Australian Computer Society
Policies and Procedures:
Assessment

inspiring success

Australian Computer Society Inc

E education@acs.org.au | W www.acs.org.au
CRICOS Provider Code 03405K
RTO ID: 40184

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Australian Computer Society Inc

E education@acs.org.au | W www.acs.org.au
CRICOS Provider Code 03405K
RTO ID: 40184

PREAMBLE

ACS regards the assessment of its qualifications as a serious matter and will not accept any form of assessment which is not fully compliant with the relevant legislation and regulations, in this case:

- National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011
- Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015
- Skilling Australia's Workforce Act 2005
- Skilling Australia's Workforce (Repeal and Transitional Provisions) Act 2005
- Other legislation relevant to the sector and to the operation of the ACS as a Registered Training Organisation

The ACS values the authenticity of assessment work and enforces penalties for academic misconduct. As part of the assessment information provided to students on commencement of each unit, trainers will draw the attention of students to the ACS view on, and procedures for, academic misconduct and, where appropriate, give examples of what would constitute academic misconduct in their subjects.

The Academic Misconduct Policy is available to students in the Moodle shell for every subject in the Introduction to the unit or subject, as is this Assessment Policy.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to all trainers and assessors involved in the delivery of the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology (DIT), the ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management and the ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability (GCITs), regarding the assessment of subjects in the qualifications developed by the ACS.

This policy and the related procedures shall apply to all ACS trainers and Delivery Partners (where applicable).

Unless otherwise specified, this document covers assessment as part of delivered DIT and GCIT courses and leading to an ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology qualification, an ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management qualification, or an ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability qualification or completion of part thereof, or as an assessment only process (RPL).

The procedures are designed to ensure that during all parts of the process the academic standards and integrity of the ACS are maintained and safeguarded and that the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence provided in the **Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015** are adhered to.

In the event of a Partner or the ACS suspecting academic misconduct by a student in an assessment, a preliminary and informal enquiry will be undertaken by the Partner in

consultation with the ACS Education Program Manager. If the preliminary enquiry fails to discover a satisfactory explanation for the student's behaviour, or a satisfactory response to the behaviour, a formal enquiry will be undertaken involving the Professional Education Governance Committee. A possible outcome of a formal enquiry can be suspension from the subject and/or program in which a student is enrolled and, where a student is also a member of the Australian Computer Society (ACS), referral of the case to the ACS Disciplinary Committee.

A student has a right of appeal against the outcomes of preliminary or formal enquiries; first, to an ACS Appeals Committee (see Academic Appeals Policy) constituted for the purpose; and subsequently, if the student so wishes and is studying a program accredited under the Australian Qualifications Framework, to the relevant education registration authority.

This document will be included with enrolment materials for all ACS programs and enrolling students will be required to sign that they have read and understood it. This document will also be included in the introductory materials to all subjects assessed by ACS.

POLICY

Assessment involves collecting evidence in accordance with the relevant Training Package guidelines, providing students with the opportunity to demonstrate competency in that subject/unit and achieve successful outcomes.

Students will have every opportunity, consistent with the policy and procedures, to complete all assessments for a subject/unit/course.

Principles of Assessment
Quality assessment outcomes will be achieved by basing the development of assessment processes and instruments on the principles of assessment:

- Fairness
  The individual learner's needs are considered in the assessment process.
  o Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments are applied by the RTO to take into account the individual learner's needs.
  o The RTO 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:
  o reflecting the learner's needs;
  o assessing competencies held by the learner no matter how or where they have been acquired; and
  o drawing from a range of assessment methods and using those that are appropriate to the context, the unit of competency and associated assessment requirements, and the individual.
- Validity

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

Validity requires:
- o   assessment against the unit(s) of competency and the associated assessment requirements covers the broad range of skills and knowledge that are essential to competent performance;
- o   assessment of knowledge and skills is integrated with their practical application;
- o   assessment to be based on evidence that demonstrates that a learner could demonstrate these skills and knowledge in other similar situations; and
- o   judgement of competence is based on evidence of learner performance that is aligned to the unit/s of competency and associated assessment requirements.
- • Reliability
  Evidence presented for assessment is consistently interpreted and assessment results are comparable irrespective of the assessor conducting the assessment.

