

University of the Western Cape			
 UNIVERSITY of the WESTERN CAPE	ASSESSMENT AND MODERATION POLICY	Council Approval Reference	C2026/02 (24 June 2026)
		Implementation Date	25 June 2026
		Revision / Amendment Number	n/a
		Policies Repealed	Assessment Policy (C2021/05) Moderation Policy (C2017/02)
		Policy Owner	APU – DVC: Academic
		Executive Management Portfolio	DVC: Academic
		Contributors	SAP, SAC, SEC, Senate
		Circulated by:	APU – DVC: Academic
		Circulated to:	Faculties

UWC ASSESSMENT AND MODERATION POLICY

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1	Introduction	3
2	Purpose of the Policy	4
3	Scope	5
4	Definitions	5
5	Policy statement	6
6	Policy Provisions	6
7	Policy Control	11
7.1.	Roles and responsibilities	11
7.2.	Implementation	13
7.3.	Monitoring	13
7.4.	Reporting	13
7.5.	Action in the case on non-compliance	14
7.6.	Publication and Dissemination	14
7.7.	Review	14
8.	Supporting Documents / Annexures	15
8.1.	Annexure 1: Related Legislation, Policies and Guiding Documents	15
8.2.	Annexure 2: Glossary of Terms	16

1. Introduction

The University of the Western Cape (UWC) affirms assessment and moderation as foundational academic practices central to the quality, credibility, and integrity of learning and teaching. This Policy positions assessment and moderation not as procedural requirements, but as core pedagogical activities that actively shape curriculum design, teaching practice, and student learning.

1.1. National Higher Education Policy and Regulatory Context

This policy is located within, and aligned to, the National Higher Education Policy and Regulatory Framework governing assessment, quality assurance, and academic standards in South Africa. This framework establishes the legal, ethical, and quality imperatives that inform institutional assessment and moderation practices and underpins public confidence in the integrity of higher education qualifications.

At a national level, higher education is regulated by the Higher Education Act, 1997 (as amended), which requires public universities to ensure the credibility, integrity, and comparability of qualifications and assessment processes. Within this legislative context, assessment and moderation function as key mechanisms through which academic standards are established, maintained, and publicly assured.

The Policy is further aligned with the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Act, 2008, and the associated NQF Level Descriptors, which articulate expected levels of learning complexity, cognitive demand, and graduate attributes across qualification types and levels. Assessment practices at UWC are therefore required to be appropriate to the relevant NQF level, generate valid and sufficient evidence of learning achievement, and support progression, articulation, and the recognition of prior learning.

Quality assurance expectations articulated by the Council on Higher Education (CHE), particularly through the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC), provide an additional regulatory layer. CHE frameworks for institutional audits, programme accreditation, and quality reviews emphasise coherent assessment design, transparent criteria, systematic internal and external moderation, and the use of assessment evidence for continuous improvement. This Policy responds directly to these requirements by embedding moderation within assessment governance, academic accountability, and quality enhancement processes.

Where applicable, the Policy also recognises the requirements of professional, statutory, and regulatory bodies in professionally accredited programmes, provided that such requirements are consistent with national policy, the HEQSF, and UWC's academic values.

UWC recognises assessment and moderation as scholarly, ethical, and developmental practices within the national policy framework. These practices uphold public trust in its qualifications, ensure fairness and consistency for students, and contribute to the ongoing enhancement of teaching and learning.

1.2. UWC Institutional Policy Context

The Assessment and Moderation Policy is grounded in the strategic priorities articulated in the Institutional Operating Plan (IOP) 2026–2030, which positions learning and teaching as central to the University's developmental mission and public purpose. Within this framework, assessment and moderation are recognised as key mechanisms for advancing responsive pedagogies, curriculum renewal, epistemic access, and student success.

The Policy is aligned with, and complements, UWC's broader institutional policy framework, including policies governing learning and teaching, the Higher Education Practice Standards (HEPS), and approved modes of

provisioning. Together, these policies shape the design, delivery, resourcing, and quality assurance of academic programmes. In this context, assessment and moderation are integral to ensuring curriculum coherence, appropriate workload allocation, sustainable provisioning, and the comparability of academic standards across different delivery modes.

