UFS Assessment Policy on Coursework Learning Programmes

POLICY STATEMENT	
1. Preamble/ background	1.1　Assessment is a cornerstone of quality and excellence in higher education. It entails making judgements about how students' work meets appropriate standards. Assessment plays a key role in both fostering learning and the certification of students. Assessment results must furthermore, assist in making judgements and in documenting, explaining and improving performance.
	1.2　The Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes takes as its points of departure national higher education legislation, requirements of relevant stakeholders such as professional bodies, as well as the vision, mission, and values of the UFS. According to the White Paper for Post-school Education and Training, 'a differentiated system should provide a variety of modes of learning, learning programmes, and methods of teaching and assessment for diverse student bodies, and should support both flexibility and innovation.'
	1.3　The policy will be implemented through Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations. These rules and regulations will take cognisance of faculty and discipline-specific assessment needs and will stipulate standard procedures and regulations that are applicable to each faculty.
	1.4　Issues pertaining to postgraduate assessment are covered separately in the UFS Policy on Master's and Doctoral Degrees which is amended from time to time. However, this policy covers all aspects of coursework learning programmes.
2. Purpose	2.1　The overarching purpose of this policy is to establish a framework within which coursework assessment practices at the UFS will:
	2.1.1 Support the development of students;
	2.1.2 Ensure effective learning within context;
	2.1.3 Improve learning and teaching practices; and
	2.1.4 Effectively measure student performance and guide certification.
3. Scope	3.1　The conditions of the policy apply to the assessment practices of all staff members at the UFS, whether part-time or permanently appointed, with regard to coursework learning programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level.
	3.2　Issues pertaining to postgraduate research-based assessment are covered separately in the UFS Policy on Master's and Doctoral Degrees which is amended from time to time.
4. Definitions and abbreviations	**Ad-hoc marker:** a person who grades assessments on an ad-hoc basis. This person is not a lecturer in the module. An ad-hoc marker is appointed to perform marking duties and is compensated for the marking duties performed in line with approved institutional tariffs as stipulated by the Department of Human Resources.

Assessment[1]: Assessment is the process of determining the value, significance, or extent of what students know, understand, and can do with |

the knowledge they acquired as a result of their educational experiences. Assessment results are used to document, explain and improve performance. Assessment can be done at various times throughout a learning programme and a comprehensive assessment plan will include either formative and summative assessment, or alternatively continuous assessment. The point at which the assessment takes place in a programme distinguishes these three types of assessment.

Blended learning: "Blended learning is the provision of structured learning opportunities using a combination of contact, distance, and/or information and communication technology supported opportunities to suit different purposes, audiences, and contexts" (Department of Higher Education and Training, 2014, p.20). "Blended learning provides the student with some control of the time, place and/or pace of learning and should create an integrated learning experience of face-to-face and online activities" (Christensen, Horn, & Staker, 2013, p.7).

CHE: Council on Higher Education

Continuous assessment[1]: Continuous assessment is used as an alternative to summative assessment. Continuous assessment is a series of assessments that occurs throughout the learning process, and not only after the learning process. Students are thus examined continuously over the duration of a quarter, semester or year. It is cumulative and the marks are calculated to produce a final result.

Coursework Learning Programmes: All undergraduate and postgraduate programmes with a coursework component regardless of the mode of delivery.

CTL: Centre for Teaching and Learning

Distance education[1]: Distance education is both a collection of teaching and learning methods as well as a mode of provision/delivery. As a collection of methods, distance education transfers and mediates the curriculum without requiring lecturers and students to be in the same place at the same time. Distance education methods include structured learning resources and activities for independent study. As a mode of provision, distance education uses the design of a programme to bridge the separation of lecturers and students. The options include a single mode of provision in which all provision takes place in distance mode; a dual mode of provision in which some modules are offered in distance mode, or a mixed mode in which the same modules are offered in both contact and distance modes. The term 'distance education', in addition refers to provision in which student spend 30% or less of the stated notional learning hours in undergraduate courses at NQF Levels 5 and 6, and 25% or less in courses at NQF Level 7 and initial postgraduate courses at NQF Level 8, in staff-led, face-to-face, campus-based structured learning activities.

DIRAP: Directorate for Institutional Research and Academic Planning

E-assessment: A broad term to denote the use of technology for a variety of assessment activities, such as the design and delivery of assessments, recording responses, marking, reporting, and storing data.

