

UOW College Hong Kong Principles and Policies on Assessment for Associate Degrees and Higher Diplomas

Version 1.1	Date of approval:	Date of effect: September 2019	Date of next review: March 2025
Approved by:	Academic Board		
Author:	Director of Quality Assurance		
Supporting documents, procedures and forms:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Regulations for Associate Degrees / Higher Diplomas • Rules on Academic Honesty • <i>Generic Level Descriptors of Qualifications Framework</i> by Education Bureau 		

Purpose

1. The purpose of the Principles and Policies on Assessment is to ensure:
 - a. assessment and grading practices across UOWCHK are consistent and reflect appropriate academic standards; and
 - b. student performance is evaluated in a valid, fair, accurate, consistent, and objective manner and in compliance with the academic standards.

Scope

2. All associate degree (AD) and higher diploma (HD) programmes offered by UOWCHK (“the College”).

General Policies on Assessment

3. Assessment is the crucial link between effective delivery of courses, student learning and development, and the assurance of educational standards.
4. All academic staff are collectively responsible for ensuring that assessment tasks are constructively aligned with intended learning and teaching outcomes. They have a professional responsibility to ensure that assessment tasks and assessment procedures:
 - a. enhance the quality of learning;

- b. accurately measure the extent to which students have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the course and the programme; and
 - c. provide a reliable basis for converting results into a final grade for the course.
5. Assessment tasks must:
- a. be fit for purpose, fair, consistent and constructively aligned to course or programme intended learning outcomes;
 - b. not discriminate in relation to gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion or belief, age, social origin or disability or disadvantage any group of students;
 - c. enable students to develop and demonstrate their learning and potential;
 - d. enable students to progress to or receive professional accreditation, where appropriate;
 - e. facilitate student learning and development by providing appropriate and timely feedback on performance;
 - f. be of sufficient scope and range to enable accurate assessment of the extent to which students have attained the course or programme intended learning outcomes;
 - g. provide a reliable and consistent basis for converting the results into a final grade for the course; and
 - h. assist academic staff to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching.
6. Assessment procedures must be an integral part of a process which encourages the development of creative and critical abilities.
7. The requirements, procedures and intended outcomes of assessments need to be clearly stated to ensure that Course Examiners (CEs), academic staff and students would have their duties clearly identified and addressed.
8. Assessment procedures must be transparent to all those involved in the process.

General Principles on Assessment

9. Each AD or HD programme should incorporate a variety of assessment tasks which together make up the assessment scheme for the programme. These can include in-class activities, presentations, group activities, tests, assignments to be completed in students' own time, examinations, reports and projects, or be

based upon pieces of work of a substantial nature such as a work or a research project. Variety promotes effective learning, allows for the assessment of a range of intended learning outcomes and supports a range of approaches to learning. An appropriate mix of formative and summative assessments should be used. Formative and summative assessment may, in practice, be combined.

10. Students should be advised, no later than the end of the second week of the semester or, where a course does not run in accordance with scheduled semesters within two weeks of the commencement of the course, of the nature and timing of all assessment tasks for the entire course and the nature and timing of the feedback they will receive on assessment tasks.
11. Distribution and completion of assessment tasks should be coordinated and not bunched together to minimise stress and pressure for both students and for academic staff.
12. Breakdown of assessment components should be clear, providing explicit definition of all components. Presentation and communication skills should be reflected in assessment criteria of all assessment tasks, particularly for essays, oral presentation and other forms of assessments.
13. Wherever possible more than one form of summative assessment should be used in a course.
14. All assessment tasks, whether graded or not, should primarily be considered formative. Students are entitled to timely and meaningful feedback on assessment tasks as this substantially contributes to both student learning and the development of students' potential.
15. Assessment tasks and procedures should be continuously improved over the semesters and be current, regularly reviewed in conjunction with external academic advisors and, where a course is required for or leads to professional accreditation, in conjunction with the relevant professional body or bodies.