Consistent with the IOP's emphasis on continuous engagement with assessment and moderation practices, this Policy conceptualises assessment as a core pedagogical activity. It informs teaching, supports student learning, and provides valid evidence for academic judgement. The Policy gives effect to this strategic intent by embedding assessment and moderation within the learning and teaching cycle, curriculum design, delivery, and review processes across all programmes (including contact, blended, and online provision).

Aligned with UWC's commitment to curriculum transformation and responsive learning and teaching, the Policy foregrounds formative assessment and feedback to enhance student engagement, agency, and progression, while ensuring rigorous and defensible summative judgement. Moderation is reframed as a continuous, collaborative, and reflective practice that supports shared academic responsibility and strengthens the integrity, fairness, and comparability of assessment decisions across faculties, departments, and modes of provisioning.

The IOP further underscores the importance of robust operational systems and evidence-based quality assurance processes to uphold curriculum integrity and institutional accountability. In response, this Policy articulates clear principles, roles, and responsibilities for assessment and moderation, while deliberately devolving implementation to faculties and departments within an institution-wide framework. This decentralised approach enables disciplinary and contextual responsiveness while ensuring alignment with institutional standards, resource frameworks, and strategic priorities.

This Policy must be read and implemented in conjunction with the applicable national legislation, quality assurance frameworks, and institutional policies governing assessment, moderation, and academic standards in higher education, as amended from time to time (**see Annexure 1**).

2. Purpose of the Policy

The purpose of the policy is to provide a coherent, institution-wide framework that guides the design, implementation, and continuous improvement of assessment and moderation practices across all faculties, programmes, and modules. It aims to:

- 2.1. Enhance Learning and Teaching** – Promote assessment as an integral part of learning, fostering critical thinking, reflection, student agency, and meaningful engagement with knowledge.
- 2.2. Support Academic Quality and Integrity** – Ensure fair, consistent, and defensible academic judgement, aligned with national and professional regulatory standards, and grounded in ethical and scholarly practice.
- 2.3. Embed Continuous and Collaborative Moderation** – Shift moderation from a traditional end-point compliance exercise to a reflective, ongoing process that accompanies students' learning throughout the curriculum.
- 2.4. Strengthen Curriculum Coherence and Renewal** – Guide curriculum development and review by ensuring assessment practices are aligned with learning outcomes, graduate attributes, and responsive pedagogies.
- 2.5. Foster Shared Accountability** – Establish clear roles and responsibilities for academic and professional staff, cultivating a culture of reflection, collaboration, and collective responsibility for quality assurance.

Through these objectives, the Policy supports UWC's commitment to producing graduates who are critically, ethically, and socially engaged, while upholding public trust in the credibility and quality of its qualifications.

3. Scope

This Policy applies to all assessment and moderation practices at UWC, across all faculties, programmes, modules, and learning activities, regardless of delivery mode, site, or assessment type. Specifically, the Policy covers:

- 3.1. All undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications, modules, co-curricular learning, and continuing education offerings (credit-bearing or not) delivered via contact, blended, hybrid, HyFlex, or online modes;
- 3.2. All registered students across levels, sites, and approved pathways;
- 3.3. All assessment forms and conditions generating evidence of learning, including formative and summative, individual or group, on- or off-campus, and workplace- or community-based assessments;
- 3.4. All academic and professional staff, external examiners, moderators, and accredited personnel involved in assessment and quality assurance.

Faculties and departments must interpret and operationalise the policy through discipline-specific rules and guidelines aligned with institutional governance. It is to be applied alongside the UWC General Calendar and relevant statutes, policies, and frameworks.

4. Definitions

For the purposes of this policy, the following definitions articulate the manner in which UWC conceptualises assessment and moderation, in alignment with national policy and contemporary higher education practice. These definitions are to be read together with **Annexure 2: Glossary of Terms**, which forms an integral part of this policy.

4.1 Assessment

At UWC, assessment is a systematic process of collecting, analysing, and interpreting evidence of student learning to inform decisions that enhance teaching, support student learning, and ensure the quality and credibility of academic outcomes. It encompasses both formative and summative dimensions, using evidence not only to certify achievement but also to improve learning, guide instructional practice, and strengthen curriculum design.

