



Assessment, Grades and Resit Policy and Procedure

Competency Assessment:

Competency-based assessment is the process of gathering evidence and making judgements about whether competency has been achieved against performance criteria and critical evidence requirements specified within the Units of Competence within Training Packages.

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

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

"C" means the person being assessed has demonstrated competence against all requirements detailed in the unit/s of competence.

"NYC" means the person being assessed has not yet demonstrated competence against one or more of the requirements detailed in the unit/s of competence/module. The person must have attempted or been provided with the opportunity to complete ALL of the assessment tasks for the unit to be deemed "NYC".

Meaningful and valid assessment

Each assessment task is directly mapped and aligned with Units / Elements of Competence from the Unit/s of Competence (Competency Standards)

Each assessment task has either suggested answers and/or critical points of evidence that determines whether the result is "C" or "NYC"

Where several assessments are required for complete assessment against the Unit of Competence, there is clear indication to trainer and student that a "C" is required in all assessments for an overall "C" in the Unit.

Assessment tools must be validated against the Training Package and by review of the tools by industry representatives. Trainer/Assessor validation meetings should review the assessment process and compare and measure the evidence being collected as further validation against the principles of assessment.

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

Students must be provided with at least three attempts at achieving competency (see below).



Assessment, Grades and Resit Policy and Procedure

Grading competency assessment

When a student is graded as "NYC" in any assessment, the student is provided (free of charge) the opportunity for one re-assessment or the opportunity to show evidence of competence. The student is given a due date for the re-assessment, and must comply with this or be marked "NYC".

There are four forms of re-assessment that can be used where a student's assessment is assessed as "NYC", these are:

1. A re-submission of work or product as per the original assessment task evidence (eg a new lesson plan or a new children's resource)
2. A re-sit of the exam/written assessment
3. A repeated demonstration where a practical demo was required to meet evidence of a criteria checklist.
4. Other form of evidence agreed to by the Institute Assessor and student.

If the student is graded "NYC" on the second assessment it becomes the students responsibility to provide to the trainer/assessor, further evidence of competence which meets the element and performance criteria required, or to arrange a further re-sit or third assessment where possible. The student is again given a due date for the re-assessment, and must comply with this or be marked "NYC".

In the case of Trainees and Apprentices and students engaged in government funded programs, the assessment of this further evidence is free of charge if conducted within the time-frame of their training plan/training contract.

In the case of fee-for-service students, a re-assessment charge of \$50 is applied to this re-assessment.

Students wishing to undertake further assessment after the third assessment attempt will be required to repeat the unit of competence/module if being offered by the Institute at the student's expense, or apply for Skills Recognition at a later time and pay the relevant fee.

Additional Grading Criteria for Performance Level Grading (PLG)

Applies only to Diploma and Advanced Diploma qualifications

Industry or higher education authorities may require students graduating from the Institute to also show results which include PLG. Where it has been determined that PLG be used for Institute courses the additional criteria for awarding of grades must be clearly defined.

Consistency in grade definitions across the Institute is required.

Graded competency means awarding candidates a "grade" based on higher level of performance or defined criteria *once competency has been achieved*.

The criteria for grade results should be defined following consultation with stakeholders, and result in either a graded mark or grade award – ie Competent (C), Credit and Distinction.



Assessment, Grades and Resit Policy and Procedure

If a student is “not yet competent” on a first assessment attempt they are not eligible to receive a graded result for that unit of competence.

Graded assessment tools must include a grade performance criterion.

Grades are determined by an aggregate of all graded assessments for the unit of competence and are not awarded until all assessments have been conducted for the unit/module.

Grading Criteria

C	Performance Graded as Competent (C) Learner performs to industry standard as per Training Package guidelines. Consistently performs at the standard required by industry and has achieved the minimum pass marks (if required) for the unit of competency.	65% to 70%
Credit	Performance Graded as Credit Level Learner performs above industry standards as per Training Package guidelines. Demonstrates an aggregate graded mark which is above the minimum required with no requirement for re-sits or re-assessments due to a NYC.	71% to 85%
Dist	Performance with Distinction Learner consistently performs above industry standards as per Training Package guidelines. Demonstrates an aggregate graded mark which is greater than 86%. Has been assessed as competent on the first attempt of each assessment.	86% to 100%

Responsibility	Institute Manager and Program Managers/Coordinators
Policy Endorsed By	Continuous Improvement Committee
Endorsement Date	30 August 2010
Policy Complies with	AQTF 2007 and National Code 2007
Version Number	Ver 1 - 2010