Rules of Evidence
Evidence requirements for assessment purposes will be based on the rules of evidence:

- • Validity
  The assessor is assured that the learner has the skills, knowledge and attributes as described in the module or unit of competency and associated assessment requirements.
- • Sufficiency
  The assessor is assured that the quality, quantity and relevance of the assessment evidence enables a judgement to be made of a learner's competency.
- • Authenticity
  The assessor is assured that the evidence presented for assessment is the learner's own work.
- • Currency
  The assessor is assured that the assessment evidence demonstrates current competency. This requires the assessment evidence to be from the present or the very recent past.

Details of the assessments for each subject in the DIT AND GCITs will be provided in the DIT AND GCITs Trainer Guides for each subject and in the learning materials provided to students online. This information is also contained in the assessment strategy for each subject and in the overall assessment strategy for the DIT AND GCITs.

Marking guides and rubrics are also included in the documents provided to trainers, along with example answers where appropriate.

Students are informed of their rights and responsibilities with regards to assessment in the Student Handbook, and of the assessments for each subject at the commencement of those subjects.

Special considerations and reasonable adjustments may be made to assessments if and when appropriate. Educational and support services will be provided to students who experience issues which impact on their ability to complete assessments on time and to the required standard.

Validation of assessments

Assessments must also focus on the application of knowledge and skills to the standard of performance required in the workplace. To ensure this occurs, assessment tools will be validated by and Industry Advisory Panel as part of an ongoing validation schedule.

The above validation schedule will be conducted in accordance with Standards 1.10 and 1.11 of the *Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015*.

Assessments will also be validated by other educators via the Victorian TAFE ICT Network (VTICTN) who meet regularly.

In addition to this, all assessments will be reviewed by trainers and assessors involved in the delivery of the subjects as part of the continuous improvement process.

Assessor qualifications

Trainers are responsible for the assessment of the work submitted by the students. Where a trainer does not have the relevant up to date TAE qualification (at the time of writing the TAE40110 - Certificate IV in Training and Assessment (Release 4)) then they must co-assess the submissions with a trainer who does hold that qualification. In this case both parties will be named in the assessment documentation and the qualified person will be indicated.

Recognition of Prior Learning

If a student has previously undertaken units in the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology (DIT), the ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management and the ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability (GCITs), they may be given RPL for those units.

Retention of records

RTOs are required by ASQA to securely retain, and be able to produce in full at audit if requested to do so, all completed student assessment items for each student.

All completed student assessment items for each unit must be retained for a period of **six months** from the date of the result or the duration of the student's enrolment, whichever is the longer period for students undertaking the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology (DIT), the ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management and the ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability (GCITs). Submitted work will be kept in the ACS Moodle Shell, but copies of work returned to students along with trainer feedback must be kept in a secure location by the Delivery Partner for this period.

Assessment items include the actual pieces of work completed by the student along with all assessor feedback and completed marking guides. In the case of presentations or other

assessments where the student's actual work cannot be kept, "the retained evidence must have enough detail to demonstrate the assessor's judgement of the student's performance against the standard required" (General Direction—Retention requirements for completed student assessment items, 2013, https://www.asqa.gov.au/news-publications/publications/general-direction-retention-requirements-completed-student-assessment accessed 21/07/17.)

The ACS will retain master copies of the assessment tools permanently.

The ACS must retain client records of attainment of units of competency and qualifications for a period of 30 years.

Moderation of assessments

In the pilot of the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology, all assessments were moderated by the ACS. Thereafter the ACS will select random samples to moderate. Since all assessments will be submitted in the ACS Moodle shell, samples can be selected from there. If there is a discrepancy in the assessment outcomes (i. e. the student is deemed Competent by the Delivery Partner but Not Yet Competent by the ACS, or vice versa) more samples will be accessed and once these have been examined, a determination will be made regarding the results for that cohort by the ACS.

If there is a variance in the marks between the trainer and the moderator, they will participate in a moderation meeting to decide on a mutually acceptable set of marks, which accurately reflect the students' knowledge and skills levels. The Moderator will submit the final results spreadsheet and Moderation Report, and the Trainer will update the marks in the Moodle Gradebook to reflect the final agreed marks.

For the GCITs, assessments will be moderated between trainers where there is more than one for a unit of competency, and by the Industry Advisory Panel where there is only one trainer.

Assessment will also be reviewed for all qualifications by the Examiners Committee, and recommendations fed back to the appropriate staff.

