ASSESSMENT POLICY

Document number	
Custodian	**DVC: Academic**
Responsible Division	**Academic Development and Support**
Status	**Approved:** Policy: Assessment – 3 Oct 2007 (Senate) Management of Assessment Results – 3 Oct 2007 (Senex) Rules of assessment and invigilation – 3 Oct 2007 (Senex)
Approved by	**Senate**
Date of approval	**22 October 2007**
Amendments	
Dates of amendments	**15 September 2016**
Review date	**2019**
Related documents	

UJ documents (e.g. Policies, Regulations, Guidelines, Contracts)	Other (e.g. Legislation, DoE and HEQC directives and guidelines)
- UJ Vision, Mission and Values; - Policy on Academic Certification; - Policy on Academic Programme; - Academic Regulations; - Language Policy; - Policy on Development and Evaluation of Learning Material; - Policy on Higher Degrees and - Postgraduate Studies; - Policy on People with Disabilities; - Policy on Recognition of Prior Learning; - Policy on Staff Development; - Policy on Teaching and Learning; - UJ Code of Academic and Research Ethics; - UJ Enrolment Management Plan; - UJ Programme Review Manual; - UJ Programme Qualification Mix; - UJ Guidelines for the Approval, Accreditation, Registration, Recording and Termination of Subsidised and Non-subsidised Programmes; - UJ Strategic Objectives 2014 – 2015; - Policy on Work Integrated Service Learning; - UJ Online Policy Framework.	- Higher Education Act (Act 101 of 1997); - South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) Act (Act 58 of 1995); - Criteria and Guidelines for Assessment of NQF Registered Unit Standards and Qualifications: SAQA, October 2001; - Guidelines for Integrated Assessment (SAQA, September 2005); - Ministry of Education: National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa (February 2001); - Higher Education Qualification Sub-framework (HEQSF) (Government Gazette Vol. 481, July 2005); - Ministry of Education: Higher Education Qualification Framework (October 2007); - CHE: Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) Criteria for Institutional Audits: November, 2004; - CHE: Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) Criteria for Programme Accreditation: November, 2004; - Work integrated learning: Good practice guide (CHE, 2011); - The assessment of student learning (CHE, ITL Resource No 5, 2004); - Guidelines for integrated assessment (SAQA, 2005); - SAQA level descriptors for the SA NQF (SAQA, November 2012). - Protection of Personal Information Act 4 of 2013 (2013)

Stakeholders affected by this document (units and divisions who should be familiar with it).	• Executive Deans; • Vice-Deans • Quality Managers; • Heads: Academic Departments; • Lecturers (part-time and full-time); • Executive Directors/Directors: Academic Service and Support Units. • Heads: Academic Support Units.
Website address of this document:	https://www.intranet.uj.ac.za

Contents

ASSESSMENT

1. PREAMBLE

This Assessment Policy reflects and underpins the University's strong commitment to excellence in assessment as an integral part of teaching and learning which is implicit in the *UJ Strategic Objectives 2014 - 2025*, namely:

- Excellence in research and innovation
- Excellence in teaching and learning.

The University of Johannesburg acknowledges that assessment constitutes a key element in its commitment to offering academic programmes that have international recognition as well as national legitimacy, credibility and well-understood academic, professional and career-orientated outcomes.

Assessment and assessment practices are regulated in accordance with current national requirements (see list of documents on cover page). The Assessment Policy is one of the principle means by which the University ensures that the quality and standard of learning outcomes of subsidised and non- subsidised (i.e. continuing education) programmes are assured, and apply across all faculties, departments and campuses. The acceptance of an integrated approach to teaching, learning and assessment, the assessment for learning strategy of UJ, as well as the UJ Teaching and Learning Strategy and the programme-based approach to education serves as a point of departure for this policy.

The principles, definitions and interpretations in this document are based on conceptual frameworks developed by South African legally constituted bodies, namely, the previously mentioned NQF and SAQA and the Council for Higher Education (CHE), including the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) and the Department of Higher Education (DHET).

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to:

Establish a clear framework of principles, regulations, guidelines and procedures for integrated, coherent, constructive assessment strategies that effectively support the achievement of intended learning outcomes in all academic programmes in the University;

21. ensure the alignment of assessment practices for subsidised and continuing education programmes across all faculties, campuses and departments with national guidelines and the requirements of professional bodies;
22. inform the alignment of faculty-specific assessment policy rules and regulations as well as the assessment of learning outside the faculties;
23. provide a framework for the management of the quality of all assessment-

related procedures and practices in the University.

3. DEFINITIONS/CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

The following are key concepts in the assessment domain:

3.1. Assessment
Assessment is a process in which evidence is gathered and judgments made about an individual's performance in relation to defined criteria.

3.2. Assessment criteria
Assessment criteria are derived directly from the learning outcomes that state what students must achieve. Criteria are the clear and transparent expression of requirements against which the student's performance is assessed. Criteria are pre-determined, objective and as clear as possible.

3.3. Assessment methods
The activities in which an assessor engages to determine student competence, for example, observation (observing students while carrying out a task), document review (evaluating a product submitted by a student, such as an artifact or portfolio of evidence) and oral or written questions.

3.4. Assessment opportunity
This refers to assessment that gives the student an opportunity to demonstrate his/her knowledge and skills with subsequent feedback that contribute to learning. The opportunity may be scheduled and supervised or not (e.g. a take home exam), but a specific date when the evidence should be submitted, must be predetermined.

3.5. Assessor
Assessor refers to the practitioner responsible for the assessment of the achievement of learning outcomes. The assessor is usually the academic staff member or practitioner (also referred to as a learning facilitator, lecturer or teacher) who teaches the module and is responsible for designing, implementing and marking student assignments, recording the results and providing feedback to the students, but may also be workplace supervisors, managers, team leaders or designated community leaders, provided that they are skilled in the process of assessment (and/or registered as an assessor with the relevant ETQA).

3.6. Authentic assessment
The assessment should allow the students to experience learning in a situation which is as close as possible to reality. Authentic assessment is contextualized and involves complex intellectual challenges.

3.7. External assessor
An expert appointed from outside the University who also assesses the student's evidence and who is usually appointed in modules where experiential learning is assessed. In postgraduate studies, the external examiner is a second or third assessor who is appointed for master's dissertations, minor dissertations and doctoral theses.

3.8. Evidence

The proof produced by the students that shows they comply with the requirements of the criteria of module/programme for which they wish to gain credit. All forms of assessment are aimed at the collection of evidence that derives from many sources.

3.9. Memorandum/assessment marking guide

A guideline document or assessment-marking guide, based on relevant assessment principles that is used to assess the student's evidence, for example, model answers, rubrics, checklists, frameworks with mark allocation.

3.10. Chief Invigilator

The invigilator, usually an academic from the relevant department, is responsible for ensuring that the assessment is conducted in accordance with the University's Rules and Regulations.

3.11. Moderators

The moderator is an internal or external person who is familiar with the module/programme content and is a competent assessor. The purpose of moderation is to ensure that the assessment in a module or academic programme meets national and institutional requirements.

3.12. Internal Moderator

This is an academic employee of the University who is nominated by the department, endorsed by the head of department or the Executive Dean and approved by the relevant faculty board to moderate the assessment of a specific module that does not have an appointed external moderator. The internal moderator is an experienced assessor in whom others have confidence and who has knowledge of the learning area/module/field of study (consult Appendix 1).