	ECS: Executive Committee of Senate **Evaluation:** The process of using assessment information to produce judgements about the value and adequacy of the student, lecturer, or learning that has taken place. **External assessor[1]:** A person who has no affiliation with the UFS and who assesses examination scripts or oral examinations and/or practical examinations, dissertations, mini-dissertations and theses. (A person who has accepted an honorary appointment or an appointment as a research associate or a person who is actively involved in a research project and/or who was employed at the UFS and has left the employment of the UFS, is considered as having an affiliation with the UFS. The UFS may reconsider this after a period of three (3) years. **External moderator[1]:** A person who has no affiliation with the UFS and who moderates examination scripts or oral examinations and/or practical examinations, mini-dissertations and theses. The UFS may reconsider this after a period of three (3) years. **Formal assessment:** Assessments that take place in a formal setting that requires invigilation. A formal assessment contributes to a student's final mark. **Formative assessment[1]:** Formative assessment measures students' progress during the learning process to provide ongoing feedback and incremental feedback. It includes a range of formal and informal assessments typically to monitor the progress being made towards achieving learning outcomes and obtaining a semester mark or predicate, i.e. admission to the summative assessment. **Informal assessment:** Assessments that are more casual in nature and do not necessarily require invigilation. These assessments can form part of learning activities and the results may or may not contribute to a student's final mark. **Internal assessor[1]:** The person, affiliated to the university who sets and/or assesses the formative and summative assessment activities. **Internal moderator[1]:** A person who is in the UFS's permanent employ and who is responsible for ensuring that the assessment meets the required standard and that its accompanying marking framework and response exemplar are done in accordance with the specified learning outcomes and at the requisite level of competence. **LMS**: Learning Management System

---

[1] This is the definition in the current version of the General Rules for Undergraduate Qualifications, Postgraduate Diplomas, Bachelor Honours Degrees, Master's Degrees, Doctoral Degrees, Higher Doctorates, Honorary Degrees and the Convocation which are updated annually. Should there be an amendment to this definition in the General Rules, the new definition will be applicable.

Marker: It is the person who assesses and grades students' assessments.

Moderation: This is the quality assurance process that ensures that the assessments conducted, meet the specified outcomes and standards, and that assessment of students' performance are consistent, fair, accurate and reliable.

Open Learning: Open learning is an approach which combines the principles of learner centeredness, lifelong learning, the flexibility of learning provision, the removal of barriers to access learning, the recognition for credit of prior learning experience, the provision of learner support, the construction of learning programmes in the expectation that learners can succeed, and the maintenance of rigorous quality assurance over the design of learning materials and support systems. Open learning is therefore, a set of principles that should apply to any learning programme.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism implies the duplication of the formulation and insights of a source text with the intention of presenting it as one's own work. Plagiarism cannot be confirmed as a result of the mere similarities of words between the source text and the borrowed text as in the case of terminology, commonly used phrases and known facts. If plagiarism is suspected it must also be provable. The source text and borrowed text must therefore be placed side by side. The mere suspicion of plagiarism cannot form the basis of an accusation. Plagiarism can be distinguished from forms of academic writing misconduct such as:

a) cribbing in tests and examinations;
b) collusion and fabrication or falsification of data;
c) deliberate dishonesty;
d) purchasing assignments, dissertations and/or theses on the Internet and presenting such documents as one's own work;
e) presenting the same work for more than one course or in consecutive years; and
f) the submission of another person's work as one's own original work.

POPI: Protection of Personal Information

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL): It is a process to evaluate skills and knowledge obtained through informal, non-formal and/or formal learning for the purpose of recognising competence against a given set of standards, competencies, or learning outcomes.

Reasonable Accommodation: Reasonable accommodation means any modification or adjustment to the environment that will enable a student with a disability to have equitable access during assessments. Students with certain permanent or temporary physical disabilities and/or intrinsic specific learning disabilities may apply for reasonable accommodation. Concessions are granted for students whose assessment (test and other) and examination performance is significantly hindered due to the presence of specific learning difficulties, physical disabilities or other disabilities. These accommodations have been designed to place such students on an equal par with students without disabilities and it is not for the purpose of giving these students any additional advantage.