Roles and Responsibilities

16. Associate Deans of Faculties, Chairs of Assessment Panels (APs) and Chair of Examination Board are primarily responsible for ensuring the integrity and security of assessment practices and procedures and for maintaining standards on courses and programmes of study.

Associate Deans of Faculties

17. Associate Deans of Faculties are responsible for ensuring that UOWCHK assessment policy and procedures are observed and implemented. They must appoint a Programme Leader for each programme of study within the Faculty.

18. Associate Deans of Faculties must appoint a CE for each course offered by the Faculty. The CE should be appointed sufficiently in advance of the start of teaching to ensure that the course is ready for effective delivery at the start of the semester.
 19. Associate Deans of Faculties must establish an AP for each course offered.
 20. Associate Deans of Faculties must ensure consistency of grade descriptors across the Faculty and their compatibility with UOWCHK grade descriptors as defined in the *Academic Regulations for Associate Degrees or Higher Diplomas*.
 21. Associate Deans of Faculties are responsible for setting Faculty-specific policy on moderation (in addition to College policy), making arrangements for internal and external moderation of assessment tasks, marks and grades, and for ensuring that the policy is adhered to by all academic staff. An evaluation of moderation arrangements should be included in the annual programme report.
- 4
21. Associate Deans of Faculties must establish appropriate procedures for the return, retention and disposal of completed assessment tasks.
 22. Associate Deans of Faculties are responsible for ensuring that procedures are in place in accordance with *UOWCHK Rules on Academic Honesty* to address, detect and respond to academic honesty issues and that such procedures are consistently applied.
 23. Associate Deans of Faculties are responsible for implementing appropriate procedures for mitigation and grade review requests and ensuring those procedures are adhered to by all academic staff.

Course Examiners (CEs)

24. The CEs are responsible for preparing the assessment tasks and their associated rubrics/marking schemes, coordinating the assessment of course outcomes, having the grades and marks moderated according to College and Faculty procedures, recommending course grades to the relevant AP for the course, and ensuring that the AP has the necessary information about the assessment criteria of the course.

Assessment Panels (AP)

25. The duties of APs are:
 - a. To maintain the academic standard of assessment in courses for which the Panel is responsible.
 - b. To determine the final grades for students in courses.

- c. To consider requests from students that illness, or other circumstances be taken into account in setting students' grades.
26. No course may be considered by more than one AP.
 27. Chaired by the relevant Associate Dean of the Faculty, APs must include the CEs for courses being considered, and may include members of the teaching staff associated with the course.
 28. The CE should be present in the AP if his/her course is being considered unless there is a good cause for absence. (S)he should provide a written application to the Associate Dean of Faculty stating the reasons for absence, together with the steps that have been taken to ensure that the course's issues will be adequately addressed at the AP.

Examination Board

29. The Academic Board (AB) shall appoint the Examination Board and determine its constitution. A quorum for the Examination Board is fifty percent of its members. Members will only be excused from attendance for good cause on prior written application to the Chair of the Examination Board setting out the reasons for absence.

5

Academic Staff

30. All academic staff are responsible for creating and maintaining an environment in which students are encouraged to develop their full potential. This requires the establishment and maintenance of high educational standards based upon academic honesty and appropriate and effective management of student learning and assessment by:
 - a. ensuring that assessment tasks comply with the principles and policies outlined in this document;
 - b. ensuring that assessment tasks are constructively aligned with their intended learning outcomes;
 - c. developing assessment tasks and procedures that are fair and effective and contribute to student learning;
 - d. administering assessment tasks fairly and efficiently;
 - e. providing timely and constructive feedback to students;
 - f. designing assessment tasks that minimise the potential for breaches of academic honesty;

- g. ensuring that students are aware of common conventions of academic honesty as well as the specific requirements of their discipline;
- h. communicating to students the expectations relating to academic honesty;
- i. providing students with appropriate guidance, learning activities and feedback on academic honesty;
- j. communicating to students the acceptable level of working together and how their work will be individually or jointly assessed;
- k. reporting instances of plagiarism or other academic dishonesty activities;
- l. encouraging students to think independently and exchange ideas freely;
- m. continually improving the effectiveness of their teaching and assessment of their courses; and
- n. developing and maintaining expertise and currency in their areas of

discipline.