3.13. External Moderator

This is a subject field expert, who is not an employee of the University, and who is officially appointed by the University to moderate the assessment of a module. A designated external moderator is an experienced assessor and has credibility in his/her area of knowledge and expertise (consult Appendix 1).

4. PRINCIPLES

Assessment for student learning reflects the tenet of academic integrity and complies with the University's Code of Academic and Research Ethics, including the rights of students. The Assessment Policy should be read together with the UJ Policy on Teaching and Learning and the Language Policy.

The following principles apply:

4.1. Assessment is coherently designed as an integral part of the teaching and learning process (assessment for learning) and should be fully aligned with the purpose, learning content and learning outcomes of the programme and its modules.

4.2. Assessment practices are based on established best practice and contemporary research (see the Good Practice Descriptors, Point 5 below), and are aligned with

the assessment practices and procedures and SAQA level descriptors required by the NQF.

4.3. Assessment is both formative and summative and is conducted throughout the learning experience.

4.4. The purpose of the assessment and related assessment criteria must be clearly communicated to students prior to assessment.

4.5. Assessment should include a wide range of approaches and methods that are fit for purpose; the use of integrated assessment is recommended.

4.6. Assessment is followed by timely and constructive feedback to support the learning process.

4.7. All assessments must be of high quality, with attention paid to language clarity, appearance (technical layout) and tally of marks.

4.8. Quality assurance is integral to assessment and is the responsibility of the relevant faculty and academic department.

5. GOOD PRACTICE DESCRIPTORS

Assessment is:

5.1. *Fair,* i.e. a student is not hindered or disadvantaged when it comes to being treated equally and in an unbiased manner and that appeal mechanisms are available to all students.

5.2. *Transparent,* i.e. all parties (students, assessors, moderators, etc.) understand the system and have the assurance that it is well planned, works in practice and is properly regulated.

5.3. *Reliable*, i.e. it is accurate and consistent in that the same judgments are made in equivalent or similar contexts in terms of standards, available assessment evidence, marks, regardless of who the assessor is or how many different people are assessing.

5.4. *Valid*, i.e. requires that assessment processes and instruments assess what they set out to assess in respect of clearly stated outcomes. Validity requires appropriate types of evidence by means of an appropriate method of assessment.

5.5. *Clear*, with reference to the expression of the requirements against which student performance is measured, with a built-in mechanism to avoid assessor/moderator deviation, inconsistency and error.

5.6. *Explicit,* the learning outcomes, and the content selection are both aligned with the assessment criteria and judgments are clearly stated and communicated to the students.

6. ASSESSMENT APPROACHES

Assessment for learning at the UJ should be in line with the following approaches to assessment which are informed by the purpose of each assessment:

6.1. Formative assessment

(a) The assessments conducted during the process of teaching and learning with the purpose of giving early indications of what and how effectively students are learning, as well as their strengths and weaknesses. Formative assessment is often used as a diagnostic tool as it provides information with which to make real-time improvements in teaching methods, learning support materials and activities.

(b) Formative assessment:
  (i) supports the teaching and learning process;
  (ii) provides feedback to the learner on his/her progress;
  (iii) diagnoses the learner's strengths and weaknesses;
  (iv) assists in the planning of future learning;
  (v) is developmental in nature and contributes to the learner's capacity for self-assessment;
  (vi) Helps to make decisions on the readiness of the learner to do a summative assessment.

(c) Marks are not necessarily allocated, but if allocated, may contribute to the year/ semester mark for admission to the final summative assessment opportunity. Students must be informed that formative assessment marks contribute to the year/semester mark.

6.2. Summative assessment

(a) The purpose of summative assessment is to make a judgment about the achievement of a student in relation to the outcomes of a unit/module and/or programme. It is used to provide information about a student's level of competence (i.e. pass or fail) on completion of a theme or sub-unit in a module, a module or an academic programme. Summative assessment must be conducted on a continuous basis and is not confined to a single written examination.

(b) Summative assessment also serves a developmental purpose, i.e. is also a learning experience. All summative assessment (excluding the final assessment opportunity) must include constructive feedback to the students in order to enhance their learning.

(c) The results of such formal assessment (e.g. tests, assignments, projects, presentations, creative production or traditional examinations) are expressed as a final mark.

6.3. Integrated assessment

(a) Integrated assessment assures overall applied competence, i.e. prevents disjointed learning experiences. It m a y be used in formative as well as summative assessment.

(b) Integrated assessment practice includes one or more of the following:
  (i) assessing a number of outcomes together

      (ii)   assessing a number of assessment criteria together

      (iii)   using a combination of assessment methods and instruments to assess the outcomes/assessment criteria

      (iv)   collecting naturally occurring evidence (such as in a workplace setting)

      (v)   Acquiring evidence from other resources such as supervisor's reports, testimonials, portfolios of work previously done (e.g. RPL assessment).

7. TYPES OF ASSESSMENT

Assessment of learning at the UJ could be conducted in a traditional or continuous way.

7.1. Traditional assessment

(a) Assessment for learning includes pre-determined formative and summative assessments, where assessments throughout the semester/year may contribute toward to semester/year mark. A formal final summative assessment is conducted at the end of the semester/year.

(b) A formal final summative assessment is scheduled *after* the following minimum number of summative assessment opportunities has taken place. Depending on the duration of the module, the following applies:

    (i)   14 week (semester module) – a minimum of three summative assessment opportunities (excluding supplementary and special assessment opportunities);

    (ii)   28 week (year module) – a minimum of five summative assessment opportunities (excluding supplementary and special assessment opportunities

7.2. Continuous assessment

(a) Continuous assessment is conducted on a continuous basis throughout the learning experience and includes formative and summative assessment opportunities. It is carried out at any of the pre-determined points of the total learning experience. These consecutive assessment opportunities, which include a variety of assessment methods, have predetermined weightings and include the assessment of all the outcomes within the module. In the case of continuous assessment, all assessments (including the final summative) contribute to the final pass/fail mark of the student.

(b) The continuous assessment schedule, which could include a formal final summative assessment opportunity (e.g. an examination), must make provision for the weighting of the summative assessment opportunities, but could make provision for the setting of prerequisites with which students must comply before progress to the following phase/step within the continuous assessment schedule. Depending on the duration of the module, the following applies:

    (i)   14 week (semester module) – a minimum of three summative assessment opportunities (excluding supplementary and special assessment opportunities);

    28 week (year module) – a minimum of five summative assessment opportunities (excluding supplementary and special assessment opportunities).

8. SPECIAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Assessment planning includes opportunities for special and supplementary summative assessment opportunities in accordance with the Academic Regulations. Supplementary summative final marks are capped at 50%.

9. ASSESSMENT METHODS

A variety of fit for purpose methods of assessment are used by the assessor/s within a module/programme to assess the student and his/her work as defined by the outcomes. The development and implementation of assessment methods are based on the principles of assessment, as well as the following:

9.1. Assessment methods include one or more of the following:
  (a) Observation of real or simulated tasks, e.g. practical / exercises / demonstrations, role-plays, presentations, etc.
  (b) Assessment of students' work, e.g. projects, assignments, case studies, portfolios, artifacts, log books, reflective journals, take home assignments, etc.
  (c) assessment such as oral or written questions, including short or long questions, essays, multiple-choice questions and also take home exams (i.e. a special type of open book exam where students are required to complete the exam away from the exam centre over a period of time and submit it on a specified date either in electronic or paper copy format).