4.2 Moderation

At UWC, moderation is a systematic, evidence-informed process of reviewing and verifying assessment judgements to ensure that decisions about student achievement are consistent, fair, and aligned with agreed standards. It encompasses activities throughout the assessment lifecycle (including design, marking, and review) and supports shared understanding of criteria, standards, and quality among academic staff. Moderation practices conducted throughout the assessment process can result in purposes identified as equity, justification, accountability and community building.

All other terms used in this Policy are defined in **Annexure 2: Glossary of Terms**. In the event of ambiguity, the definitions contained in Annexure 2 shall apply.

5. Policy statement

The Policy promotes a balanced approach encompassing assessment of learning, assessment for learning, and assessment as learning, fostering student engagement, progression, and agency, alongside continuous, collaborative, and reflective moderation. Implementation is devolved to faculties and departments within an institution-wide framework that aligns with national legislation, quality assurance standards, and UWC's strategic priorities. Through these practices, UWC maintains robust academic standards, supports responsive and transformative teaching, and develops graduates who are critically, ethically, and socially engaged.

6. Policy Provisions

All assessment and moderation rules, procedures, and practices at UWC must be implemented in accordance with the provisions set out below and applied consistently across faculties, departments, and modes of provision.

6.1 Purpose of Assessment

Assessment at UWC is primarily aimed at facilitating student learning and developing graduates equipped for lifelong learning. Within the learning and teaching cycle, assessment serves multiple, inter-connected purposes: diagnosing students' prior knowledge and learning needs (Diagnostic Assessment); supporting learning through formative feedback and engagement with assessment criteria (Formative Assessment/ Assessment *for* Learning); making summative judgements for progression, certification, selection, or placement (Assessment *of* Learning / Summative Assessment); fostering students' self-evaluative capacity and sustained learning practices (Assessment *as* Learning); and providing evidence to evaluate the quality of modules, programmes, and teaching practices. Academic staff are responsible for ensuring that the purpose of each assessment is explicit, aligned with approved learning outcomes, and clearly communicated to students. A single assessment activity may legitimately serve multiple purposes.

6.2. Principles of Assessment

Assessment at UWC should inspire confidence in its results among all stakeholders, including faculties, departments, lecturers, students, academic support units, and employers. Trustworthy assessment relies on principles such as reliability, validity, and fairness, which underpin the quality and usefulness of assessment data. Lecturers are responsible for understanding and applying these principles to support meaningful learning and ensure students achieve their intended outcomes. While this framework provides guidance, academic staff must interpret and apply these principles in contextually appropriate, equitable, and pedagogically sound ways aligned with the University's transformative mission. Principles should be applied holistically, collectively promoting academic integrity, meaningful learning, and the development of graduates capable of critical and constructive engagement in society. Assessment effectiveness is judged by adherence to these principles. The full set of assessment and moderation principles relevant to UWC is provided in **Annexure 2: Glossary of Terms**.

Note: All principles below are to be applied in the design, implementation, and evaluation of assessment activities.

6.2.1 Reliability

- Assessment methods, conditions, marking criteria, and judgements should be reliable and appropriate for the intended learning outcomes.
- A range and combination of assessment methods should be used to enhance overall reliability.
- Consistency in marking through moderation, calibration, and shared criteria should be maintained when multiple assessors are involved.

6.2.2 Validity

- Programmes and modules should be designed to allow all students to demonstrate intended learning outcomes, including discipline-specific and graduate attributes.
- Assessment tasks, criteria, and opportunities should be aligned with learning outcomes, teaching activities, and cognitive complexity.
- Assessment should reflect the depth, content, and epistemic demands of the learning outcomes.
- Assessment methods should be selected and combined to support diverse ways of knowing, epistemic access, and student success.
- Assessment tasks should be sequenced and weighted to enable valid and equitable judgements.
- Internal and external benchmarks should be applied, and review practices periodically to maintain defensible academic standards.

6.2.3 Fairness and Equity

- Equitable opportunities should be provided for all students. Socio-economic, cultural, and educational diversity should be accommodated.
- Reasonable accommodations and support mechanisms for students with specific needs should be implemented.
- Inclusion, equity, and equal opportunities should be promoted throughout assessment practices.

6.2.4 Differentiation

- Distinction should be made between varying levels of student understanding and mastery.
- Outcomes should reflect authentic achievement, free from bias or unfair advantage.
- The full spectrum of student competence and engagement should be captured.

