



QA1.2 Assessment Policy and Procedures

Policy Code	QA1.2
Standard Reference	RTO Standards 2025 — Outcome Standards 1 & 2 AQF Assessment Standards
Responsible Officer	Academic Manager / Trainers and Assessors
Review Cycle	Annual or upon regulatory change

QA1.2.1 Purpose

This policy ensures that all assessment activities conducted by MACI meet the Principles of Assessment and the Rules of Evidence as required by the RTO Standards 2025, producing valid, reliable, and fair assessment outcomes that reflect genuine competence.

QA1.2.2 Assessment Design and Development

All assessment tools — including tasks, observation checklists, simulated environment scenarios, questioning tools, and marking guides — must be:

- Developed or contextualised by a qualified assessor with current vocational competence in the relevant field.
- Subjected to formal pre-use validation before deployment to students, confirming fitness for purpose.
- Accompanied by a mapping document cross-referencing each task to the relevant unit of competency (Elements, Performance Criteria, Knowledge Evidence, and Performance Evidence).
- Written in plain English with clear instructions, conditions, time limits, and evidence requirements.
- Inclusive of language, literacy, and numeracy (LLN) considerations appropriate to the qualification level.
- Designed to address all assessment conditions specified in the unit of competency.

QA1.2.3 Student Information Prior to Assessment

Prior to commencing any assessment, MACI ensures students are informed of:

- The specific assessment requirements, tasks, and submission conditions.
- The performance criteria and benchmarks against which they will be assessed.
- The process for receiving constructive feedback.
- The formal appeals and reassessment process and timeframes.
- MACI's academic integrity requirements, including AI-use disclosure obligations.
- Any reasonable adjustment arrangements available to them.

QA1.2.4 Conducting Assessments

All assessors must:

- Hold the required vocational competencies and assessor qualifications (TAE40122 Certificate IV in Training and Assessment, or equivalent) — per QA3.2 Credential Policy.
- Base all assessment decisions solely on evidence against unit requirements, free from bias or conflict of interest.
- Document all assessment decisions, feedback provided, and any third-party evidence gathered, in the Student Management System (Vettrak/LMS) or student file.



- Apply a variety of assessment methods appropriate to the unit and learner cohort (e.g., observation, written tasks, oral questioning, competency conversations, portfolio review).
- Make reasonable adjustments where necessary, documenting these and ensuring they do not compromise assessment integrity or validity.

QA1.2.5 Feedback and Reassessment

QA1.2.5.1 Feedback

Following every assessment decision, assessors must provide feedback that:

- Clearly states whether the outcome is Competent (C) or Not Yet Competent (NYC/NC).
- Specifically references the assessment criteria where the student met or did not meet requirements.
- For NYC/NC outcomes, provides clear guidance on the gap between the student's performance and the required standard, and practical steps to address it.

QA1.2.5.2 Reassessment

- Students deemed NYC/NC are provided with reassessment opportunities within a defined reassessment period following the unit end date, as specified in the student's timetable. A limited number of reassessment attempts, not exceeding three (3), may be provided during this period at no additional cost.
- The reassessment period typically commences within 10 working days following the unit end date and is generally completed within 2–4 weeks. Where applicable, students may be scheduled into a designated reassessment week to complete outstanding assessment requirements.
- Where a student is unable to complete reassessment within the defined reassessment period due to compassionate and compelling circumstances, the reassessment period may be extended, subject to approval by the Academic Manager and supported by appropriate verifiable evidence provided by the student.
- Reassessment may involve an alternative assessment method, provided the requirements of the unit of competency are met.
- Any reassessment beyond the approved period or outside standard conditions may incur reassessment fees per unit, as outlined in the Fees Policy and the student's Written Agreement.
- Where a student remains NYC/NC following reassessment, the matter is referred to the Academic Manager for determination of further action, which may include additional support, intervention, or re-enrolment.