9.2. Multiple-choice summative assessments are conducted as approved by the Faculty Board concerned, but the weight of the multiple-choice assessment, in any one module, may not exceed a maximum of twenty per cent (20%) of the final mark for exit-level modules, and not more than 50% for other modules.

9.3. Electronic assessment complies with all the principles and procedures as described in this policy and the Academic Regulations. In addition, the following apply:
  (a) Staff members tasked with electronic assessment and related activities possess expertise and knowledge of the technical requirements necessary to create fair, valid and reliable electronic assessment opportunities.
  (b) In the interest of standardisation, security and management of assessments, formal assessment opportunities are conducted, using the learning management system endorsed by the University whenever possible.
  (c) Due diligence is exercised to ensure the appropriate security of electronic assessment materials and evidence. Assessors take advantage of security measures offered by assessment software and related tools.

(d) Use of electronic assessment neither advantages nor disadvantages any student.

(e) Every student is given the opportunity to become conversant in the use of an applicable electronic assessment tool before they are required to complete an electronic assessment.

(f) Due diligence is exercised to verify the authenticity of students and their assessment evidence. Where student identity cannot be directly or securely verified, electronic assessments are part and parcel of a portfolio of evidence that is based on integrated assessment and establishes a trend of student ability.

(g) If student evidence is annotated in an electronic medium, such annotations are clearly differentiated from student evidence.

(h) When electronic assessments are conducted, staff is responsible for the following additional management functions, where relevant:

- Provide sufficient information to allow workstations (on and off campus) to be suitably set up to meet the specific requirements of an assessment opportunity.
- Provide students with a reasonable opportunity to check their access to the electronic environment and solve access problems via relevant support channels.

10. COMMUNICATION WITH STUDENTS

10.1. Communication is required with the students before and after assessments. Different channels of communication are utilized, e.g. the learning guide, face- to- face communication and communication technology.

10.2. Communication *before* assessment should include:

(a) information on the purpose, relevant assessment criteria, dates and venues, weightings of the different assessment opportunities, mode and type of assessment, guidelines on how to answer questions, e.g. write a case study or write an open book exam, etc.

(b) Clear guidelines on reasonable penalties for late submissions of assignments that are discussed with students and included in the learning guide.

(c) Procedures for the review of assessment results.

10.3. Communication *after* assessment, i.e. constructive feedback (not only a grade on a list) is provided in writing or verbally throughout the learning process and should provide valuable information to the student on what, why and how performance may be improved, thereby contributing to the learning experience. Quality of dialogue in feedback is important while students should be encouraged to seek additional assistance where required

10.4. Constructive feedback to students includes the viewing of their marked evidence/assessment script/assignment, etc. The following have application:

Requests for the explanation of the award of final marks in the final summative assessment opportunity must be made within 10 days after classes commenced for the second semester for first semester assessments. In the case of a second semester assessment opportunity, requests must be made three days prior to commencement of classes the following year. No assessment material (for example, answer scripts or portfolios) or copies of it may be provided to students after such explanatory discussion, if such material would not otherwise have been returned to the

student.

    (a)   Exceptions (i.e. due to large student numbers and University holidays) are addressed in faculty assessment policies. Faculties and departments take the scheduling of the final assessment into account when managing this aspect.

    (b)   Assessment results are confidential. An individual student's assessment results are not disclosed to fellow-students or unauthorised staff members. Class lists on notice boards do not include names of students only their student numbers and the results.

11.   ASSESSMENTS RELATING TO SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES

Assessment in the various assessment contexts identified below, must be conducted by taking this Assessment Policy into consideration, as well as the relevant UJ policies and/or Academic Regulations:

11.1. *Work integrated learning (WIL) and service learning (SL),* i.e. applied learning that intentionally seeks to integrate a student's theoretical learning with clinical and/or practical skills and/or promote civic learning and personal growth through continuous reflection (in the case of service learning, while meeting actual community needs) in an authentic environment, i.e. industry or community.

11.2. *Recognition of prior learning (RPL)* has reference to the comparison of previous learning and experience by a student, howsoever obtained, against the learning outcomes required for a specified qualification, and the acceptance of such learning for purposes of qualification of that which meets the requirements.

11.3. *Students who require exceptions to the assessment specified for the module* either for the weighting of an assessment as a contribution to the overall mark or change in the nature of the assessment must apply formally to the Dean in writing with a motivation explaining the reasons for the application. This must include supporting documentation depending on the reasons. Applications for exceptions may only be considered under the following circumstances with the appropriate supporting documentation:

    (a)   Serious medical condition or extended illness period;

    (b)   Death in the family or extended family;

    (c)   Exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student (fire, flood, accident, etc.).

The Dean, in consultation with the relevant Head of Department, may consider this request if the appropriate supporting documents are provided and the circumstances warrant the request for an exception. An appeal of this outcome may be escalated to the Registrar.

11.4. *If a qualification and the modules therein are to be phased out*, all students registered for that qualification must be notified as close as possible to the beginning of the year that the curriculum or qualification on which they are registered will be phased out. Students should be provided with the phase out plan for the qualification depending on the year of study. The information must include the last year of offering of the qualification and modules. If replacement modules are available, then students must be informed of the rules for these modules. If pre-requisites must be changed to co-requisites, these changes must be amended in the Rules Book. In special cases, the Dean in consultation with the Head of Department, may schedule a special examination in cases where the students are unable to graduate as the module concerned has been phased out or discontinued.

11.5. *Electronic assessment* includes the recording, transmission, presentation and subsequent processing of students' assessment materials and evidence using computers and associated hardware.

11.6. *Assessment in online programmes* to occur according to the online policy framework.

11.7. *Students with disabilities* wishing to submit an application for special assessment conditions do so in accordance with the procedures set out in the University's Policy on People with Disabilities and Academic Regulations.

12. EXAMINATION CENTRES

Examinations may be written at approved UJ examination centres. External UJ Examination Centres will comply with the required security protocols for assessment and other related policies like Invigilation and Assessment Rules.

13. THE ASSESSOR

The assessor possesses the required expertise in the subject matter of the learning field and proficiency in the assessment process and is appointed by the faculty or division concerned (consult Appendix 1).

13.1. Provision is made for the appointment of chief assessors, co-assessors, assistant assessor and/or external assessors as the need arises.

13.2. Workplace supervisors, managers, team leaders and designated community workers can be appointed as assessors, provided that they are skilled in the assessment process and/or registered with the relevant ETQA.

13.3. External assessors for the assessment of Master's dissertations and doctoral theses are appointed in accordance with the University's Policy on Higher Degrees and Postgraduate Studies.

14. MODERATION

Moderation ensures that the assessment of the achievement of the module/programme outcomes described is fair, valid and reliable and that

students are assessed in a consistent, accurate and well-designed manner. It is also a means of evaluating the performance of the assessor/s. Consult Appendix 1 in this regard.

