

17) Grading in a Course

The following is a list of standard grades which students may receive for individual subjects:

- i) High distinction;
- ii) Distinction;
- iii) Credit;
- iv) Pass;
- v) Fail.

HD	D	CR	P	F
≥ 85%	≥ 75% < 85%	≥ 65% < 75%	≥ 50% < 65%	< 50%
A High Distinction is the highest grade awarded for a subject. If a High Distinction is awarded for a task it shows that the task was completed with an exceptional level of skill.	A Distinction grade shows that a subject was completed with a high level of skill.	A Credit grade shows that a subject was completed with a good level of skill.	A Pass grade shows that a subject was completed with an adequate level of skill.	A Fail grade shows that a subject was not completed to the required level

- vi) Incomplete

A student may receive incomplete for any subject which they have failed to complete. In this event, the student may be required to complete the entire subject again.

- vii) Pass Conceded

A Pass Conceded grade is given to students who have not reached the required pass grade due to extenuating circumstances but are considered to be competent in the area of study.

Successful completion of subject assessment

Students will be entitled to have a final subject assessment, or final grade entered onto their Academic Transcript after they have completed all the necessary assessment requirements for a subject in which they were entitled to be enrolled.

Calculating a final course result

See: Award Eligibility and Graduation

A final result for an entire course will consist of:

individual marks for each completed subject showing the final subject grades and a summed average result for all subjects completed for the course.

18) Grading of Assessment Tasks in Subjects (VET & HE)

Successful completion of subject assessment

Students will be entitled to have a final subject assessment, or final learning outcome entered onto their student record after they have completed all the necessary assessment requirements for a subject in which they were entitled to be enrolled.

Calculating a final subject result

A final result for a completed subject will consist of: individual marks for each completed assessment task showing the final grade of each; a summed average result for all Assessment tasks completed for the subject (including any ZERO or Not Yet Competent (NYC) results).

Grading in Assessment tasks

Students will be entitled to have a final grade/outcome entered into their student record after they have completed all the requirements for a specific task assessment, within a subject in which they were entitled to be enrolled.

Students may receive a ZERO score or NYC outcome for non-submission; ineligible submission; plagiarised submission; work which does not meet any of the submission requirements.

Ineligible submission may include, but is not limited to work:

- i) that is not accessible to be graded;
- ii) which has been submitted after submission deadlines and/or any approved extension;
- iii) that was submitted when a student was not enrolled in a subject or Unit of Competency;
- iv) which has previously been submitted for assessment more than the approved number of times;
- v) work which has been submitted for assessment in another subject or Unit of Competency.

19) Appeals Against Results in Assessment Tasks or Subjects

Refer to Academic Appeals Policy

20) Feedback

In the case of Higher Education student's assessment feedback will be indicated by the appropriate grade, but where suitable, comments in addition to grading will be provided that will be constructive towards improving student skills and understanding of how they met or did not meet the assessment criteria, or demonstrated or did not demonstrate their skills and knowledge.

For students undertaking vocational courses of study feedback will be provided using the formal Assessment feedback form and will include assessment outcomes and constructive feedback in relation to all key elements of the task.

Assessments judgements will be moderated within subjects to ensure consistency and evaluated within the context of the course to enhance the effectiveness of the curriculum. Assessment judgements will also be moderated across the course to ensure reliability, validity and integrity across campuses and delivery modes.

The initial assessment task will usually take place before the midpoint of each subject and initial feedback provided and should be provided within two weeks of submission. In the case of a bootcamp subject, summative assessment feedback will be provided within 1 week of submission and formative assessment feedback will be provided on a daily basis, or within a study day of task submission.

21) Final Evaluation of All Grades (HE) and Competency Outcomes (VET)

There will be a final evaluation of all grades/learning outcomes for each completed subject/Unit of Competency at the conclusion of each study block.

Final outcomes will be evaluated by the Assessment Review Committee (ARC). Where necessary, individual marks/learning outcomes may be adjusted to best reflect both AIT policy, course requirement and subject/Unit of Competency requirements.