	Student management system: This is a systematic procedure by which the records of a student are created, captured, maintained, and disposed of. Such a system usually supports and records administrative functions related to student admission, fees, courses, timetabling, attendance, assessment, and certification. In the case of the UFS, the current student management system is PeopleSoft. **Summative assessment[1]:** Summative assessment is regarded as assessment **of** learning and is distinguished from formative assessment, which is assessment **for** learning. Summative assessment takes place after the learning has been completed, i.e. at the end of a quarter, semester or year, and provides information and feedback that sums up the teaching and learning process. The intention behind summative assessment is to validate performance and award grades or marks. **UFS:** University of the Free State **Universal Design for Learning (UDL):** offers an approach to designing curriculum that prioritises accessibility and inclusivity. It is a set of principles that provide a structure to design teaching to meet the diverse needs of all students.
5. Guiding principles	5.1 The principles below serve as guidelines by which UFS assessment practices can be measured in terms of individual assessment opportunities and the processes at module and programme level. Faculties are responsible for the interpretation and application of these guidelines in terms of faculty assessment rules and regulations. These guidelines should not be considered or applied in isolation, but, as far as possible, balanced in relation to one another. 5.1.1 Assessment for learning should be placed at the centre of subject and programme design. 5.1.2 The purpose of assessment should clearly and timeously be communicated to all relevant stakeholders. 5.1.3 Assessment should be holistic and criterion referenced (where student performance is judged against pre-specified criteria or standards), rather than norm referenced (where student performance is compared with that of peers in the same class or cohort). 5.1.4 Assessment should be authentic[2] and balanced. Assessment should be integrated into the relevant learning and teaching processes. 5.1.5 Assessment should be transparent, valid, reliable, and just. 5.1.6 Assessment can assume various forms, gather information from various contexts, and use various methods, depending on what is being assessed and the needs of the student and the academic field. 5.1.7 Assessment should incorporate multiple assessment opportunities that include an appropriate balance of formative, summative, and or continuous assessment methods. 5.1.8 Assessment should be impartial. 5.1.9 Feedback regarding assessments and assessment results should be clear, accurate, timely, and meaningful. As far as possible, feedback should be individualised and should support students to achieve higher levels of success in their studies. Individualised feedback helps students to understand where their performance

	has been satisfactory and where improvement is needed.
	5.1.10 Progress should be linked to the demonstration of key competencies and learning outcomes as outlined in course outcomes.
	5.1.11 Results from assessment opportunities should be used to support students.
	5.1.12 The process and quantity of assessment should be practical, feasible, and realistic, linked to the credit value of the module, and manageable for both students and academics.
	5.1.13 Security measures should be implemented and maintained through the introduction of the necessary procedures to prevent, detect and handle dishonesty.
	5.1.14 Universal design for learning (UDL) principles should be considered in assessment design to allow students, where possible, to engage and express themselves in multiple ways.
6. Policy	**6.1 General Minimum Assessment Requirements** 6.1.1 All modules will be required to incorporate a minimum number of assessments, which will be specified in Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations. 6.1.2 All UFS modules should incorporate multiple assessment opportunities that include an appropriate balance of formative, summative, and or continuous assessment at the appropriate NQF-level in their design, in order to give effect to the guiding principles defined in this policy. 6.1.3 A first undergraduate module assessment should take place within four weeks of the commencement of the module. This assessment can be a formal or informal assessment, but marks obtained in the assessment should contribute towards a student's final mark. 6.1.4 All lecturers will be responsible for ensuring that assessment results are directly submitted into an authorised institutional system. This system will provide students with real-time access to their academic records, while still complying with the General Rules regarding student payment of fees. No assessment results may be made available to students on notice boards or in any other way that allows students to see the marks of other students. Institutional deadlines for submission of student assessment results, which all faculties are required to strictly adhere to, will be set annually by DIRAP and the Examination Division. These deadlines will be included in the UFS calendar and will be in accordance with national deadlines for submission of student data to the Department of Higher Education and Training. 6.1.5 As copyright of all assessments resides with the UFS, lecturers will be responsible for ensuring that students are exposed to the types of assessment that will be used in the module either by means of providing previous years' assessments or examples thereof.

---

[2] Authentic assessments require application of what students have learned to a new situation. It demands judgement and innovation to determine what information and skills are relevant and how it should be used.