14.1. Faculty Boards are responsible for the determination and implementation of moderation processes and procedures that ensure that all students in all academic programmes are assessed in a consistent, accurate and well- designed manner.
14.2. At least one assessment opportunity (including the replacement assessment or supplementary thereof) is moderated in a 14-week or semester module. In a 28-week (year), module at least two assessment opportunities (including the special assessments or supplementary thereof) are moderated.
14.3. The moderated assessment opportunities are those that carry the greatest weight in the calculation of the final module mark and are determined by the assessor.
14.4. All relevant question papers and/or set of instructions (e.g. in the case of an assignment, portfolio, etc.) should be internally quality checked and either internally or externally moderated.
14.5. The last summative assessment (final examination), inclusive of supplementary and special assessments, of an exit level undergraduate module must be moderated externally.
14.6. All honours and coursework-based Master's modules are moderated externally.

15. VERIFICATION

The monitoring of the quality of the assessment processes from verification of the correctness and accuracy of recorded marks to the receipt and analysis of all moderators' reports, the confirmation or overturning of all moderators' findings and reports to Executive Deans is performed by the assessment committees or portfolios in the faculties.

16. COPYRIGHT, DISHONESTY AND PLAGIARISM

16.1. Materials from copyright-protected sources included in assessments adhere to statutory and other legal requirements and are handled in accordance with DALRO principles.
16.2. Evidence of dishonesty and/or plagiarism is handled in accordance with University and/ or Faculty Rules and Regulations.

17. APPLICATION FOR A REVIEW OF FINAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

A student may apply to the assessor responsible for the allocation of the final summative module for an explanation of the mark and a possible remark, in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations related to appeals.

18. FACULTY ASSESSMENT POLICIES

Faculties may develop faculty-specific assessment policies in line with the University's Assessment Policy and approved by Faculty Board and Senate. Faculty assessment policies are:

(a) developed within the unique context of the faculty concerned;
(b) aligned at faculty level to avoid contradictions between different faculty policies
(c) communicated to all students in the faculty and all students should have access to the Faculty Assessment Policy;
(d) managed at lecturer/assessor, departmental and faculty levels (see Appendix 1).

19. QUALITY MANAGEMENT OF ASSESSMENT

Faculties take full responsibility for the quality management of assessment (consult appendices 1 and 2) and include:

(a) The management of security in accordance with the University's security business rules in this regard.
(b) The relevant faculty quality management structures for assessment are responsible for the development of a faculty-specific assessment policy and the implementation of the policy (including the necessary support structures and mechanisms, the communication to lecturers and students, etc.).
(c) Verification of the accuracy of assessment results is conducted by means of a formalised faculty auditing system, as determined by the Audit Committee of Council.
(d) Regular programme reviews by external review panels address assessment from assessment as part of learning to assessment practices, staff responsible for assessment, moderation and the assessment system.

20. PUBLICATION AND REVIEW

20.1. The Registrar delegates the responsibility to the Central Academic Administration for inclusion of the policy in the University policy databases and makes it available on the University intranet.
20.2. On Senate approval of the Assessment Policy, the faculties are responsible for the communication of the policy to students and employees and for making opportunities available to employees to develop assessment competences where relevant.

21. REVIEW OF THE POLICY

Regular review of the policy is conducted in consultation with the relevant quality assurance structures at faculty and institutional level (i.e. the STLC) and under the auspices of the official custodian of this policy, namely the DVC: Academic.

---oOo---

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENT AT FACULTY LEVEL

The implementation of assessment is a faculty-specific responsibility. The following are addressed in the faculty-assessment policies:

1. APPOINTMENT OF ASSESSORS AND MODERATORS

Assessors and moderators are nominated by the department, endorsed by the Head of department or the Executive Dean, approved by the relevant Faculty Board. External assessors and moderators are remunerated according to the relevant University policy. Appointments of external assessors are made in accordance with set criteria laid down in faculty procedures.

2. THE ASSESSOR

2.1 The assessor (usually the academic staff member responsible for facilitating learning within a specific module) is responsible for:
   (a) planning, designing and implementing the assessment;
   (b) communicating the assessment requirements to students;
   (c) marking and judging student achievement in accordance with the required outcomes;
   (d) providing constructive feedback to the students;
   (e) recording results in accordance with this policy;
   (f) participating in the moderation process.

2.2 Faculties set criteria for the appointment of all categories of assessors and their associated responsibilities, establish mechanisms for the supervision of assistant assessors and have procedures in place for ratification by the relevant assessment structures in the faculty.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASSESSORS

3.1 Assessors are responsible for:
   (a) familiarising themselves with the outcomes and assessment criteria of the module they will be assessing;
   (b) consulting with co-assessors, moderators etc.
   (c) planning the assessment and making decisions about the assessment methods, assessment instruments, activities, type and amount of evidence required;
   (d) ensuring that the assessment workload is realistic and fair to the student and assessor in terms of the outcomes, time allocated and the number

of assessments per module;

(e) ensuring a 'good fit' between the purpose of the assessment method selected and the purpose of the assessment;

(f) ensuring that the assessment method enables students to demonstrate an understanding of the underpinning theory, apply this knowledge in a particular context, reflect on their performance and, where relevant, demonstrate that integrated learning has occurred;

(g) ensuring that the evidence is sufficient and appropriate, relates to the current competence of the students and meets all the criteria that must be collected;

(h) ensuring that the evidence is the student's own work and, in the case of group work, that he/she has made a fair, or the required contribution to the end-result;

(i) conducting the assessment, collecting evidence, making a judgment based on a relevant memorandum/assessment marking guide about the evidence relating to the assessment criteria and providing constructive feedback to the student with regard to the assessment decision;

(j) ensuring a reliable and credible distribution of assessment questions, tasks, projects, etc. across all corresponding previous summative assessment opportunities (e.g. semester, year, supplementary, special) by establishing that no more than 25% of the questions asked or tasks/projects required in such previous assessments are repeated in the current assessment opportunity, unless special permission to do so is granted by the relevant Executive Dean;

(k) controlling that the name of the assessor is indicated on the cover page of all assessments/individual project mark allocation sheets.

32 The following conditions apply to the use of assistant assessors (marking assistants) in summative assessment:

(a) It is essential that continual coordination and support be provided by the assessor to the assistant assessor.

(b) Assistant assessors may assess only if the assessor has provided them with sufficient guidance regarding their specific assessment task (including suitable training in constructive feedback).

(c) If an assistant assessor has not yet successfully completed the relevant programme e.g. has not yet graduated), such student may only be chosen by the assessor as an assistant assessor on condition that he/she has exceptional academic merit in the relevant module. In the case where a student is used as an assistant assessor the student must have completed the degree in which the module resides – to be approved by the dean in exceptional cases.

(d) The assessor must continually moderate a minimum of 10% of the marking of every assistant assessor. This must occur continually and not only at the beginning or the end of all the marking.

(e) Provide an assistant assessor with adequate support. The assessor must assess at least 5% or a minimum of 25 of the evidence him-/herself before an assistant assessor begins to mark.