Grade Categories

The DIT and GCITs are competency-based qualifications, ensuring that students demonstrate the ability to perform certain tasks to a required standard. As such, the following grades will apply to the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology, the ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management and the ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability:

CA	*Competency Achieved*: the student has demonstrated competency in the unit/subject
NYC	*Not Yet Competent*: the student has not demonstrated competency
WD	*Withdrawn*: the student has withdrawn from the unit/subject
NS	*Not Submitted*: the student did not submit the assignment/assessment for this unit/subject

In addition to the above, some universities with whom the ACS has articulation agreements request that the student obtain a certain % mark or associated grade in order to articulate into their degrees (for example 60% average or Credit average). For this reason, a % mark for each assessment will also be provided to students for the purposes of articulation. Weightings are provided for each assessment item in the subject outlines (and in the Gradebook in Moodle) to ensure that these % marks accurately reflect the student's abilities in each subject. The % also provides students with additional feedback on their performance, but the % mark and grades do not have a direct correlation with the competency grades, except in the case of some quizzes (where a student has to answer 80% correctly to be deemed Competent in that quiz, for example).

Students must be deemed Competent in all assessments to be deemed competent in a Unit of Competency, and will be awarded the qualification based on these grades (C, NYC, WD, NS), not the % mark or grade.

The % mark grades are as follows:

Grade	Range of Marks
High Distinction (HD)	85%+
Distinction (DI)	75 – 84%
Credit (CR)	65 – 74%
Pass (PS)	50 – 64%

Again, the above grades are for articulation purposes only, and will not determine whether a student attains the qualification or not.

Release of results
Results will not be released to students by the Delivery Partner until moderation has been completed by the ACS and the results have been agreed by the trainer and the moderator.

PROCEDURES

Assessment assignments will be submitted online and trainers/assessors involved in the delivery of subjects must ensure that the work submitted is the student's own work. In particular, trainers and assessors must be very vigilant for cases of plagiarism, and ensure that all students are fully informed of the Academic Misconduct Policy at the commencement of the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology, the ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management and the ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability, and reminded of it at the commencement of each subject. If any case of plagiarism is found, the Academic Misconduct Policy must be enacted, and the ACS must be informed.

Australian Computer Society Inc

Management of the assessment process

The table below outlines the responsibilities of Management in the assessment process:

Task	Responsibility	Documentation
Development of training and assessment strategy	ACS Education Project Manager	Training and Assessment Strategy for each qualification Assessment Strategy and Marking Guide for each subject/unit Assessment Mapping documents for each subject/unit
Allocation of appropriately qualified trainers and assessors to each subject/unit	Delivery Partner, approved by ACS	Trainer Profiles
Provision of information to trainers and students re assessment	ACS Education Project Manager Delivery Partner	Staff Handbook; Student Handbook; ACS website Distribution to staff and students of handbooks
Development of assessment policy and procedures	ACS Education Project Manager	ACS Assessment Policy
Development of strategy for industry validation of assessments and implementation of the strategy	ACS Education Project Manager	Industry Advisory Panel Policy IAP Terms of Reference IAP Validation Schedule Validation Record – Industry Experts
Development of Moderation procedures	ACS Education Project Manager	ACS Assessment Policy Moderation Guidelines for the ICT50115 Diploma of Information Technology (DIT), the ICT80115 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology and Strategic Management and the ICT80215 Graduate Certificate in Information Technology Sustainability
Engagement of moderation assessors	ACS Education Project Manager	Contracts for moderators
Development of RPL process	ACS Education Project Manager	RPL Student Information Guide

Conduct of assessments

Trainers/assessors must ensure that all assignments and assessments are conducted and submitted on time and by the student whose name appears on the assignment or assessment.

All assessments will be evaluated using the Marking Guides provided by the ACS and meaningful feedback will be provided to the student in a timely manner. In the case of formative assessments, not more than one week after the due date, and in the case of

summative assessments (at the end of a subject) not more than three weeks after (allowing time for moderation and ratification to take place). Feedback should provide students with information about how their work could be improved.

Online quizzes must be conducted at specific times with a time limit and under examination conditions. For example, all students must do such quizzes at the same time and in the same place and invigilators must monitor the room to ensure that no irregularities take place. Quiz questions will be randomised so that students do not do them in the same order.

Once DIT assessments have been submitted and assessed, they must be moderated by the Delivery Partner in the first instance (if more than one class with different trainers is being run at the same time) according to the Moderation Guidelines provided by the ACS.