Grades/learning outcomes which are modified after the conclusion of a subject/Unit of Competency must be accurately diarised in AIT's internal marking system and the student records, with details of why any change was made and recording the original score.

22) Moderation

a) Responsibilities

Action	Responsibility	Timing
Undertake moderation in subjects	TLC	End of study block
Review subject moderation	TLC	No less than once each term for EACH subject
Review of a subject's moderation practices	TLC	Annually

Moderation is a process used to help assure the consistent high-quality delivery of subjects at AIT. There are three general kinds of moderation:

- i) Internal Moderation: That is, moderation within individual subjects
- ii) Intra Moderation: That is, where judgements between courses and campuses are compared
- iii) External moderation: That is, where we compare our grading with similar/same courses at other tertiary institutions

Internal moderation is used by AIT in all subjects both during the first year of new subjects and also following the completion of assessments and assessment tasks during the provision of individual subjects.

External moderation is used by AIT in making pre-moderation reviews of assessment tasks for proposed new subjects. External moderation may be used by AIT during the completion of some subjects.

Further reasons that AIT engages in both internal and external moderation are:

- i) To ensure that high quality assessment is applied consistently within AIT's courses;
- ii) To ensure that the expected standard of student outputs is appropriate and is comparable to similar standards applied in other tertiary courses in Australia;
- iii) To ensure that student outputs and completed assessment tasks are evaluated consistently and fairly across all students in the same subjects, or course.

b) Moderation of Judgements for Completed Assessments

All assessment tasks (and especially major assessment tasks) for subjects and Units of Competency undergo internal moderation for a predetermined % of all submitted assessment tasks in a given study block.

For VET Units of Competency this will be calculated in accordance with the published formula for determining a sample size.

In the case of HE, a major assessment is designated to be any individual or combined task assessment valued at 30% or greater of the total assessment for the subject. For VET Units of Competency, a major assessment is one that is the only assessment undertaken to determine competency outcomes.

Internal moderation is particularly appropriate when there is more than one marker within an individual subject, in which case moderation serves to:

- i) Ensure that grading within subjects is consistent between markers;
- ii) To ensure that the assessment processes were applied accurately and fairly.

In the case where there is only one marker the moderation process serves to ensure reliability and fairness of the assessment outcomes.

c) Process followed to internally moderate subjects with more than one marker

- i) All the markers for a specific subject or assessors for a particular Unit of Competency will meet after the conclusion of the assessment period and prior to the marking process. One or more of the markers will have completed provisional marking of several assessments;
- ii) Comparison of assessment practices will be made by all the markers and guidelines confirmed.
- iii) Markers may decide to:
 - (1) divide marking of particular portions of individual assessment, OR
 - (2) mark entire assessments proportionately;
- iv) Where entire assessments are marked proportionately it may be deemed appropriate for markers to have a further moderation meeting on the conclusion of marking and prior to the publication of results. The purpose of such a meeting would be to:
 - (1) compare final assessments between class groups; to ensure that the established guidelines were followed,
 - (2) ensure that there was no disparity in marking between classes/cohorts.

It may be appropriate for some Assessment tasks which are brief in nature or more clearly subjective to be graded by multiple markers in viewing sessions. Moderation in that instance will occur during the grading process.

d) Process followed to internally moderate subjects with a single marker

The marker will have completed provisional marking of several assessments. Comparison of assessment practices will then be made with another faculty member to ensure that the level of assessment is deemed consistent, accurate, reliable and fair.

It may be deemed appropriate to have a further moderation meeting upon the conclusion of marking and prior to the publication of results. The purpose of such a meeting would be to:

- i) compare final assessments between cohorts;
- ii) ensure that the established guidelines are consistently applied;
- iii) ensure that there was no disparity in marking between class groups.

e) Review of Moderation

The Academic Director should review moderation processes in conjunction with the TLC.

- i) The Academic Director may recommend:
- ii) no change to current practice; that subjects undertake more or more stringent moderation;
- iii) recommend a review of the moderation practices used within specific subjects.

f) External Moderation and Validation of Assessments

All proposed assessments and assessment tasks for subjects under development will be referred to and approved by the TLC.