## 4.	THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF MODERATORS

Moderators have to ensure that students are assessed in a consistent, accurate and well-designed manner. A distinction is made between internal and external moderators in that an external moderator is a subject-field expert who is not a member of the University and is officially appointed by the University to facilitate the external moderation of a module. Moderation must comply with the following requirements:

4.1	A moderator ensures that:
   (a)	the assessment practice and plan of a module or programme, which includes assessment outcomes, criteria, methods and instruments, meets institutional and national requirements;
   (b)	The memorandum has been used fairly and accurately by the assessor in the assessment of student evidence. A moderator must clearly, by means of annotations, indicate which student evidence was moderated;
   (c)	Student evidence is signed by the moderator unless precluded from doing so by the type of evidence and/or materials used. The fact is noted on every individual project mark allocation sheet that is signed by the moderator;
   (d)	A comprehensive report on the standard of the assessment and on the assessor's treatment of student evidence is submitted on completion of the moderation of an assessment.

4.2	The external moderator:
   (a)	ensures that two or more providers delivering programmes for the same qualification (or unit standard) are assessing consistently to the same standard and in a well- designed appropriate manner;
   (b)	judges whether the assessors are appropriately qualified, experienced and competent in assessment practices;
   (c)	determines the appropriateness of the chosen assessment methods;
   (d)	ensures, through sampling, monitoring and observing (whichever is appropriate), that the assessment processes and the students' evidence are adequate to ensure consistency, fairness, validity and reliability;
   (e)	Submits, on completion of the moderation of an assessment, a comprehensive report on the standard of assessment and on the assessor's treatment of student evidence.

## 5.	THE MODERATION PROCESS

5.1	Moderation adheres to the following requirements:
   (a)	The assessor communicates with the moderator as to how the module was planned where applicable) and/or the assessment thereof.
   (b)	The assessment, memorandum/assessment marking guide, learning guide, and if requested a copy of the textbook used for the module and a blank copy of the moderator's report is made available to the moderator.

(c) A sample of at least 30 marked scripts must be submitted for moderation. If there are fewer than 30 scripts in total, then all the scripts must be submitted for moderation.

(d) After completion of the assessment, the assessor is required to make available to the moderator a report that addresses any problems experienced with the marking and/or any other information relevant to the student's evidence and the moderation process.

(e) If the assessor and moderator cannot agree on proposed changes to an assessment, the matter is referred to the head of department concerned, who, after discussion with the parties involved, will make the final decision.

(f) All exit-level and course-work postgraduate modules are moderated externally.

(g) External moderators' reports are submitted to the assessor, the head of department and the faculty assessment committee (or equivalent).

(h) The faculty assessment committee (or equivalent) has a quality assurance function and should analyse moderators' reports to identify trends, inform relevant role players to improve assessment practices, develop staff's assessment skills, etc.

---oOo---

MANAGEMENT OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The management of assessment results is a faculty-specific responsibility. The following are addressed in the faculty assessment policies:

1.   VERIFICATION OF RESULTS OF FINAL ASSESSMENTS OR ANY ASSESSMENT NOT RETURNED TO STUDENTS

1.1   Verification of results is a very important part of quality assurance processes and practices, as evidence is not returned to the student. The accuracy, reliability and recording of marks are identified by audit practices as a risk.

1.2   Verification includes the verification of the correctness and accuracy of the recorded marks, the receipt and analyses of all moderators' reports, the confirmation or overruling of moderation findings and the report to Executive Deans.

1.3   Verification of University Certificates is conducted in accordance with the processes and procedures as stipulated in the Academic Certification Policy.

1.4   Security measures are applied in accordance with the stipulations of the Academic Certification Policy and associated procedures and the CAA retention schedule.

2.   FINALISING OF RESULTS: VERIFICATION OF FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY RESULTS

This section distinguishes between final assessments of traditional summative assessments (examinations), as well as continuous summative (i.e. not traditional) assessments that are not returned to students and which contribute to the final mark as per the specific faculty regulation/s approved by Senate and contained in the Faculty Rules and Regulations.

The MAMS (Management of Marks system) is the official UJ system that must be used to capture all marks.

2.1   The assessor is responsible for managing the final assessment, its moderation and the related marking process. It is the assessor's responsibility to reconcile the number of students in the assessment venue with the number of scripts as per the invigilators' reports and to document this reconciliation once the students have completed the assessment.

2.2   A final assessment of a *traditional assessment* (e.g. an examination) where more than one assessor is involved in the process, the assessor is responsible for ensuring that each assessment has been assessed by an experienced/competent assessor.

2.3   A final assessment of a *continuous summative assessment,* the assessor is responsible for ensuring that each assessment has been assessed by   an

experienced/ competent assessor.

2.4 Once the marking process is complete, the assessor is responsible for ensuring that:

(a) Results are captured on the mark sheet;

(b) Marks awarded for each question or assessment activity are reconciled with the total marks awarded for the question paper or activity/activities, and

(c) The total marks awarded for the question paper or activity/activities are reconciled with the mark sheet.

2.5 The assessor is responsible for finalising the marking, verification and moderation process within ten calendar days of the date of the assessment opportunity.

2.6 In a final assessment of a *traditional summative assessment* (e.g. an examination), it is the responsibility of the assessor to produce exception reports, investigate the variances and adjust the marks accordingly, as approved by Senate for border-line students, i.e. any students with:

(a) final marks of 38% or 39%;

(b) final marks of 73% or 74% of undergraduate and postgraduate students, excluding such coursework-based master's results;

(c) last assessment opportunity marks of 38% or 39% with a final mark of 50% or more;

(d) module mark of at least 60% but failed the module;

(e) 15% variance between module mark and final summative assessment mark and

(f) Any other exception (i.e. exception reports) as approved by Senate.

2.7 In a final assessment of a *continuous summative assessment,* it is the responsibility of the assessor to produce exception reports, investigate the variances and use discretion in the adjustment of the marks ~~accordingly~~, as approved by Senate for border-line students, i.e. any students with:

(a) final marks of 48% or 49%;

(b) final marks of 73% or 74% of undergraduate and postgraduate students (levels 8 and 9), excluding such coursework-based Master's results;

(c) Any other exception (i.e. exception reports) as approved by Senate.

2.8 With regards to final assessment marks for undergraduate and honours programmes and for module assessments in coursework-based master's programmes, the Heads of Faculty Administration and/or a designated faculty officer may round off the final mark upwards for the purpose of capturing such mark on the Student Data System, providing only that the decimal point is 0,5% or higher.

2.9 In respect of the final mark of a coursework-based master's candidate, the final mark may be rounded off upwards for the purpose of capturing such mark on the

ITS Student Data System, providing only that the decimal point is 0,5% or higher.

2.10 Heads of Departments are accountable for the verification process and may delegate the work accordingly.

2.11 The Faculty Departments are responsible for retaining all documentation related to the examination/assessment and verification process as evidence for quality assurance purposes.

2.12 The department is responsible for the safe keeping of the examination scripts/attendance slips for a period as specified in the CAA Retention of Documents.

3. INTERNAL AUDITING STRATEGY

3.1 An internal auditing process that ensures an accurate and reliable reflection of assessment marks obtained by students is initiated by faculty assessment committees or portfolios, on an annual basis, in accordance with Council audit requirements.

3.2 Each faculty develops an internal auditing strategy. The strategy, as approved by the faculty board concerned, addresses, on a five-year rotational cycle, the modules/qualifications scheduled for internal auditing.