Moderation of assessment for the GCIT will be conducted between trainers where there is more than one for a unit of competency, and by the Industry Advisory Panel where there is only one trainer.

All assessment results are reviewed and ratified by the Examiners Committee prior to release.

Recording of results

Results should be recorded in the Grade Book in Moodle by the trainer, but must be hidden from students. Both the percentage marks and grades and the Competent/Not Yet Competent grades will be recorded in the Grade Book, but the only grades relevant to whether a student attains the qualification will be the Competent or Not Yet Competent grades. The other marks and grades are for extra feedback and articulation purposes only.

Trainers must ensure that all student names on the list are accurate and that results recorded against those names are also accurate.

The Delivery Partner must then inform the ACS that the assessment/assignment has been assessed. In the case of the pilot program all assessments were moderated by the ACS, and in the case of subsequent cohorts the ACS will pick random samples, at least 20% of those submitted.

In the case of discrepancies, the ACS's judgement will be final, and the results adjusted accordingly.

Once the ACS has moderated all results at the end of a subject, the moderator will submit a Moderation Report with the final marks, and these will be entered in the Moodle Gradebook by the trainer, and the results can be released to the students. Under no circumstances should results be released to students until this process has been completed and the Delivery Partner has been informed of the final marks.

Records of results will be maintained as described in the policy above.

Students at risk

If students are identified as being at risk of being deemed Not Yet Competent in a unit or subject, those students must be identified in a timely manner (i. e. not at the end of the subject or unit, but at any time that their problem becomes apparent) and additional academic support (refer to the Academic Intervention Strategy in *S10 ACS Monitoring Course Progress Policies and Procedures ECA* and *S9 ACS Completion with Expected Duration* policy) must be provided to those students to give them the best chance possible to achieve competency.

Extensions and resubmission of assessments

An extension on a submission deadline will only be permitted in the case of health (supported by medical certificates), critical incidents (as defined by the ACS Critical Incident Policy) and Procedure; or another serious event which impacts on the student's ability to study. The trainer will make a determination regarding this, and take into consideration reporting requirements and moderation and ratification deadlines.

Resubmission of assessments will NOT be permitted if an assessment is submitted late without a written application for an extension by the student prior to the deadline. This application must be signed by the student and the trainer.

If students submit an assessment on time and are initially assessed as Not Yet Competent, they will be entitled to a second attempt (resubmission). The due date for resubmission and reassessment will be determined by the teacher, with due consideration given to reasonable timeframes for the students and reporting requirements prior to the unit of subject end date.

Further resubmissions may be permitted on a case by case basis, and if there are special considerations to be taken into account. Special considerations may include illness; any critical incident as defined by the ACS Critical Incident Policy and Procedure; or another serious event which impacts on the student's ability to study. The trainer will make a determination regarding this in conjunction with the ACS.

If a student disagrees with the outcome of an assessment they will have the right to access the Academic Appeals process as outlined in the relevant policy, which is provided to students upon commencement of the course.

Continuous improvement of assessment

This will take place on a regular basis and through several processes, as outlined in the table below:

Task	Responsibility	Documentation
Review of assessment tool post-delivery of subject	Trainers/assessors of Delivery Partner	Program Review Checklist Subject Report
Review of assessment tool as part of Validation Schedule	Industry Advisory Panel (ACS) Educators Advisory Panel (ACS)	Validation Record – Industry Experts Validation Record – Educators
Updating of assessment tools	ACS in conjunction with Delivery Partners ACS following recommendations of IAP/EAP	Recommendations for improvement Updated versions of assessment tools

If a student is found to have plagiarised, the Academic Misconduct Policy will come into play, as outlined below:

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE

Preliminary enquiry into alleged academic misconduct

Where faculty have concerns that the action of a student may involve academic misconduct they will discuss the issue with the ACS Education Program Manager.

If the ACS Education Program Manager believes the issue warrants further explanation, the Senior Administration Officer (or, in place of the Senior Administration Officer, the ACS Education Program Manager) will notify the student by email of a date, time and other details for a meeting, teleconference, or similar.

The student may invite a faculty, administrative staff member or student of ACS to participate in the discussion.