6.2.5 Cognitive Complexity

- Tasks should be designed across a spectrum of intellectual demand, from recall and understanding to analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and creation.
- Factual, conceptual, and procedural knowledge should be integrated according to the learning outcomes.
- Cognitive demand should be aligned with the level and nature of the programme or module.

6.2.6 Balance and Workload

- Workload, sequencing, and complexity should be aligned with students' learning progression.

- Assessment design should support institutional goals, programme outcomes, and graduate attributes.
- Diverse and sequenced tasks should be used to measure learning holistically.

6.2.7 Meaningfulness and Purpose

- Assessment tasks should be aligned with programme outcomes and graduate attributes.
- Learning, reflection, and knowledge integration should be enhanced.
- Competencies applicable to academic, professional, and societal contexts should be developed.

6.2.8 Transferability and Application

- Students should be able to apply knowledge and skills across novel, professional, or real-world contexts.
- Adaptability, problem-solving, and contextual application of learning should be fostered.

6.2.9 Feasibility

- Assessment methods must be practical, sustainable, and resource-efficient.
- There should be a balance between educational value, time, cost, and administrative feasibility.
- Scalability, technology integration, and workload should be considered without compromising rigour.

6.2.10 Accountability

- Assessment decisions should be documented and justified.
- Continuous improvement, student learning, and academic integrity should be supported.
- Roles, responsibilities, and decision-making should be clearly defined and consistently applied.

6.2.11 Transparency

- Assessment processes, criteria, and expectations should be explicit and transparent.
- Marking, feedback, and grading procedures must be clear and defensible.
- Equity, trust, and self-regulated learning should be promoted while preserving creativity and autonomy.

6.2.12 Authenticity of Evidence

- Tasks should reflect students' own work and real-world application.
- Relevant professional, societal, or disciplinary contexts should be simulated.
- Higher-order thinking, reflection, and decision-making is essential.
- Learning and assessment should be integrated to enable mutual reinforcement.
- Collaboration should be structured authentically, where appropriate.
- The student should be allowed choice and judgement in task completion.
- Complex, open-ended tasks that elicit original and diverse responses, should be designed.

6.2.13 Academic Integrity

- Expectations and consequences for misconduct should be clearly communicated.
- Tasks should be designed to ensure authenticity and prevent dishonesty.
- Ethical guidelines for the use of generative AI and other external tools should be applied.
- UWC academic integrity policies and procedures should be consistently applied.

6.3. Purpose of Moderation

Moderation is a purposeful, evidence-based process at UWC aimed at improving the quality of assessment, which in turn strengthens learning and teaching. It ensures that assessment tasks, criteria, marking, and outcomes are fair, consistent, defensible, and aligned with programme and institutional learning outcomes.

Moderation is not a post-hoc compliance exercise, but an integral, continuous component of the assessment, learning, and teaching cycle. Moderators play a key role in reviewing the decisions of assessors, ensuring that judgements are aligned with the principles of assessment (i.e. validity, reliability, fairness, and authenticity) and that grades awarded are defensible and evidence-based.

6.4 Principles of Moderation

Moderation at UWC is guided by principles designed to enhance assessment quality, strengthen learning, and improve teaching practice. Internal and external moderators at UWC are required to interpret and apply these principles as active, evidence-based mechanisms for enhancing assessment quality. Moderation is not simply a procedural or compliance exercise; it is a critical pedagogical tool that strengthens learning and teaching.

6.4.1 Equity and Fairness

Moderators must ensure that all assessment tasks and grading decisions provide students with a fair opportunity to demonstrate learning and that judgements are consistent across markers and cohorts.

- Assessment tasks should allow all students to achieve intended outcomes. This should be assessed and verified.
- Marking should be reviewed to ensure consistency and comparability across markers and student groups.
- Any inadvertent advantage or disadvantage in assessment or marking should be identified and addressed.

6.4.2 Justification of Academic Judgements

Moderators must assess and verify that grading decisions are credible, defensible, and aligned with institutional and programme standards.

- It should be confirmed that student grades reflect achievement against the stated criteria.
- Moderation on substantive evaluation, should not solely be based on statistical measures or normative distributions.
- Feedback should be provided to the assessors to improve the alignment of judgement with assessment standards.