3.3 The internal auditing function is performed by assessment committees or portfolios in the faculties. A report on the auditing process is tabled at the Faculty Quality Committee.

3.4 Executive Deans are accountable for the implementation and monitoring of the respective faculty internal auditing processes and procedures.

4. FACULTY ADMINISTRATION AND CENTRAL ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

4.1 The Head of Faculty Administration is responsible for the administration of marks and results.

4.2 Heads of Departments approve and counter-sign final mark sheets, as signed by the relevant parties, for submission to the faculty assessment committee (or equivalent).

4.3 The Faculty Assessment Committee is responsible for the final approval of marks and amendments to marks and results, after which the results are officially released. Processes and procedures are contained in Appendix 1 of this policy.

4.4 Documents pertaining to final assessments, e.g. final signed assessment opportunity mark sheets and global statements, are stored in accordance with the requirements of the CAA retention schedule.

4.5 Faculties are responsible for the safe keeping of documents.

4.6 Central Academic Administration is responsible for monitoring the amendments of final results. The Head of Faculty Administration is responsible for filing documentation supporting such amendments.

4.7 Assessments, memoranda/assessment-marking guides and student's evidence are managed as follows:

Mechanisms and procedures that ensure strict confidentiality, the safe-guarding and security of assessments, including electronic assessment, as well as access during the marking process, are implemented and monitored in accordance with requirements of the University's Academic Certification Policy and the requirements of this policy (see Appendix 2).

(a) All persons involved in assessment (from assessors to staff responsible for the recording of assessment results) sign a security protocol annually, at the start of the year, stating that they will treat all assessment results as confidential.

(b) A system for the storage of students' evidence (hard and/or electronic copies) is made available.

5. APPLICATIONS FOR THE REVIEW OF FINAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

5.1 Students may view their assessment in discussion with the assessor as specified in the UJ academic regulations.

5.2 No assessment material (e.g. scripts or portfolios) or copies thereof are provided to the student after the explanatory discussion if such material is not otherwise returned to the student.

5.3 Students may apply for a remark of the final summative assessment for which a fee, as determined by the University, is payable in accordance with the appeals process as stipulated in the Academic Regulations.

5.4 The Executive Dean may, at his/her discretion, decide to appoint an external arbitrator to re-asses the final and/or last summative assessment. The decision by the Executive Dean is final.

5.5 A fee, as determined by the University, is payable for the assessment by arbitration. The fee is refunded if the result is altered by the arbitrator from a fail to a pass or from a pass without distinction to a pass with distinction. In all other cases, the fee is forfeited to the University.

---oOo---

RULES OF ASSESSMENT AND INVIGILATION

1. PREAMBLE

Integral to the University of Johannesburg's commitment to excellence is the provision of a set of regulations that ensures thorough security and limits breaches of rules in assessment and final assessment arrangements, as well as in the invigilation requirements in compliance with the principles of sound corporate governance, while at the same time being as fair as possible to employees and students.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this set of rules is to:

2.1   establish a clear set of rules that addresses security risks regarding the setting, printing, handling, transport and storage of assessment and/or final assessment papers;

2.2   provide directives regarding the alteration of assessment and final assessment opportunity marks;

2.3   provide directives concerning access control and the use of electronic devices at final assessment opportunity venues;

2.4   establish provisions regarding invigilation for final assessment opportunities;

2.5   provide rules that govern the committing of offences and/or transgressions of assessment and/or final assessment regulations by students during such assessment processes;

2.6   Integrate and align the relevant rules and regulations across all faculties, responsible academic support divisions and campuses.

3. SECURITY MEASURES PRIOR TO ASSESSMENT AND FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

3.1   Computer passwords should be utilised during the setting of assessment papers.

3.2   Electronic copies of assessment papers must be password protected.

3.3   No student may enter the office of a lecturer whilst he/she is in the process of setting assessment papers unless these papers are secured.

3.4   Lecturers' offices should be locked at all times when the lecturer is out of office during the setting of assessment papers.

3.5   All draft hard copies of assessment papers must immediately be destroyed.

3.6   Once set and moderated, assessment and final assessment question papers are saved on discs or memory sticks that are stored and locked in a fire- and waterproof safe (i.e. assessment and final assessment question papers are not stored on the hard discs of computers).

3.7 Final question papers are copied on approved University printers (i.e. not personal desktop printers) under the supervision the Assessment Department at Central Academic Administration.

3.8 Assessment and final assessment question papers may be forwarded electronically only by using SAPSS system or password protected or encrypted email, provided that an Executive Dean has given approval for his/her faculty to do so.

3.9 No unsealed assessment question papers (assessment and final assessment opportunities) may be handled by temporary employees, student assistants or external invigilators, only by an official employee of the relevant faculty or department in question.

3.10 Answer sheets for assessments (tests) must be kept in the faculty and final assessment answer books must be kept by the Assessment department under lock and key for security reasons.

4. PRINTING OF ASSESSMENT (TEST) QUESTION PAPERS

4.1 Only University printers, (i.e. not personal desktop printers) are used for copying of question papers. In the case of a limited number of copies, copying can also be done in a particular department or faculty. An authorised faculty or departmental employee is present during the copying of assessment question papers.

4.2 No employees other than those mentioned in this policy, may be admitted into the printing area during the printing of assessment question papers and assessment material.

4.3 The printing area has a secure lockable door displaying a notice indicating the rules of admittance for authorised employees during the printing of assessment material.

4.4 During the printing of assessment or assessment material, the faculty or department makes an appointment for the printing of assessment or assessment material. No other material is printed during this period.

4.5 For the full duration of the printing period (which is completed in one session) the designated employee from the faculty or department oversees the printing of the final assessment or assessment material.

4.6 The transportation or moving of assessment or assessment material is the responsibility of the relevant faculty or department.

4.7 The printers are instructed not to accept or hand over assessment or assessment material to students, student assistants, temporary employees or persons not identified as authorised employees. University employee cards are shown for identification purposes.

4.8 Checks are carried out after each printing session to ensure that:

    (a) no master copies were left on the machine and that all assessment or assessment question papers (the whole consignment), as well as all spoilt copies, were removed from the printing room by the employee designated

by the faculty or department;

(b)   no electronic images or memory remained on the printing machine after final assessment or assessment question papers have been printed in cases where final assessment or assessment question papers are electronically downloaded to a printing machine.

5.   PRINTING OF FINAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION PAPERS

5.1.   **The Assessment Department is responsible for copying of final assessment papers.** Only dedicated Assessment printers, (i.e. not personal desktop printers) are used for copying of question papers. An authorised Assessment employee is present during the copying of final assessment question papers.

5.2.   No employees other than those mentioned in this policy, may be admitted into the Assessment department printing area during the printing of final assessment question papers and assessment material.

5.3.   The printing area has a secure lockable door displaying a notice indicating the rules of admittance for authorised employees during the printing of final assessment material.

5.4.   For the full duration of the printing period the designated employee from the Assessment department oversees the printing of the final assessment or assessment material.

5.5.   The transportation or moving of final assessment or assessment material is the responsibility of the Assessment department.

5.6.   Checks are carried out after each printing session to ensure that:

(a)   no master copies were left on the machine and that all final assessment or assessment question papers (the whole consignment), as well as all spoilt copies, were removed from the printing room by the employee designated by the assessment department.