Possible outcomes of the preliminary enquiry:

If, as a result of discussion with the student, the ACS Education Program Manager determines that:

- no academic misconduct has occurred, no further action will be taken and the student will be notified accordingly; or

- the action of the student constitutes academic misconduct, ACS Education Program Manager will provide academic counselling to the student and may decide on a further course of action, including re-submission of an assessment item, awarding zero marks for an assessment item; or another outcome appropriate to the case; or

- a more serious outcome is appropriate; ACS Education Program Manager will request the Professional Education Governance Board to initiate a formal enquiry.

If the student chooses not to participate, the ACS Education Program Manager will decide on the most appropriate outcome.

If the student does not agree to the course of action proposed by the ACS Education Program Manager, the student may initiate an appeal against the decision (see Academic Appeals Policy).

Formal enquiry into alleged academic misconduct

The Professional Education Governance Board, upon receipt of advice from the ACS Education Program Manager following an initial enquiry, will review the case and the evidence provided to determine whether the case should proceed to formal enquiry.

Where the Professional Education Board concludes that:

- the evidence in the case is insufficient to proceed, they will advise ACS Education Program Manager, the affected faculty, and the student accordingly. No further action will be taken and no information about the case will be recorded in the student's records.

- the action of the student lacked intent, but constituted academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to continue their involvement in the program and the student, affected faculty and ACS Education Program Manager will be advised accordingly. Information about the case will be recorded in the student's records (see "Recording information about academic misconduct" below).

- there is sufficient evidence to proceed to formal enquiry, they will establish a formal enquiry committee consisting of: a member of the Professional Education Board, ACS Education Program Manager, a member of faculty and the Senior Administration Officer (or, in place of the Senior Administration Officer, the ACS Education Program Manager). The quorum for a formal enquiry will be three, but must include a member of the Professional Education Board and ACS Education Program Manager. The formal enquiry committee might meet at a physical location or communicate by teleconference, exchange of emails, or similar.

The documentation that is provided to the formal enquiry committee in considering the matter must be provided to the student who is the subject of the enquiry.

Faculty who made the allegation may present their case to the enquiry but will not serve as a member of the committee. The Senior Administration Officer (or, in place of the Senior Administration Officer, the ACS Education Program Manager) will write by email to the student providing details of the alleged misconduct and inviting the student to provide evidence to the formal enquiry committee regarding the allegation. The student may be assisted or represented at the enquiry by an ACS nominee or any faculty, staff member or student of ACS.

The formal enquiry may proceed whether or not the student responds or attends.

Options available to the formal enquiry committee

a) Where the formal enquiry concludes that the action of the student does not constitute academic misconduct, no further action will be taken and no information about the case maintained in the student's records.

b) Where the formal enquiry concludes that the action of the student constitutes academic misconduct, but warrants disciplinary action equivalent to or less serious than the value of the relevant item of assessment, the matter will be referred back to ACS Education Program Manager for implementation. Information about the case will be maintained in the student's records (see "Recording information about academic misconduct" below).

c) Where the formal enquiry concludes that the action of the student constitutes academic misconduct warranting disciplinary action more serious than the value of the relevant item of assessment, the Professional Education Board will determine an

appropriate outcome and notify the Student Support Officer (or, in place of the Student Support Officer, the ACS Education Program Manager). If the student is also a member of the Australian Computer Society (ACS), the formal enquiry committee may also refer the case to the ACS Disciplinary Committee.

The Senior Administration Officer (or, in place of the Senior Administration Officer, the ACS Education Program Manager) will provide confirmation by email of the outcome of the formal enquiry to the student and affected faculty.

Appeals against outcomes of a formal enquiry

If the student does not agree to the course of action determined by the formal enquiry committee, the student may initiate an appeal against the decision (see Academic Appeals Policy).

Students may continue their program of study pending the outcome of an appeal, unless ACS Education Program Manager is of the view that to do so places the student, other students or faculty at risk (where this occurs, appropriate documentary evidence is to be maintained on the student's file).

Recording information about academic misconduct

ACS will maintain information about academic misconduct for a minimum of seven years from the date of the last incident recorded.

ACS Education Program Manager and the Professional Education Board will have access to all information recorded about a student when determining whether the actions of that student constitute academic misconduct and when determining an appropriate outcome. No information relating to the case will be recorded if ACS Education Program Manager or the Professional Education Board determines that no academic misconduct occurred.

Where a student appeals the outcome of a preliminary or formal enquiry, the Appeals Committee (see Academic Appeals Policy) will have access to all information relating to the case and to any other cases recorded against the student.