6.4.3 Accountability and Transparency

Moderators must document and communicate moderation processes and outcomes to ensure compliance with institutional and external standards, and support continuous improvement.

- Clear records should be kept of moderation activities, decisions, and justifications.
- Outcomes should be reported to support programme improvement and institutional quality assurance.
- Moderation should provide stakeholders with confidence in the integrity of the assessment and grading processes.

6.4.4 Community Building and Professional Learning

Moderators must use the moderation process to foster collaboration, shared understanding of standards, and professional development among academic staff.

Moderators, whether internal or external, must therefore apply these principles holistically: reviewing assessor decisions; engaging in constructive dialogue; and using evidence from student work to guide judgements. In doing so, moderation fulfills its primary purpose i. e. to improve the quality of assessment, which in turn enhances student learning and teaching effectiveness across the University.

6.5. Assessment and Moderation Within the Learning and Teaching Cycle

Moderation is embedded throughout the assessment, learning, and teaching cycle. Its purpose is not only to ensure fairness and consistency, but to improve the quality of assessment and strengthen learning and teaching. Moderators actively review the decisions of assessors to ensure alignment with institutional standards and assessment principles.

6.5.1. Pre-Assessment (Design & Planning)

- Moderators review assessment tasks, criteria, and rubrics for alignment with programme outcomes and fairness.
- They ensure that assessment tasks allow all students to demonstrate intended learning.
- Exemplars and peer discussion should be used to calibrate expectations and enhance consistency.
- **Impact:** Improves validity, clarity, and fairness, and informs teaching strategies to support learning.

6.5.2. During Assessment (Marking & Consensus)

- Moderators review and, where necessary, adjust assessor decisions through second marking or consensus moderation.
- They facilitate discussions on grading and evidence to align judgement with standards.
- **Impact:** Enhances accuracy and credibility of grades, ensuring that assessment reflects student achievement.

6.5.3. Post-Assessment (Review & External Moderation)

- Moderators should analyse grade distributions and engage external reviewers to verify standards.
- They should provide feedback to refine assessment design and teaching practice.

- **Impact:** Supports continuous improvement of assessment and learning quality.

6.5.4. Professional Development & Calibration

- Moderation should be used as a collaborative professional learning activity through discussion of exemplars and calibration of standards.
- It enhances assessment literacy and pedagogical expertise among academic staff.
- **Impact:** Builds shared understanding, improves teaching quality, and supports high-quality student learning outcomes.

7. Policy Control

7.1. Roles and Responsibilities in Assessment and Moderation

Effective assessment and moderation at UWC rely on clearly defined roles, delegated authority, and accountability across all levels of the institution. All role players contribute to enhancing the quality of assessment and moderation, promoting fairness, strengthening learning, and improving teaching practice.

7.1.1. Students

Students are active participants in the assessment process. Their responsibilities include:

- 7.1.1.1. Engaging purposefully with learning and assessment activities.
- 7.1.1.2. Understanding the requirements for assessments and demonstrating achievement of module and programme outcomes.
- 7.1.1.3. Participating fully in assessment planning and reflection.
- 7.1.1.4. Providing feedback to lecturers and coordinators to support improvement of assessment design and implementation.

Note: Students contribute indirectly to moderation by ensuring that their work provides evidence of learning that can be reliably assessed and moderated.

7.1.2 Lecturers

Lecturers are the primary assessors of student achievement. Their responsibilities include:

- 7.1.2.1. Applying the UWC assessment policy and principles in designing, conducting, and marking assessments.
- 7.1.2.2. Providing clear information on assessments and learning expectations to students.
- 7.1.2.3. Engaging in professional development to strengthen assessment literacy.
- 7.1.2.4. Responding constructively to moderation feedback to improve alignment of assessments with intended outcomes.

Note: Moderation evaluates lecturers' assessment decisions to ensure fairness, validity, and alignment with institutional standards.

7.1.3 Heads of Department (HOD) / Programme Coordinators

HODs ensure compliance with assessment and moderation policies at the departmental level.

Responsibilities include:

- 7.1.3.1. Monitoring assessment and moderation practices to ensure credibility, consistency, and

transparency.

7.1.3.2. Supporting lecturers in applying assessment and moderation principles effectively.

7.1.3.3. Identifying and addressing deviations from policy, including potential inequities or misalignment with outcomes.