6.   VARIED APPEARANCE OF ASSESSMENT PAPER AND FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY BOOKS/SCRIPTS

6.1.   Use is made of assessment paper and final assessment opportunity books/scripts with different colours at the top of the cover page.

6.2.   The available colours are changed continually.

6.3.   Academic Departments decide which of the different colours to use for assessment papers, and are responsible for ordering assessment paper.

6.4.   The Assessment Department on the colours to be used for final assessment opportunity answer books. The choice may not be made known until directly before a final assessment opportunity. The Assessment Department is responsible for ordering final assessment books.

7.   TRANSPORTATION OF FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY QUESTION PAPERS

7.1.   Only with well-motivated reasons may assessment question papers for final

assessment opportunities be printed at campuses other than those where they are written. This may be done a few days before the commencement of a final assessment opportunity. In such cases, the question papers are stored and locked in a secure fire- and waterproof safe at the respective Assessment office for distribution to invigilators before a final assessment opportunity.

7.2. In instances where question papers are transferred or moved between campuses, the Assessment Officer of each campus is always present to regulate the process. If the Assessment Officer cannot be present, locked steel trunks are used to transport the papers between campuses or buildings. The Assessment Officer is the only person permitted to be in possession of the key for the locks on the trunks. The Assessment Department are in charge of arrangements regarding special summative assessment and supplementary summative assessment opportunity papers

7.3. The same security measures applicable for the safekeeping of question papers are applied on all campuses.

8. RETURN OF DOCUMENTATION AFTER FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY SESSION

After completion of final assessment opportunities, Assessment Officer locks away unused assessment books. Unused assessment answer books, together with blue venue report form and blue toilet register, are returned to the offices of the Assessment Department for safekeeping after every final assessment opportunity session. Used assessment scripts and attendance registers are kept in secure storage in the relevant departments for as long as determined by CAA Retention of Documents schedule.

9. ACCESS CONTROL

9.1. During final assessment opportunities, final assessment opportunity venues remain locked until shortly before the final assessment opportunity.

9.2. Access control is mandatory at final assessment opportunity venues. Students are required to produce their university student access cards, and exam timetable or any other electronic access control method used by the university, to gain entry to the venue.

9.3. A student's university access card, as well as his/her attendance form, remains on the desk next to him/her for the duration of the final assessment opportunity for checking purposes by Invigilators after the commencement of the final assessment opportunity.

9.4. Cases, satchels, or any other unauthorised items may be not placed at the front of the assessment venues. Permissible items include purses and penholders, as well as pocket calculators as previously determined by the lecturers of applicable modules and as indicated on the examination paper. Full-time storage facilities are available for cases, satchels and other items other than firearms on all campuses. Firearms must be left in the care of Security Services beforehand.

10. TELEPHONES IN OR AT FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY VENUES

10.1. Telephone contact is made available to invigilators in or near the final assessment opportunity venues as far as is possible.

10.2. Students' electronic devises (e.g. cell phones, tablets or smart watches) must be switched off during final assessment opportunities.

11. RULES FOR INVIGILATORS AND THE INVIGILATION OF FINAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Compliance with stipulations laid down in Appendix 3 and the following is required:

11.1. The appointment and allocation of invigilators are appropriate to class size. The ratio of invigilators to students is 1:50 or 1:30 in the case of electronic assessment. A copy of their role and responsibilities is attached as part of their contract.

11.2. Procedures are developed to ensure security and accommodate disruptions, deviations and emergencies.

11.3. Suitable venues are allocated and the admission of authorised persons only is permitted.

11.4. Permissible aids, as per assessor's instructions, e.g. type of calculator, are identified.

11.5. Procedures are developed for actions to be taken in case of irregularities.

11.6. Procedures for the identification of students, attendance registers and the reconciliation of student evidence and attendance register are developed.

12. INVIGILATION FOR FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

12.1. Assessment invigilation is a normal academic duty as described in the Conditions of Service for employees of the University of Johannesburg, i.e. paragraph D7(v) on the duties of academic employees.

12.2. Academic staff members are responsible for assessment invigilation for the whole duration of a final assessment session for the subject or module assigned to them. Faculties determine the number of occurrences or sessions an academic employee should invigilate per final assessment. Guidelines that may be considered by the faculty boards concerned are as follows:
Lecturers - determined by the HoD according to the existing need
Senior lecturers   - at least 3 sessions
Associate professors and professors   - at least 2 sessions
Head of department   - at least 1 session

12.3. A sufficient number of invigilators relative to the size of the venue is a prerequisite. The ratio of invigilators to students is 1:50, taking into account the size and shape of the assessment venue and the nature and scope of the risk. This number is determined by the head of the department (HoD) and, when applicable, in consultation with the Executive Dean concerned. The academic takes the role of Chief Invigilator and is supported by invigilators.

12.4. The ratio of invigilators to students is 1:30 for all electronic assessment opportunities. This is necessary due to the high-tech environment where the dynamics of assessment are different. The computers in the labs are placed

near to each other and specialized invigilation is necessary regarding cell phones and other electronic equipment. It would be advisable that no student satchels are allowed inside the electronic assessment venues.

12.5. Each venue must have a minimum of two invigilators of both genders at all times. The first assessor for the module in which the assessment is being conducted acts as chief invigilator. In the event of more than one campus being involved, a chief invigilator is appointed for each of the campuses.

12.6. Part-time external invigilators may be contracted if the number of invigilating sessions for Lecturers, as set out under 11.2 and 11.3, above has been used to the maximum and a need for more Invigilators exists. The HoD concerned signs the motivation if this is the case. The following applies:

    (a) The remuneration of part-time invigilators who are appointed is in accordance with the University tariff in this regard.

    (b) Employees of the University do not receive any remuneration for invigilation, irrespective of the number of invigilation sessions.

    (c) As far as possible, departments provide their own Invigilators for postgraduate assessments that entail smaller numbers of students.

    (d) Academic departments are responsible for the part-time Invigilator budget, calculated on the basis of additional needs once the conditions stipulated under 11.2 above are met.

    (e) All invigilators must undergo an invigilation training session.

12.7. Academic departments are responsible for processing remuneration claims from external assessors.

13. TRANSGRESSIONS COMMITTED DURING FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

A student commits a transgression if:

13.1. He/she commits plagiarism.

13.2. during a formal assessment opportunity, the student is in possession of any book, cell phone, computerised watch or any unauthorised electronic device that has not been switched off, memorandum, notes in whatsoever form, or any papers, documents or database equipment, except such answer books or other books, papers or documents that the invigilator has supplied or access to such other sources that the invigilator has authorised.

13.3. The student helps or attempts to help another student, or obtains help or attempts to obtain help from another student, or obtains help or attempts to obtain help from any source of information, with the exception of explicitly approved sources as permitted by the assessor.

13.4. the student helps another student to commit an offence (also considering that a student is under an obligation to take all reasonable measures to ensure that another student does not have access to her/his work).

13.5. The student has unauthorised information stored on a pocket calculator, cell phone or any other device brought into the assessment venue, whether or not he/she has had the opportunity to access such information.

13.6. The student causes a disturbance in or in the proximity of the assessment venue or conducts him-/herself in an improper or unbecoming manner.