6.1.6 Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations must provide a clear and transparent process of how student enquiries regarding assessment results will be dealt with.

6.1 E-assessment

6.2.1 All standard provisions regarding general assessment will apply equally to e-assessments.

6.2.2 Unless otherwise specified, all e-assessments should be hosted only on UFS approved systems and technology. The Architectural Review Board of the UFS will be responsible for approving these systems and technology.

6.2.3 Use of third-party software applications, portals, and other resources will be allowed only where they have been approved or selected and procured through standard UFS processes, and meet the following criteria:

6.2.3.1 provide security of data as set out in the relevant UFS policy and as defined by the POPI Act;

6.2.3.2 able to guarantee the anonymity of students, especially in online systems;

6.2.3.3 do not generate additional costs or fees for students beyond standard UFS fees;

6.2.3.4 quality assurance of resources is within the domain of the relevant teaching academic/ department; and

6.2.3.5 all requests must be evaluated by an institutional committee responsible for the review of third-party software applications and resources.

6.2.4 All academic staff and markers who make use of e- assessment as part of their e-assessment practices should attend training sessions on the use of these online systems (including Blackboard, Question mark, and Turnit-In).

6.2.5 The following provisions apply for e-examinations:

6.2.5.1 Both online tests and assessments submitted as assignments and Turnitin assignments are acceptable summative assessment types that can be completed as an examination or form part of a continuous assessment module.

6.2.5.2 An e-examination should not be the first online assessment to which a student is exposed. Students should have completed at least one online assessment in the same format as the e-examination during the preceding semester.

6.2.5.3 E-examinations in the form of an online test must be invigilated. The same invigilation requirements that apply to written examinations, apply to e-examinations.

6.3 Use of ad-hoc markers

6.3.1 Use of ad-hoc markers is encouraged where needed to generate the required capacity for effective assessment and student feedback. Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations specify criteria for the use of markers.

6.3.2 For undergraduate level assessments, all ad-hoc markers need to have at least successfully completed the relevant module they are expected to mark. For postgraduate level assessments, markers must have a relevant postgraduate degree. Assessment of research-based modules within programmes are regulated through the guidelines set out for research supervision. Lecturers will be responsible for ensuring that ad-hoc markers are qualified to mark. All ad-hoc markers are required to undergo initial general training before commencing marking, thereafter assignment-specific training is required each time before marking a new assessment. Training does not need to be face-to-face.

6.3.3 Assessors are expected to assess a reasonable sample of scripts before ad-hoc markers start any assessment. In addition, assessors are expected to mark a reasonable number of all scripts received. The number of scripts assessed by assessors will be defined in Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations.

6.4 Assessment Moderation

6.4.1 Moderation is an important tool that seeks to ensure that quality standards for the inputs, processes and outputs of assessment are maintained. Moderation thus does not only take place at the end of a process, but forms part of the cyclical nature of quality assurance in assessment.

6.4.2 Internal moderation must be performed internally on all assessments. Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations need to provide guidance on internal moderation of assessments.

6.4.3 All exit-level modules, including contiuous assessment modules, must be internally and externally moderated. Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations need to provide guidance on external moderation of continuous assessment modules (also refer to the Quality Assurance Policy).

6.4.4 The same internal and external moderators may not be used for more than three consecutive years, unless approved by faculty structures as specified in the Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations.

6.5 Staff Capacity

6.5.1 All full-time and part-time staff involved in assessment will be expected to adhere to the UFS Assessment Code of Conduct. This document is attached as Annexure A.

6.6 Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations

6.6.1 All faculties are expected to develop Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations. Upon approval of this policy, each faculty will develop Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations which will guide the implementation of the policy and within which structures will be put in place to ensure:

6.6.1.1 the implementation and execution of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes on faculty level;