7.1.3.4. Ensuring staff receive adequate training and support in assessment and moderation.

Note: HODs facilitate the assessment and moderation processes as a quality enhancement mechanism across the department.

7.1.4 Module Coordinators

Module coordinators oversee assessment at the module level. Responsibilities include:

7.1.4.1. Ensuring that assessment methods, criteria, and tasks align with programme outcomes and professional standards.

7.1.4.2. Leading internal moderation reviews and acting on feedback to improve assessment quality.

7.1.4.3. Monitoring that assessments provide sufficient evidence for fair and accurate judgements.

7.1.5 Year Coordinators

Year coordinators ensure coherence of assessment across a student cohort. Responsibilities include:

7.1.5.1. Monitoring student progress and providing feedback.

7.1.5.2. Coordinating assessment schedules with module coordinators.

7.1.5.3. Ensuring compliance with university and faculty assessment rules.

7.1.6 Internal Moderators

Internal moderators are faculty-based individuals who review and verify lecturer assessment decisions.

Responsibilities include:

7.1.6.1. Planning and preparing moderation activities aligned with the principles of moderation.

7.1.6.2. Assessing whether marks and feedback are fair, consistent, and aligned with criteria and standards.

7.1.6.3. Providing constructive feedback to lecturers, module coordinators, and HODs.

7.1.6.4. Documenting moderation activities in line with the assessment and moderation framework.

7.1.7. External Moderators

External moderators perform the same functions as internal moderators but bring an independent perspective from outside the faculty or institution. Responsibilities include:

7.1.7.1. Validating fairness, consistency, and alignment of assessments with programme and professional standards.

7.1.7.2. Supporting the development of professional communities of practice and the calibration of academic standards across institutions.

7.1.8. Faculty

7.1.8.1. Faculty Assessment Committees

7.1.8.1.1. Oversee policy implementation and ensure sound assessment and moderation practices.

7.1.8.1.2. Coordinate and interpret assessment and moderation policy in the faculty context.

7.1.8.1.3. Develop faculty-specific assessment and moderation strategies, procedures, and staff training.

7.1.8.1.4. Monitor compliance with professional and regulatory requirements.

7.1.8.2 Dean/ Deputy Dean (Learning and Teaching)

7.1.8.2.1. Is accountable for implementation of assessment and moderation at the faculty level.

7.1.8.2.2 Ensures effective distribution of assessment information, adherence to standards, and management of internal moderation processes.

7.1.8.2.3 Oversees records, reporting, interventions, and appeals procedures.

7.2 Implementation

7.2.1 Faculty-Level Implementation

Each faculty, through its Faculty Assessment Committee, must develop Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines that interpret and operationalise this Policy in accordance with institutional requirements and disciplinary contexts.

7.2.2 Approval and Institutional Support

Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines must be submitted to the Senate Assessment Committee for approval prior to implementation. The Academic Planning Unit provides institutional guidance, capacity development, and implementation support.

7.2.3 Institutional Oversight

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Academic, the Registrar, and Faculty Assessment Committees are jointly responsible for overseeing the implementation of this Policy and approved Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines.

7.3 Monitoring

7.3.1 Monitoring of Compliance

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Academic is responsible for monitoring compliance with this Policy and approved Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines through institutional review, audit, and consultative mechanisms.

7.3.2 Policy Stewardship

The Director of the Academic Planning Unit coordinates the development, revision, approval, and communication of assessment and moderation policies and guidelines.

7.3.3 Continuous Quality Enhancement

Assessment and moderation processes at UWC are fully embedded within the learning and teaching cycle and form an integral component of the University's integrated quality assurance framework. These processes are systematically aligned with faculty-level quality committees and institutional governance structures responsible for quality assurance. Through coordinated monitoring, evaluation, and reporting mechanisms, the system ensures effective feedback loops across all levels of the institution, thereby promoting consistency, regulatory compliance, and ongoing enhancement of assessment and moderation practices.

7.4 Reporting

7.4.1 Faculty Reporting

Faculties must submit annual reports on assessment and moderation practices and outcomes as part of institutional quality assurance processes.