Professional Year Warnings Procedure

In the case of the PE Online course, which is the part of the Professional Year conducted by the ACS, there is a very specific system of warnings and removal of students.

Academic Misconduct

What constitutes academic misconduct is outlined in this policy. In cases of academic misconduct for the ACS, there is a three-strike policy.

Warnings for Academic Misconduct

First warning

The first time the student commits academic misconduct, this is reported to the ACS and the student is sent a first formal warning by email, with the provider copied in, explaining the reason for the warning.

Second Warning

If the student commits academic misconduct for a second time, they are sent a second formal warning by the ACS with the provider copied in, and again the reason is explained.

Third and Final Warning

If a third instance of academic misconduct occurs, the student is sent a third and final warning. This warning informs the student of the action necessary to avoid removal from the PE Online course and a date by which this action must be taken. If the student fails to take the necessary action by the deadline set out in this warning, they will be removed from the course on that date, and they will be notified of this removal, with the provider copied in.

The student can appeal this decision (see Appeals Policy) if they have evidence that they did not commit academic misconduct.

If a student wishes to remain part of the program, they will then be required redo the entire PE Online course at their own expense.

If the student needs to be moved to a later cohort to complete the PE Online course (and therefore the Professional Year) the ACS **cannot** guarantee that the student will be put in the next cohort to start the course again. Students will be put in the next *available* cohort, but this may not be for several weeks because there is a limit to the size of cohorts, so if the cohort is full, no more students can be added. This means that the completion and graduation dates can be delayed for a significant period of time.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a very serious form of academic misconduct, and as such has its own policy and warning procedure in Professional Year.

Extensive guidance is provided to students regarding plagiarism; what it is and how it can be avoided, both in the ACS Online Orientation and in the PE Orientation Week, at the beginning of the PE Online course. Therefore, plagiarism is not tolerated in the PE Online course, just as it is not tolerated in the professional workplace. This is one measure that the ACS has put in place to ensure that students do not intentionally or unintentionally commit plagiarism. In

fact, students must complete an assignment cover sheet to submit with each assignment, which declares the work to be all their own with the following declaration:

> "I declare that the assignment is based on my own work and that all material previously written or published in any source by any other person has been duly acknowledged in the assignment. I have not submitted this work, or a significant part thereof, previously as part of any academic program."

Another measure the ACS has put in place to ensure that plagiarism does not occur, is that once discussion posts are posted or assignments are submitted, a program called Vericite checks them for plagiarism against all previous submissions. This alerts the tutor of any similarities between discussion posts or assignments of any current or past students.

In addition to this, if tutors suspect that a student has copies something from the Internet for a discussion post or assignment, they check the content themselves, and are usually able to track down the source.

Warnings for Plagiarism

There is a one-strike policy for plagiarism in the Professional Year. This means that if a student plagiarises and there is proof either through Vericite or through the tutor finding the original source of the information, the student will be given **ONE** warning. The student will be notified of this via email and their PYear provider will be copied in to that email to alert them that the student is at risk of failing PYear.

If the student then commits plagiarism again, they are removed from the course. They will then be deemed to have failed PYear. Students will be informed of this decision by email with the PYear provider copied in. The student can appeal this decision (see Appeals Policy) if they have evidence that they did not plagiarise their work.

If a student wishes to remain part of the program, they will then be required to complete the entire PE Online course at their own expense. This will affect their completion and therefore graduation date.

For more regarding reenrolment fees please contact your PY provider or the ACS Education team.

Australian Computer Society Inc

E education@acs.org.au | W www.acs.org.au
CRICOS Provider Code 03405K
RTO ID: 40184

Definitions

The following definitions, taken from the *Standards for Registered Training Organisation (RTOs) 2015*, are relevant to assessment:

AQF certification documentation is the set of official documents that confirms that an AQF qualification or statement of attainment has been issued to an individual.

AQF qualification means an AQF qualification type endorsed in a training package or accredited in a VET accredited course.

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

Assessment system is a coordinated set of documented policies and procedures (including assessment materials and tools) that ensure assessments are consistent and are based on the Principles of Assessment contained in Table 1.8-1 and the Rules of Evidence contained in Table 1.8-2.

Assessors are persons who assess a learner's competence in accordance with Clauses 1.13 to 1.16.

Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) means the framework for regulated qualifications in the Australian education and training system, as agreed by the Commonwealth, State and Territory ministerial council with responsibility for higher education.

Authenticated VET transcript has the meaning given in the *Student Identifiers Act 2014.*

Client means a learner, enterprise or organisation that uses or purchases the services provided by an RTO**.**

Code means the unique identifier for units of competency, skill sets, VET accredited courses, modules, AQF qualifications or training packages as required by the Standards for Training Packages and Standards for VET Accredited Courses.

Competency means 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.

Current industry skills are the knowledge, skills and experience required by VET trainers and assessors and those who provide training and assessment under supervision to ensure that their training and assessment is based on current industry practices and meets the needs of industry.

Current industry skills may be informed by consultations with industry and may include, but is not limited to:

a) having knowledge of and/or experience using the latest techniques and processes;
b) possessing a high level of product knowledge;
c) understanding and knowledge of legislation relevant to the industry and to employment and workplaces;
d) being customer/client-oriented;
e) possessing formal industry and training qualifications; and
f) training content that reflects current industry practice.

Data Provision Requirements are the requirements for data provision as agreed by the Industry and Skills Council and implemented by the VET Regulator as required by its governing legislation.

Educational and support services may include, but are not limited to:

a) pre-enrolment materials;

b) study support and study skills programs;
c) language, literacy and numeracy (LLN) programs or referrals to these programs;
d) equipment, resources and/or programs to increase access for learners with disabilities and other learners in accordance with access and equity;
e) learning resource centres;
f) mediation services or referrals to these services;
g) flexible scheduling and delivery of training and assessment;
h) counselling services or referrals to these services;
i) information and communications technology (ICT) support;
j) learning materials in alternative formats, for example, in large print;
k) learning and assessment programs contextualised to the workplace; and
l) any other services that the RTO considers necessary to support learners to achieve competency.

Independent validation means**,** for the purposes of Clause 1.25, that the validation is carried out by a validator or validators who:
a) are not employed or subcontracted by the RTO to provide training and assessment; and
b) have no other involvement or interest in the operations of the RTO.

Industry means the bodies that have a stake in the services provided by RTOs. These can include, but are not limited to:
a) enterprise/industry clients, e.g. employers;
b) group training organisations;
c) industry organisations;
d) industry regulators;
e) industry skills councils or similar bodies;
f) industry training advisory bodies; and
g) unions.

Industry and Skills Council means the Commonwealth, State and Territory ministerial council established by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), or its successor.

Industry engagement, for the purposes of Clauses 1.5 & 1.6, may include, but is not
a) limited to, strategies such as: partnering with local employers, regional/national businesses, relevant industry bodies and/or enterprise RTOs;
b) involving employer nominees in industry advisory committees and/or reference groups;
c) embedding staff within enterprises;
d) networking in an ongoing way with industry networks, peak bodies and/or employers;
e) developing networks of relevant employers and industry representatives to participate in assessment validation; and
f) exchanging knowledge, staff, and/or resources with employers, networks and industry bodies.

Learner means a person being trained and/or assessed by the RTO for the purpose of issuing AQF certification documentation.

Mode of delivery means the method adopted to deliver training and assessment, including online, distance, or blended methods.

Module means a group of learning outcomes in a VET accredited course where it can be established that it is not possible to develop an appropriate unit of competency.

National Register means the register maintained by the Commonwealth Department responsible for VET and referred to in section 216 of the *National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011.*

Nationally Recognised Training (NRT) Logo means the logo used nationally to signify training packages and VET accredited courses.

Operations of an RTO include training, assessment and administration and support services related to its registration, including those delivered across jurisdictions and offshore.

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) means an assessment process that assesses the competency/s of an individual that may have been acquired through formal, non-formal and informal learning to determine the extent to which that individual meets the requirements specified in the training package or VET accredited courses.

a) formal learning refers to learning that takes place through a structured program of instruction and is linked to the attainment of an AQF qualification or statement of attainment (for example, a certificate, diploma or university degree);

b) non-formal learning refers to learning that takes place through a structured program of instruction, but does not lead to the attainment of an AQF qualification or statement of attainment (for example, in-house professional development programs conducted by a business); and

c) informal learning refers to learning that results through experience of work-related, social, family, hobby or leisure activities (for example the acquisition of interpersonal skills developed through several years as a sales representative).

Record means a written, printed, or electronic document providing evidence that activities have been performed.