6.6.1.2 that minimum assessment requirements are followed; this includes but is not limited to regulations that prescribe the

	number of assessments, processes related to feedback, aspects pertaining to multi- campus collaboration,
	6.6.1.3 that the use of ad-hoc markers and marking practices are regulated on a faculty level.
	6.6.1.4 that discussions take place in the case of final summative assessment results, based on trends in assessment results, with a view to making adjustments as appropriate;
	6.6.1.5 that reports from internal and external moderators are reviewed to determine suitable corrective courses of action based on the findings of these reports before finalising provisional results;
	6.6.1.6 that relevant processes and procedures related to student appeals on assessment results are specified;
	6.6.1.7 the safeguarding of assessments, including scripts and assessment results;
	6.6.1.8 that moderation takes place internally and externally, at appropriate levels;
	6.6.1.9 the development and regular review of faculty assessment rules and regulations; and
	6.6.2 Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations need to align with the institutional policy and must be approved by the Academic Committee of Senate.
7. Roles and Responsibilities	Several key players will fulfil critical roles in the implementation of this policy. These are presented below: **7.1 Vice Rector Academic** 7.1.1 Custodian of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes. **7.2 DIRAP** 7.2.1 Responsible for the alignment of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes' processes and strategies with the national policy and requirements as outlined by the Department of Higher Education and Training. 7.2.2 Responsible for the implementation of the quality enhancement framework as outlined by the CHE. **7.3 Deans of Faculties** 7.3.1 Responsible for overseeing the development and review of Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations and alignment with the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes. **7.4 Heads of Department** 7.4.1 Responsible for the implementation of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes on departmental level. 7.4.2 Responsible for dealing with non-compliance of this policy; if needed, the non-compliance can be escalated to the Dean of the faculty. 7.4.3 Responsible for the quality assurance of the assessment process in their department/ school.

	7.4.4 In addressing the previous three points it is critical that Heads of Department ensure that all relevant staff in the department participate in the necessary assessment training sessions.
	7.4.5 Responsible for the oversight of student assessment results, including the implementation of departmental results review processes that uphold UFS standards.
	7.5 Programme Directors/Coordinators (where applicable)
	7.5.1 Responsible to ensure that the outcomes of the programme are achieved; that assessment criteria and assessment methods used are appropriate; and that cross-field outcomes are achieved.
	7.5.2 Responsible to ensure that adequate result review processes are implemented in their programmes.
	7.6 Faculty Teaching and Learning Managers
	7.6.1 Coordinate the implementation of the University's and the faculty's teaching and learning strategies, Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes, as well as Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations.
	7.7 CTL
	7.7.1 Responsible to provide assessment training to lecturing staff.
	7.7.2 Shares best practices in assessment.
	7.7.3 Advises faculties on the implementation of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes.
	7.7.4 Responsible to ensure that the policy is reviewed every three years.
	7.7.5 Supports staff in the design and development of e-assessment activities; this includes providing the relevant training in e-assessment practices and software.
	7.8 ICT Services
	7.8.1 Responsible for the establishment and maintenance of the necessary technical infrastructure related to e-assessment, as well as the integration of these systems with the student management system.
	7.9 Academic staff
	7.9.1 Adhere to the criteria stipulated in Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations and the Assessment Code of Conduct.
	7.9.2 Apply criteria for effective assessment in teaching practice, take responsibility for further development and attend required assessment training.
	7.10 Support staff in faculties (where applicable)
	7.10.1 Responsible for implementing assessment procedures including but not limited to the capturing of marks on official UFS platforms and to attend training in using the relevant platforms.
	7.11 Examination Division

	7.11.1 Implementation of institutional examination procedures.
	7.12 Registrar
	7.12.1 Responsible for alignment of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes and the General Rules.
	7.13 Other relevant faculty structures
	7.13.1 Roles and responsibilities of these structures should be set out and clarified in the Faculty Rules and Regulations. This includes management structures, such as Heads of Schools.

8. Accountability and Authority:

8.1 Implementation:	8.1.1 The policy will be implemented through Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations which must be aligned with the institutional policy and approved by the Academic Committee of Senate.
8.2 Compliance:	The following key stakeholders fulfil roles in implementation of the policy in order to ensure compliance to the policy on different levels: 8.2.1 DIRAP is responsible for alignment of policy processes and strategies with the national policy and requirements as outlined by the DHET as well as for the implementation of the quality enhancement framework as outlined by the CHE. 8.2.2 Deans are responsible for overseeing the development and review of Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations in alignment with the policy. 8.2.3 Heads of Department are responsible for the implementation of the policy on departmental level. 8.2.4 Programme directors (where applicable) are responsible to ensure that the outcomes of the programme are achieved and that assessment criteria and methods used are appropriate, as well as that cross-field outcomes are achieved. 8.2.5 Teaching and Learning Managers are responsible for the coordination and implementation of the faculty's learning and teaching strategies, this policy, as well as the Faculty Assessment Rules and Regulations. 8.2.6 CTL is responsible to provide assessment training to lecturing staff and to share best practices in assessment, as well as to advise and support faculties in the implementation of the policy. CTL is also responsible to ensure that the policy is reviewed every three years. 8.2.7 ICT services are responsible for the establishment and maintenance of the necessary technical infrastructure related to e-assessment, as well as the integration of these systems with the student management system. 8.2.8 Academic staff are responsible to adhere to the criteria stipulated by the Faculty Assessment Rules and