7.4.2 Institutional Reporting

Faculty-level assessment and moderation reports are submitted to the relevant Faculty structures and consolidated for institutional oversight. These consolidated reports are first reviewed by the Senate

Assessment Committee (SAC) for quality assurance, standardisation, and institutional monitoring. SAC then provides a summary report and makes recommendations to Senate. Senate holds ultimate institutional oversight responsibility for assessment and moderation processes and ensures that findings are actioned through the relevant governance and quality assurance structures.

7.4.3 Feedback and Communication

Key findings and recommendations are communicated to relevant stakeholders to support shared accountability and professional learning.

7.5 Action in Cases of Non-Compliance

7.5.1 Remedial Action

Instances of non-compliance with this Policy or approved Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines are addressed through appropriate remedial measures, including targeted support, capacity development, and formal institutional intervention where necessary.

7.6 Publication and Dissemination

7.6.1 Policy Release

This Policy and all approved Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines are published on the University website and disseminated through established institutional communication channels.

7.7 Review

7.7.1 Review Cycle

This Policy and associated Faculty Assessment and Moderation Guidelines are reviewed at least every five years, or earlier where required, to ensure alignment with institutional strategy, national legislation, and quality assurance requirements.

8. Supporting Documents / Annexures

8.1. Annexure 1: Related Legislation, Policies and Guiding Documents

National Legislative and Regulatory Framework

This policy is informed by and aligned with the following national legislation, policies, and quality assurance instruments:

- Higher Education Act 101 of 1997
- National Qualifications Framework Act 67 of 2008
- Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). *White Paper for Post-School Education and Training* (2013)
- DHET. *Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework (HEQSF)* (2013), as amended
- South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). *Level Descriptors for the South African Qualifications Framework* (2012)
- SAQA. *National Guide for Designing and Implementing Assessment for NQF Qualifications, Part-Qualifications and Professional Designations* (2014)
- SAQA. *National Policy and Criteria for Credit Accumulation and Transfer* (2014)
- Council on Higher Education (CHE). *Criteria for Programme Accreditation* (2004), as amended
- CHE. *Policies on the Recognition of Prior Learning, Credit Accumulation and Transfer, and Assessment in Higher Education* (2016)
- CHE. *Improving Teaching and Learning Resource No. 5: The Assessment of Student Learning* (2006)
- CHE. *Quality Assurance Guidelines for Remote Teaching, Learning and Assessment* (2020)
- Applicable policies, standards and accreditation requirements of professional bodies governing professional qualifications

Institutional Policy Framework (UWC)

At institutional level, this policy must be read in conjunction with the following University of the Western Cape policies, frameworks and regulatory documents:

- UWC Institutional Operating Plan (IOP) 2026–2030
- UWC Teaching and Learning Strategy and Graduate Attributes
- UWC Framework for Student Retention and Success
- UWC Flexible Teaching and Learning Policy (2021)
- UWC Policy on the Moderation of Assessment, including the roles and responsibilities of internal assessors and external moderators
- Academic Rules relating to Assessment as set out in the UWC General Calendar (Section 3)
- Student Disciplinary Rules as set out in the UWC General Calendar (Section 4)
- UWC Plagiarism Policy
- UWC Policies and Guidelines for Experiential Learning and Work-Integrated Learning
- UWC Policies on Master's and Doctoral Degrees
- UWC Quality Criteria for the Internal Review of Academic Programmes
- UWC Policy for the Development and Approval of Academic Programmes

8.2. Annexure 2: Glossary of Terms

The terms set out below apply to this Policy and must be interpreted consistently with the National Higher Education policy and UWC institutional frameworks.