Programme Leaders

31. The Programme Leaders' (PLs') role in relation to assessment include:
- a. providing academic leadership for their programmes and benchmark them against the Qualifications Framework and commonly accepted academic standards for associate degree programmes;
 - b. coordinating the workload of assessment tasks of the courses in their programmes, and endorsing changes to scheduled dates for completion of assessment tasks proposed by CEs in their programmes; and
 - c. considering proposals for changes to the assessment tasks of the courses in their programmes before these changes are submitted to the Associate Deans of Faculties for endorsement.

Students

32. Students should take responsibility for their own learning and are expected to:
- a. read, appreciate and observe the general regulations for assessment on the ARRO/UOWCHK web site; assessment requirements contained in course outlines of courses upon which they are enrolled and any supplementary requirements imposed by the CE or the Faculty responsible for delivering the course or courses upon which they are enrolled;

- b. manage their time and comply with deadlines set for the completion of assessment tasks;
- c. submit work for assessment which satisfies the requirements of academic honesty;
- d. attend examinations at the time scheduled; and
- e. use feedback on assessment tasks constructively to enhance their learning.

Benchmarking against International Standards

- 33. In exercising their duty to maintain academic standards in courses for which they are responsible, Associate Deans of Faculties must have reference to the norms for similar courses at other comparable institutions. Procedures for review and continued improvement of assessment should be documented and reported to Faculties.
- 34. Faculties should assure the College that the relevant standards are being maintained and should conform to the following principles:
 - a. Review of assessment should cover the academic level of the course syllabus, the full range of assessment activities in the course, and the extent to which assessment in a course is adequately aligned to the learning outcomes identified for the course.
 - b. Review of assessment instruments and students' assessed work should benefit from the input of qualified peers, with the necessary experience of similar work in other similar institutions with international reputation.
 - c. PLs and CEs have to ensure that the arrangements for the review of assessment in a course in a Faculty are clearly documented, and approved by the AB.

Assessment Criteria and Grade Descriptors

- 35. Assessment criteria and grade descriptors must be clearly defined and communicated in writing to students within two weeks of the commencement of the course. Academic staff and APs must adhere to these when assigning student grades.

Assessment Criteria

- 36. Assessment Criteria are vital in criterion-referenced assessment. It should:

- a. establish clear and unambiguous standards of intended outcomes and achievement;
 - b. embody effective methods for accurately assessing student learning and achievement;
 - c. be consistent with intended learning outcomes;
 - d. describe the knowledge, understanding and skills that are expected to be displayed in the assessment task; and
 - e. be developed for each assessment task, including group work and peer assessment.
37. Assessment criteria should be designed to:
- a. enable students to understand how their work has been assessed and the grade awarded;
 - b. enable markers to award grades which accurately and fairly reflect the attainment of the intended learning outcomes of the work being assessed;
 - c. facilitate meaningful feedback to students;
 - d. bring transparency and accountability to assessment processes and procedures;
 - e. achieve consistency of marking on courses forming part of a particular programme of study and across Faculties;
 - f. promote understanding of assessment procedures and processes amongst students and academic staff;
 - g. enable the Faculty to assess the quality and effectiveness of learning and teaching procedures and processes.