	Regulations and the Assessment Code of Conduct, as well as to apply criteria for effective assessment in their teaching. 8.2.9 Support staff in faculties (where applicable) is responsible for implementing assessment procedures including but not limited to capturing marks on official UFS platforms. 8.2.10 The Examination Division is responsible for the implementation of institutional examination procedures. 8.2.11 The Registrar is responsible for alignment of the policy and the general rules.
8.3 Monitoring and evaluation:	The following individuals and/or entities are responsible for monitoring and evaluation of the policy on different levels: 8.3.1 The Vice Rector Academic is the custodian of the policy. 8.3.2 DIRAP monitors and evaluates the implementation of the policy through the implementation of the quality enhancement framework. 8.3.3 Heads of Department are responsible for dealing with non-compliance of the policy and the quality assurance of the assessment process in their department or school. They are also responsible for oversight of student assessment results including the implementation of departmental results review processes. 8.3.4 Programme Directors are responsible to ensure that adequate result review processes are implemented in their programmes.
8.4 Development/review:	8.4.1 CTL reporting to the Academic Committee of Senate is responsible for development and review of the policy.
8.5 Approval authority:	8.5.1 Academic Committee of Senate 8.5.2 Executive Committee of Senate 8.5.3 Senate 8.5.4 Council
8.6 Interpretation and advice:	8.6.1 The Academic Committee of Senate is responsible for the interpretation and advice on the policy.
9. Who should know this policy?	
All academic and relevant support staff members	
10. Policy/procedure implementation plan	10.1 The custodian of the Assessment Policy on UFS Coursework Learning Programmes is the Vice-Rector: Academic. 10.2 Policy oversight will be provided by the Academic Committee of Senate. This Committee will have the following terms of reference:

	10.2.1 Reviewing this policy and related policy instruments every five years, implementing necessary refinements to reflect changing circumstances and requirements as appropriate; and 10.2.2 Reviewing key trends in assessment at the UFS and making strategic recommendations to the ECS regarding any actions to be taken.
11. Resources required	11.1 This policy has no specific resource requirements, apart from the time required by key personnel to participate in faculty-level and institutional committees as required. 11.2 Ongoing investment will be needed in design, deployment, configuration, physical resources, and maintenance of e-assessment platforms for the UFS. 11.3 Ongoing investment will be needed in professional development activities regarding assessment for UFS staff (permanent and part-time).
12. Answers to FAQs	
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE POLICY	
Performance Indicator(s):	To be completed on review by the person responsible for implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Annexure A

University of the Free State code of conduct for assessors and moderators

Scope and applicability

This code applies to all assessment activities, all assessors, markers, internal and external moderators specifically in terms of assessment and moderation practices at the UFS.

Code of conduct

Assessors, markers, and moderators are required to:

1. Provide accurate information about students;
2. Refrain from signing assessment and/ or moderation documentation that is incomplete or untrue;
3. Ensure that the assessment process is clear, transparent and accessible to all students;
4. Refrain from inappropriately amending assessment evidence of any sort;
5. Continuously review and improve assessment practices and tools;
6. Provide opportunities and mechanisms for reassessment where applicable;
7. Ensure that assessment is fair and measures what it is supposed to measure;
8. Gather and assess evidence against the prescribed outcomes and assessment criteria;
9. Be consistent in making assessment judgements against unit standards;
10. Attend refresher courses and other assessment training and keep updated on assessment practices;
11. Avoid aggressive or abusive language or behaviour toward students;
12. Provide timeous and constructive feedback on assessment activities;
13. Use student information, assessment results and other assessment information only for the purpose for which it is intended and in a confidential manner.