QA1.2.6 Academic Integrity and Authenticity

QA1.2.6.1 Framework Principles

MACI's academic integrity framework is: Educative (promoting understanding of integrity expectations); Preventative (designing assessment to minimise misconduct opportunities); Detective (using appropriate tools and processes); Procedurally Fair (giving students opportunity to respond to allegations); and Proportionate (applying outcomes reflecting severity of misconduct).

QA1.2.6.2 Student Induction

All students complete an academic integrity induction prior to or at commencement of enrolment, covering: definition and importance of academic integrity; examples of misconduct; MACI's position on AI use; consequences of misconduct; and referencing requirements. A signed declaration is retained in the student's file.

QA1.2.6.3 Assessment Design to Prevent Misconduct

Trainers and assessors design assessment tasks that minimise misconduct risk by:

- Incorporating contextualised, authentic tasks reflecting workplace realities.



- Using a variety of methods (observation, demonstration, competency conversations) rather than relying solely on written submissions.
- Requiring personalised elements such as workplace-specific scenarios or reflective components.
- Incorporating staged submissions to monitor progress and detect inconsistencies.

QA1.2.6.4 AI Use Policy

AI Use Category	MACI Position
Permitted Use	AI may be used for brainstorming, editing for clarity, or summarising research, provided the student discloses such use and retains editorial control.
Prohibited Use	AI must not be used to generate substantial content, answer assessment questions directly, or produce work submitted as the student's own.
Disclosure Requirement	Any use of AI must be declared using the AI Use Declaration Form, which must accompany the assessment submission.

QA1.2.6.5 Detection and Authenticity Verification

All written assessment submissions must be checked using approved plagiarism and AI-detection software (e.g., Turnitin, Ouriginal, or equivalent):

Detection Type	Threshold	Required Action
Similarity Score	< 25%	Acceptable, provided appropriate referencing is evident
Similarity Score	25–35%	Assessor to review flagged content; student may be required to explain or resubmit
Similarity Score	> 35%	Flagged for investigation; authenticity verification mandatory
AI Detection	Low	Acceptable
AI Detection	Moderate	Assessor to conduct authenticity verification
AI Detection	High	Flagged for formal investigation; authenticity verification mandatory

Authenticity verification methods include structured oral/written questioning, direct observation, competency conversation, and third-party verification. All verification activities are documented using the Authenticity Verification Record.

QA1.2.6.6 Misconduct Outcomes

Misconduct outcomes are applied proportionate to severity:

- Minor Misconduct (e.g., first-instance uncited content): Written warning, mandatory integrity module completion, and resubmission.
- Serious Misconduct (e.g., substantial plagiarism, undisclosed AI use, collusion): NYC outcome with no resubmission, formal written warning, mandatory integrity training.
- Gross Misconduct (e.g., contract cheating, impersonation, falsification): Unit failure, suspension, or exclusion; potential regulatory reporting.

Students may appeal any misconduct finding within 10 working days in accordance with the Complaints and Appeals Policy.



QA1.2.7 Assessment Procedures

Procedure / Action	Responsibility
Assessment tools are developed or reviewed by a qualified assessor with current vocational competence. Pre-use validation is completed before deployment.	Assessor / Academic Manager
Students receive full assessment briefing materials including requirements, benchmarks, feedback process, appeal rights, and AI disclosure obligations prior to each assessment.	Trainer / Administration
Assessors conduct assessments in accordance with the Principles of Assessment and Rules of Evidence. All decisions and feedback are documented in the SMS/LMS.	Assessors
Written submissions are checked through plagiarism and AI-detection software. Results are reviewed and actioned in accordance with the threshold table above.	Assessors / Academic Manager
Where NYC/NC, constructive feedback is provided within 5 business days of the assessment decision, and reassessment is offered within 10 working days of the unit end date.	Assessors / Academic Manager
Where suspected misconduct is identified, the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure (RTO-ACM-001) is activated within 10 working days.	Academic Manager
All assessment records are stored securely in the SMS/LMS or student file, retained for a minimum of 5 years post-completion.	Administration