Grade Descriptors

38. Grade descriptors describe various levels of achievement. For individual assessment tasks grade descriptors indicate how well the assessment criteria have been met by the work carried out. For award classification they indicate the level of achievement across a programme of study as a whole.
39. UOWCHK *Academic Regulations for Associate Degrees and Higher Diplomas* address the grading of courses as follows:

8

Grade	Grade Point	Grade Definitions
-------	-------------	-------------------

A+	4.3	Excellent	The qualifiers, such as “Excellent”, “Good”, “Fair” etc., define student performance with respect to the achievement of course intended learning outcomes (CILOs).
A	4.0		
A-	3.7		
B+	3.3	Good	
B	3.0		
B-	2.7		
C+	2.3	Fair	
C	2.0		
C-	1.7		
D	1.0	Marginal	
F	0.0	Failure	
P (Pass-fail course only)		Pass	

40. APs may deviate from the grade descriptors only under exceptional circumstances. Such situations include:
- professional accreditation requirements;
 - when applying compensation for mitigating circumstances;
 - when adjustments are deemed necessary to compensate for error on the part of the college;
 - in borderline cases (e.g. between classifications), where there is sound evidence that a student is deserving of a higher grade; and
 - in cases of academic dishonesty.

Assessment Tasks

41. Assessment tasks are designed to align with the course intended learning outcomes to provide evidence on how well each student has achieved the intended learning outcomes. Such evidence could be provided by assignments, examinations, tests, case studies, laboratory work, practical work, group projects

and peer assessment, reports, practicum etc. The choice of assessment tasks should relate directly to the course intended learning outcomes.

42. Assessment tasks must be defined in the course outline for each course. Information about the requirements of the assessment tasks, their timing, weighting, assessment criteria, formula for determining the final course grade, and penalties for late submission, exceeding word limits, incorrect citing of authorities and incorrect use of English (or other languages, if appropriate) should be clearly stated in course outlines provided to students within the first two weeks of the commencement of the course and accompany the assessment task when it is distributed.
43. Changes to the scheduled date for completion of assessment tasks during the semester must be approved by the PLs, or in the case of General Education courses, by the Associate Dean of the Faculty.
44. Under normal circumstances, assessments are to be completed in the semester in which the student is registered for the course. There are exceptional cases, e.g. internships, where the assessments may be completed at a later date.
45. Assessment tasks must reflect the topics and relative importance of the intended learning outcomes of the course.
46. Assessment tasks should be scheduled so that there is sufficient time for students to receive feedback before the end of the semester.
47. Decisions on the form the end of course examination will take and the material students can bring into the examination must be consistent with the course intended learning outcomes and take into account the conditions under which the examination will be written.
48. No changes (except for corrections of typos) should be made on the examination questions during examination. CE is required to report to the AP if there are any changes made unavoidably.
49. Assessment and examination questions, particularly take-home assessments, should not be re-used in their original form.

Groupwork

50. Groupwork assessments must be carefully planned and take account of the timing and balance of groupwork across the programme in which the students are engaged.
51. Assessments should not normally be based entirely on groupwork unless this is essential to the intended learning outcomes of the course. In case of groupwork assessments used for summative purposes, the expected achievement and the marking criteria for students within the group must be clearly defined.

52. Students undertaking groupwork should receive adequate instruction, guidance and support in advance to enable them to understand how to approach the groupwork and how it will be assessed.
53. Students should be provided with the assessment criteria and intended learning outcomes for groupwork right at the start of the course so that they can identify whether, and to what extent, the work of their peers has met the intended learning outcomes and a reasoned grade for the work produced.

Peer Assessment

54. Peer assessment may be used to develop students' ability to be constructively critical of one another's work and seek improvement from others' critical appraisals on their work.
55. Measures should be in place for peer assessments to be moderated by the member of the academic staff responsible for the course. Moderators must be particularly alert to subjective peer assessment.
56. Assessment of courses should not be based entirely on peer assessment.

Examination

57. Examinations may be in the form of closed or open book, which should be stated clearly in the course outline. Students should be told not later than the end of the second week of the semester or, where a student subsequently joins a course within two weeks of their joining, whether the examination will be open book, with limited material, with defined material or closed book.
58. Formal written examinations should be conducted in the duration of 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5 or 3 hours, where appropriate.