13.7. The student disregards the instructions of invigilators or assessors.

13.8. The student poses as another student.

13.9. The student writes an assessment without official authorisation.

14. TRANSGRESSIONS OF ASSESSMENT AND FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY REGULATIONS

14.1. When a breach in assessment or final assessment opportunity regulations is suspected, the assessment paper/final assessment opportunity scripts, product or any other material or equipment that, in the opinion of the invigilator pertains to the irregularity, together with the transgression report from the student and Invigilator, including all evidence, are forwarded to the relevant Executive Dean who will, after considering the severity of the case, forward it to the Manager: Judicial Services if necessary.

14.2. In the case of online assessments, the University reserves the right to record assessment opportunities by way of digital invigilation software for purposes of use thereof in disciplinary proceedings in relation to any transgressions during assessment opportunities. Possible student transgressions will be flagged by the online invigilation software or by a trained online invigilator. Video recording will be submitted as part of the evidence of an alleged transgression.

14.3. The Executive Dean or his/her delegated authority compiles a report, which is submitted to the Executive Director: Student Affairs within ten (10) working days of the transgression. This report will be submitted, together with the original project, the s from the assessor and any other evidence relevant to the case.

14.4. A detailed description of the rules regarding assessment opportunity irregularities is distributed to students biennially before each main final assessment opportunity, both verbally and in writing, in accordance with the University's assessment procedures.

14.5. Appropriate penalties are imposed on students who are found guilty.

15. CHANGING OF ASSESSMENT AND FINAL ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITY MARKS

15.1. After being finalised, assessment and module marks are changed only with the approval of the HOD, and final assessment opportunity marks only with the approval of the Executive Dean using official electronic means and in accordance with the provisions in Appendix 2.

15.2. Changes in final assessment opportunity marks are made in accordance with the directives of Auditors. Only the Head of Faculty Administration or senior staff is authorised to download Executive Dean-approved changes on the system. Proof for the authorisation for changing marks is electronically filed on Perceptive content and kept for reference for an indefinite period.

15.3. Changes to final assessment opportunity and assessment marks are processed in the faculty responsible for the module.

---oOo---

TRANSGRESSIONS DURING WRITTEN, PRACTICAL AND ELECTRONIC SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES

1.   MANAGEMENT OF SUSPECTED TRANSGRESSIONS

The following measures apply in respect of:

1.1   Suspected Written Summative Assessment Opportunity Transgressions

1.1.1   The answer script/book is confiscated by the invigilator and the time of the transgression recorded on the script/book. A new answer script/book is issued. The time of issuing the new answer book/script being handed out is also recorded on the new script/book. No additional time is allocated to the candidate who is only permitted to continue writing for the remainder of the scheduled time.

1.1.2   The candidate proceeds with answering the remaining questions in the new script/book.

1.1.3   A transgression report describing the incident must be prepared immediately after the event by the invigilator as well as the student if the student so wishes. (The student is asked to make an immediate declaration thereby preventing additional time to fabricate a 'story'.) The student must be informed that he/she has the right not to make a declaration and that the incident will be reported to the Head of Department and Executive Dean of the Faculty/College concerned.

1.1.4   All original evidence and documentary proof is confiscated and the nature of the evidence recorded on the incident report. These are submitted to the relevant Head of Faculty Administration who refers it to the Executive Dean concerned who, in consultation with the relevant Head of Department and after ascertaining that a prima facie case has been made to which the candidate must answer, refers all relevant documentation to the Executive Director: Student Affairs, within ten (10) working days, for further action.

1.1.5   Should the evidence referred to under 1.1.4 be of such a nature that makes confiscation difficult, for instance, written notes on body parts or clothing, the invigilator involved writes a detailed report describing the evidence and asks the candidate to remove all traces of the notes etc. before resuming the assessment opportunity. Should the chief invigilator or one of the other invigilators be in a position to corroborate the report of the invigilator involved by submitting a report, the credibility of the evidence is increased.

1.1.6   Should the suspected offence involve an electronic device, the invigilator consults the assessor before responding to the offence.

1.2   Suspected Practical Summative Assessment Opportunity Transgressions

1.2.1 The Academic Staff member responsible for the assessment or evaluation refers the case to the relevant Head of Department and Executive Dean by

means of a memorandum which describes the case in detail. After considering the case, the Executive Dean compiles a report which is submitted to the Executive Director: Student Affairs within ten (10) working days of the transgression. This report must be submitted, together with the original project, the memorandum from the assessor and any other evidence relevant to the case.

1.3   Suspected Electronically Submitted Summative Assessment Opportunity Transgressions

1.3.1   Transgressions in this category include all forms of plagiarism as described in the applicable policy against plagiarism, that is, all suspected acts of failing to acknowledge the ideas, writings, works or inventions of others, or to present the ideas, writings, works or inventions of others as one's own.

1.3.2   Search engines and anti-plagiarism software may be used in the detection of suspected transgressions in this category.

1.3.3   The Academic Staff member responsible for the assessment or evaluation refers the case to the relevant Head of Department and Executive Dean by means of a memorandum which describes the case in detail. After considering the case, the Executive Dean compiles a report which is submitted to the Executive Director: Student Affairs within ten (10) working days of the transgression. This report must be submitted, together with the original project, the memorandum from the assessor and any other evidence relevant to the case.

2.   MANAGEMENT OF ALLEGED TRANSGRESSIONS

The following procedures apply for alleged written, practical and electronically submitted summative assessments:

2.1   The Student Disciplinary Committee investigates the alleged transgression and finds the candidate guilty or not guilty. If found guilty, the candidate is sentenced and a penalty imposed.

2.2   While the disciplinary case is pending the candidate's answers, project or material submitted electronically for the assessment opportunity may not be evaluated. Therefore no results in the relevant module, project or material submitted electronically for the assessment opportunity are available. The investigation and sentencing must be completed as soon as possible in order that continuation of further studies is not jeopardised.

2.3   Should the candidate be found not guilty, the answer script, project or material submitted electronically for the assessment opportunity must be evaluated immediately and the results published.

2.4   Should the candidate be found guilty, the Manager of the Student Judicial Services enters all relevant data regarding the transgression on the computer system and blocks the candidate from further studies for the period imposed as described in the penalty.

2.5   In the event of an expulsion, suspended sentence or a warning being imposed as a result of a guilty verdict, the information is placed on the ITS system and displayed on the candidate's academic record.

2.6   In the event that a candidate is found guilty and a subject, module or project

is cancelled, the outcome is sent to the Head: Faculty Administration of the Faculty/College concerned and the subject, module or project is cancelled on the computer system. The reason for cancellation is shown as "for disciplinary purposes".

2.7 The Manager of the Student Judicial Services also forwards a copy of the memorandum reflecting the verdict and penalty of the guilty candidate to the relevant Executive Dean of the Faculty and to the scanning section of the Application/Biographic Department to be scanned into the relevant student's records.

2.8 A list of all blocked candidates is electronically forwarded to Central Academic Administration where the Senior Manager: Assessments forwards this information to all other major Universities in South Africa.

2.9 Other Universities also send lists of their blocked candidates to the Senior Manager: Assessments who in turn enters this information into the University's computer system.