Services mean training, assessment, related educational and support services and/or any activities related to the recruitment of prospective learners. It does not include services such as student counselling, mediation or ICT support.

Skill set means a single unit of competency or a combination of units of competency from a training package which link to a licensing or regulatory requirement, or a defined industry need.

Standards for VET Accredited Courses are the standards made under subsection 188(1) of the *National Vocational Education and Training Regulator Act 2011* or the equivalent requirements adopted by a non-referring State.

Statement of attainment means a statement issued to a person confirming that the person has satisfied the requirements of the unit/s of competency or accredited short course specified in the statement.

Statistically valid means for the purposes of these Standards, a random sample of appropriate size is selected to enable confidence that the result is sufficiently accurate to be accepted as representative of the total population of assessments being validated.

Student Identifier has the meaning given in the *Student Identifiers Act 2014*.

Third party means any party that provides services on behalf of the RTO but does not include a contract of employment between an RTO and its employee.

Training and assessment strategies and practices are the approach of, and method adopted by, an RTO with respect to training and assessment designed to enable learners to meet the requirements of the training package or accredited course.

Training Package means the components of a training package endorsed by the Industry and Skills Council or its delegate in accordance with the Standards for Training Packages. The endorsed components of a Training Package are: units of competency; assessment

requirements (associated with each unit of competency); qualifications; and credit arrangements. The endorsed components form part of the requirements that an RTO must meet under these Standards. A training package also consists of a non-endorsed, quality assured companion volume/s which contains industry advice to RTOs on different aspects of implementation.

Training Product means AQF qualification, skill set, unit of competency, accredited short course and module.

Unit of competency means the specification of the standards of performance required in the workplace as defined in a training package.

Validation is the quality review of the assessment process. Validation involves checking that the assessment tool/s produce/s valid, reliable, sufficient, current and authentic evidence to enable reasonable judgements to be made as to whether the requirements of the training package or VET accredited courses are met. It includes reviewing a statistically valid sample of the assessments and making recommendations for future improvements to the assessment tool, process and/or outcomes and acting upon such recommendations.

VET means vocational education and training.

VET accredited course means a course accredited by the VET regulator in accordance with the Standards for VET Accredited Courses.

VET Quality Framework comprises:
   a) the Standards for Registered Training Organisations
   b) the Australian Qualifications Framework
   c) the Fit and Proper Person Requirements
   d) the Financial Viability Risk Assessment Requirements
   e) the Data Provision Requirements

VET Regulator means:
   a) the National VET Regulator; and
   b) a body of a non-referring State that is responsible for the kinds of matters dealt with under the VET legislation for that State.

End of Document
Assessment Policy and Procedure

Authors

Asheley Jones/ Derinda Smith		

Version History

Date	Version	Revision History	Author /Reviser
February 2015	**1**	**Original document**	AJ/DS
September 2015	**2**	**Rectification of header, new DIT Code, DIT Coordinator replaced by Education Program Manager and new Version Control Panel added**	DS
October 2015	**2.1**	**Additional details about Principles of Assessment, Rules of Evidence, Retention of Records and Grade Categories**	DS
October 2015	**2.2**	**More information added about grades and marks, and entering marks into the Moodle grade book**	DS
July 2017	**2.3**	**Adjustments made as detailed in** *Internal Quality Compliance Audit Checklist Assessment – V 2.2*	DS
April 2018	**2.4**	**Updated table of contents**	Louise Smith

Approvals
This document requires the following approvals.
Date of issue and version details must be entered upon approval.

Name	Title	Date of Issue	Version
Asheley Jones	**Director, Education**	**February 2015**	1
Simon Taylor	**Director, Education**	**September 2015**	2
Simon Taylor	**Director, Education**	**October 2015**	2.1
Simon Taylor	**Director, Education**	**October 2015**	2.2
Allyn Radford	**Director, Education**	**July 2017**	2.3
Louise Smith	**Director, Education**	**April 2018**	2.4

Distribution
This document has been distributed to:

Name	Title	Date of Issue	Version

Custodian title & e-mail address:	Louise Smith – Director of Education Louise.smith@acs.org.au

Australian Computer Society Inc

Responsible Business Group:	Education
Distribution: **Highlight which is applicable and provide names where applicable**	General (no restriction on distribution) Restricted (distribution limited to certain (Business Systems) groups or (named) individuals.