Late Submission of Assessment Tasks

59. Penalties for failure to submit assessment tasks on time should be consistent across the courses in a Faculty and be applied consistently by all academic staff. The rules regarding late submission must be stated in course documents and in course outlines.
60. Students who fail to submit any summative assessment task will result in no marks being awarded for that assessment component.

Marking/Grading

61. Any paper submitted by students for assessment purposes shall be marked or graded with reference to the marking scheme agreed with relevant CE. This

may be in the form of general grade descriptors and/or detailed marking schemes/criteria for the assessment task as deemed appropriate by CE.

62. Marking must not discriminate on grounds of gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion or belief, age, social origin or disability.
63. Marks will only be awarded to legible assessment tasks. Students will not be permitted to re-write illegible work. Where an assessment task is wholly or partially illegible to the extent that the ability of the marker to assess its quality is impaired, it will be assessed on the basis of the legible part or parts and a mark awarded accordingly.
64. Methods utilised in marking students' work should enable all those involved in the process to be confident that the marks awarded fairly reflect the level of achievement of intended learning outcomes demonstrated by the work submitted.

Promotion of Good Marking Practices

65. Marking should normally be undertaken by the tutors responsible for the delivery of the course. Other academic staff engaged in the delivery of the course may also be involved in marking. Where other academic staff are involved in marking, the CE has the responsibility for ensuring that good marking practices have been deployed and a consistent approach to marking has been adopted.
66. Marking carried out by staff who are not full time academic staff should receive adequate guidance and supervision from the CE of the course.

Moderation

67. Moderation of all assessment tasks is an essential best practice to be adopted. It involves moderation of the assessment tasks and marks/grades to ensure that assessment has been conducted accurately, consistently and fairly. It also provides valuable feedback and contributes to the constructive alignment of marking standards across the Faculty.
68. Information on Faculty policies on the moderation of assessment tasks, marks and grades must be made available to students and academic staff.

Moderation of Assessment Tasks

69. The aim of moderating assessment tasks is to provide assurance that the design of a specific assessment task is a valid and reliable measure of the intended learning outcomes. It should ensure that:

- a. each task is a valid and reliable means of providing students with an opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes for the course;
- b. the questions or instructions are clearly worded, written in student-friendly language, and are unambiguous;
- c. the assessment workload is appropriate to the course being assessed, particularly where there are multiple components to the assessment;
- d. the time-scale allowed for completion of the assessment task is reasonable;
- e. all students can reasonably be expected to have access to the resources required for completion of the assessment task; and
- f. there are clear assessment criteria, a marking scheme and grade descriptors.

Moderation of Marks/ Grades

70. Moderation of marks/grades aims to reinforce assessment reliability by ensuring consistency and standards among markers. The moderation mechanisms may include:
- a. double marking, i.e. two academic staff marking the same piece of work (not splitting the total marking task between two or more academic staff);
 - b. audio/video recording of assessments with no tangible output, e.g. presentations, music or drama performances, practical demonstrations, which are examined by a second marker who was not present at the original assessment;
 - c. simultaneous moderation of assessments with no tangible output by the presence of a second assessor or by a panel of assessors at the time of the assessment, either in person or using teleconferencing or similar technology; and
 - d. analysing marks across a cohort of students and against those of previous cohorts of students.
71. Double marking is considered a good practice in borderline cases and cases in dispute. The mark of the first marker usually stands unless there are significant discrepancies between the marks of the two markers. Faculties should determine their own policies in this area, including a clear definition of what would constitute a “significant discrepancy”, as appropriate to the marking practices in the Faculty. Students should be assigned the final score, rather than the two different scores, unless for a valid reason, so as not to cause unnecessary confusion for students.