The TLC will ensure that proposed assessment tasks are suitable for particular subjects by making comparisons through a formal validation process, where possible, to:

- i) like subjects delivered at other tertiary institutions in Australia;
- ii) like subjects currently being delivered at AIT;
- iii) same subjects being delivered across AIT;
- iv) same subjects being delivered by other tertiary institutions.

The TLC will also seek input and advice from industry for the purposes of aligning learning outcomes (skills and knowledge) with industry needs and requirements (both current and future).

Additionally, external moderation ensures that:

- i) assessment tasks are clearly aligned with the stated learning outcomes for individual subjects or Units of Competency;
- ii) assessment processes are fair, reasonable, valid and reliable;
- iii) are appropriate; and
- iv) assessments have clearly defined tasks, criteria, requirements, and instructions for students and assessors/markers.

While external moderation may not be possible for every subject, the TLC endeavours to ensure that periodic external moderation is undertaken. External moderation should be made for each subject not less than once every four taught terms.

The TLC is responsible for nurturing relationships with other tertiary providers to facilitate this process.

23) Publication

This policy is published on the web sites of AIT to ensure students have up-to-date and accurate information publicly available to them.

Section 3 – Reference and Supporting Information

1) Definitions

Word/Term	Definition
Moderation	Process of monitoring assessment judgements for validity, reliability and fairness
Validation	Process of evaluating effectiveness and appropriateness of an assessment tool or suite of assessment tools
Unit of Competency	the specification of knowledge and skill, and the application of that knowledge and skill, to the standard of performance expected in the workplace.
Competency Outcome	An assessable outcome of a learners skills and knowledge for a vocational Unit of Competency
Study block	Duration of study for a subject or Unit of Competency

2) Supporting documentation

Document name	Document type	Location
Academic Appeals	Policy	Internal
Academic Integrity	Guideline	Internal
Academic Integrity	Policy	Internal
Academic Integrity	Procedure	Internal
Academic Progression	Policy	Internal
Academic Total Quality Management	Policy	Internal
Award Eligibility and Graduation	Policy	Internal
Award Eligibility and Graduation	Procedure	Internal
Examination	Policy & Procedure	Internal
Feedback	Guideline	Internal

Late Submission	Policy	Internal
Academic Staff	Handbook	Internal
Higher Education Standards Framework 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard 1, clause 1.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment, sub-clauses 3 and 4 Standard 3, clause 3.1 Course Design, sub-clause 1e Standard 5, clause 5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement, sub-clause 2 	Framework	External
Under 18 Years Student Management and Supervision Procedure	Procedure	Internal
U18 International Students Guideline	Procedural Guide	Internal
National Code 2018	Govt Standards	External
TEQSA Threshold Standards 2015	Regulatory Standards	External
Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015 Standard 1 Training and Assessment, clause 1.6 - Industry Relevance & clauses 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11 - Assessment	Framework	External
Broadcasting Services Act 1999	Legislation	External

Section 4 – Change History

1) Change History

Version	Approval date	Department	Approved by	Change
V1.0	November 2014	Group Accreditation & Compliance	Group Manager	Development of Group Policy replacing existing entity level policies
		Technology & Design Division	General Manager	
V1.1	20 July 2019	Group Accreditation & Compliance	Compliance Manager	Update to align with regulatory and legislative changes and internal processes
		Technology & Design Division	General Manager	
V1.2	18 October 2019	Group Accreditation & Compliance	Group Manager	Update to new template
		Technology & Design Division	General Manager	
V1.3	9 November 2020	Group Accreditation & Compliance	Group Manager	Update appeal period to five days
		Technology & Design Division	General Manager	

V1.4	22 March 2021	Group Accreditation & Compliance	General Manager	Update from Academic Director to Executive Dean
		Technology & Design Division	Executive Dean	
V1.5	16 June 2022	Group Quality, Accreditation & Compliance	Executive General Manager	Section 7i) updated.
		Technology & Design Division	Academic Director	