72. How vigorous a moderation should be carried out will depend on a number of factors including:
- a. how well defined the assessment task is;
 - b. whether different people mark the same assessment task, e.g. whether team teaching is involved;
 - c. the experience and employment status of the marker, e.g. academic staff not familiar with the marking processes, inexperienced part-time academic staff;
 - d. whether mark distributions for the same cohort of students differ noticeably for different assessments;
 - e. whether different students perform different tasks; and
 - f. the importance of the mark, in terms of both its weighting and its academic level.
73. In most cases it is sufficient for a sample of the assessed work to be moderated. Sample size should be determined by taking into account the factors described above and should adequately represent the student population of the course.

External moderation

74. External moderation plays a key role in maintaining academic standards. This is usually undertaken by the External Academic Advisor. Faculties should refer to the document on *Appointment of External Academic Advisors* for this purpose.

Feedback

75. Students should receive prompt, adequate and meaningful feedback on all assessments. Feedback on assessment tasks should enable students to:
- a. understand the reasons for the grade awarded;
 - b. identify the strengths and weaknesses in the work submitted; and
 - c. improve their future performance.
76. The format and manner of the feedback is at the discretion of the CE. It is good practice for Faculties to develop standard formats and procedures in the interests of accuracy and certainty of feedback and for record keeping.
77. Whilst oral feedback is valuable, students will benefit more from written feedback. A record should be kept of the feedback and when it was provided.

Retention of Students' Work

78. To safeguard the integrity and objectivity of assessment process, divisional procedures should ensure that students' work is available for:
 - a. internal and external moderation;
 - b. procedures relating to allegations of academic dishonesty; and
 - c. grade review procedures.
79. Students must have access to all marked works.
80. Completed work should not be retained indefinitely. Retained work and any copies kept by the Faculty may be retained until students graduate or up to a time when the Associate Dean of Faculty considers necessary and/or appropriate to specific purposes, for example in relation to professional accreditation.
81. City University's Code of Practice on Personal Data (Privacy) Issues should be adhered to where students' work, or copies of that work, is retained.
82. Associate Deans of Faculties should ensure that retained work and any copies of returned work kept by the Faculty are disposed of securely and confidentially after the expiration of the retention period.
83. Under exceptional circumstances, students may be permitted to view their marked examination scripts. Students who would like to receive a copy of their marked examination script have to follow the data access procedure prescribed in the City University's Code of Practice on Personal Data (Privacy) Issues. They should, however, not be permitted to remove the original examination scripts from the Faculty.
84. It is recommended that a record is kept of student access to examination scripts.

Assessment: Students with Disabilities

85. Under Section 2 of Disability Discrimination Ordinance Cap. 487 ("DDO"), "disability" means:
 - a. total or partial loss of the person's bodily or mental functions;
 - b. total or partial loss of a part of the person's body;
 - c. the presence in the body of organisms causing disease or illness;

- d. the presence in the body of organisms capable of causing disease or illness;
 - e. the malfunction, malformation or disfigurement of a part of the person's body;
 - f. a disorder or malfunction that results in the person learning differently from a person without the disorder or malfunction;
 - g. a disorder, an illness or disease that affects a person's thought processes, perception of reality, emotions or judgment or that results in disturbed behaviour.
86. Section 24(2) of the DDO, subject to certain exceptions, makes it unlawful for an educational establishment to discriminate against a student with a disability by:
- a. denying that student's access, or limiting that student's access, to any benefit, service or facility provided by the educational establishment;
 - b. expelling that student; or
 - c. subjecting that student to any other detriment.
87. Students with a disability must not be disadvantaged. They must have the opportunity to disclose a disability throughout their programme of study.
88. A student with a disability who requires additional support or adjustments to assessment should notify ARRO/UOWCHK by completing the respective Questionnaire for Students with Disabilities. Medical confirmation of the disability and consequent needs must be provided within a time limit specified by the Faculty. If the medical confirmation and information of required special needs is not provided within that time, the Faculty, in conjunction with the Student Development Services, should adopt appropriate and justifiable procedures to address the student's needs.
89. Students should be advised that Faculties need not consider the effect of a disability upon the performance in an assessment if that disability has not been disclosed and supported by medical evidence prior to the assessment.
90. Faculties must ensure, in conjunction with the Student Development Services, that justifiable procedures and mechanisms are in place to adequately support the learning needs of students with a disability.
91. Works presented in assessment tasks by students with a disability must be marked in the same way as the works of other students.

92. Faculties, in consultation with the Student Development Services, should make justifiable adjustments to assessment procedures to ensure that students with a disability have an equality of opportunity when undergoing assessments.
93. Without limiting the modification in a particular case, adjustments to assessment may involve:
 - a. having the student take the assessment in a separate room;
 - b. allowing the student extra time;
 - c. providing additional or special equipment; and
 - d. allowing rest breaks, amanuensis or the presence of a carer, particularly where regular medication is required.

Academic Honesty and Penalties for Breach

94. All students of the College are expected to appreciate and comply with the requirements and obligations of academic honesty. Work presented by students of the College must be their own work, give proper acknowledgment of the work of others and honestly report findings obtained.
95. Students must abide by UOWCHK *Rules on Academic Honesty*, which is available at http://www.cityu.edu.hk/UOWCHK/cs_rules_regulation.htm.
96. All academic staff have the professional responsibilities to provide guidance and feedback on academic honesty to students and to lead by example by ensuring that the work of others is acknowledged in their teaching and research.
97. To avoid or at least reduce opportunities for academic dishonesty, when setting assessment tasks, in whatever form, CE should:
 - a. design the task and the accompanying instructions in the way most likely to lead to prompt identification of academic dishonesty;
 - b. avoid re-using the same, or very similar assessment topics, and/or examination questions used in previous semesters;
 - c. provide clear instructions on how the work should be presented to comply with the requirements and obligations of academic honesty, for example as to attribution and citing of authorities and sources;
 - d. provide clear instructions, particularly where the assessment task is to be completed in students' own time, on the extent to which, if at all, students can make use of third party assistance; and

- e. provide clear guidance where the task involves joint or group activities on the acceptable level of joint work, how that joint work should be acknowledged, what amounts to acceptable co-operation and collaboration, what amounts to unacceptable collusion and how individual contributions to joint or group work will be assessed.
98. When marking assessment tasks, in whatever form, markers should:
- a. be alert to academic dishonesty in work presented;
 - b. investigate suspected academic dishonesty; and
 - c. respond to instances of academic dishonesty in accordance with procedures laid down in *UOWCHK Rules on Academic Honesty*.

Mitigation and Grade Review

99. Students who have been unable to attend or complete an assessment task, or who believe their performance has been impaired by medical or other circumstances beyond their control, must have the opportunity to apply for mitigation in accordance with *UOWCHK Academic Regulations for Associate Degrees / Higher Diplomas*.
100. If students are dissatisfied with a decision of the Examination Board, they may request for a review of their grades on the basis of the limited grounds defined in *UOWCHK Academic Regulations for Associate Degrees / Higher Diplomas*.

Classification of Award

101. Academic awards should accurately reflect the student's achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the programme.
102. Upon completion of all appropriate graduation requirements, students will be given an appropriate award with one of the following classifications:

Classification for AD/HD Award	CGPA
Distinction	3.4 or above
Credit	3.0 - 3.39
Pass	1.7 - 2.99

103. Associate Deans of Faculties should recommend award classifications to the Examination Board for review and endorsement. The Examination Board

reserves the right, upon the recommendation of the Faculty, to make exceptions in the application of these indicative grade point averages.

Version Control Table

Version	Date Effective	Approved by	Amendment
1	October 2014	Academic Board	
1-1			Updated to reflect the changes to Academic Regulations approved on 13 September 2017 and the new institutional structure upon Cap320 registration in March 2019. The scope extended to include higher diploma programmes.