Term	Meaning
Accountability	Ensures that assessments are transparent, credible, and ethically grounded, serving as a foundation for all other assessment principles. It integrates the collective responsibility of academics, institutions, and students to uphold rigorous, fair, and purposeful assessment practices.
Academic Integrity	Encompasses honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage in academic pursuits. It involves giving credit, providing facts, engaging ethically, and upholding university policies on academic misconduct.
Alignment	The deliberate coherence between learning outcomes, curriculum content, teaching strategies, and assessment tasks to ensure that students are assessed on what they are intended to learn.
Alternate assessment	Variations of assessment formats and processes designed to support diverse learners and enable demonstration of learning in multiple ways.
Analytic rubric	An assessment tool that evaluates distinct components of a task separately, with individual scores combined to produce an overall mark.
Applied competence	The integrated demonstration of foundational knowledge, practical skills, and reflexive judgement applied ethically and effectively in authentic, real-world contexts relevant to a qualification or part-qualification.
Artificial Intelligence (AI)	A branch of computer science enabling machines to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, including pattern recognition, decision-making, automation, and, in educational contexts, personalised learning and assessment support.
Authentic assessment	Assessment that requires students to apply knowledge and skills to complex, real-world, or simulated tasks.
Authenticity of evidence	Ensures that student submissions genuinely reflect their own knowledge, skills, and competencies, maintaining academic integrity and credibility, while addressing challenges posed by generative AI tools.
Baseline assessment	Assessment conducted at the start of a learning period to determine students' prior knowledge, skills, or readiness.
Balance	Ensures equilibrium between task demands and student capacity, proportionally aligning assessments with institutional goals, learning outcomes, and diverse assessment criteria.
Benchmark	A measurable reference point or standard used to compare levels of achievement nationally or internationally.
Cognitive complexity	Refers to the deliberate design of tasks requiring students to engage with content at varied levels of intellectual demand, from foundational recall to advanced synthesis and evaluation.
Competency	The demonstrated ability to perform tasks effectively and independently within a defined academic or professional context.
Content-based assessment	Assessment focused on discrete knowledge or isolated skills rather than integrated understanding or application.
Continuous assessment	An ongoing process of collecting evidence of student performance over time using multiple assessment opportunities and methods.

Council on Higher Education (CHE)	The statutory body responsible for quality assurance and oversight of higher education in South Africa, including the HEQSF.
Criterion-referenced assessment	Assessment in which student performance is judged against defined criteria or standards rather than against the performance of other students.
Curriculum	A coherent framework of learning experiences, content, teaching approaches, and assessment strategies designed to enable achievement of learning outcomes.
Diagnostic assessment	Assessment conducted prior to instruction to identify strengths, gaps, or learning needs for targeted support.
Discrimination	The ability of an assessment to differentiate effectively between students based on levels of understanding and mastery of the subject matter, ensuring fair and equitable evaluation.
Examiner	An individual responsible for setting, administering, and overseeing formal assessments to ensure validity, reliability, and fairness.
Exit level module	A capstone module positioned at the highest level of a qualification, integrating and synthesising programme learning.
Exit level outcomes	Statements describing the knowledge, skills, and attributes students are expected to demonstrate upon completion of a qualification.
Fairness	The principle that assessment provides equitable opportunities for all students to demonstrate achievement without bias or undue disadvantage.
Feasibility in terms of cost and time efficiency	Ensures assessment tasks balance educational value with practicality, minimising unnecessary resource expenditure and maximising efficiency while maintaining validity and reliability.
Feedback	Information provided to students about their performance to guide improvement and learning.
Feed-forward	Guidance provided to students to support future learning and improved performance.
Formative assessment	Assessment conducted during learning to monitor progress, provide feedback, and inform teaching and learning decisions.
Foundation competence	Understanding of the knowledge and thinking that underpin actions and performance.
Generalisability and transferability	Assessment should evaluate and support students' ability to apply knowledge, skills, and competencies across diverse contexts.
Generative AI	Artificial intelligence systems capable of producing new content such as text, images, or audio, with implications for learning and assessment integrity.
Holistic rubric	An assessment tool that evaluates a task as a whole rather than scoring individual components separately.
Informal formative assessment	Ongoing, non-formal assessment embedded in everyday teaching activities, often involving immediate feedback.
Internal moderation	A peer-review process within the institution to ensure consistency, validity, and fairness of assessment practices and judgements.
Large Language Models (LLMs)	Advanced AI systems trained on extensive datasets to perform language-related tasks.
Learner-centred learning	An approach that places students' needs, experiences, and agency at the centre of teaching, learning, and assessment.
Learning	A transformative process resulting in sustained changes in knowledge, skills, understanding, values, or behaviour.
Learning outcomes	Clear, measurable statements of what students are expected to know, understand, and be able to do upon completion of learning activities.

Learning programme	A structured and coherent set of learning experiences leading to a qualification or part-qualification.
Level descriptor	A general statement describing typical learning achievements at a specific level of the qualification's framework.
Moderation	A quality assurance process that verifies assessment design, implementation, and outcomes to ensure alignment with standards and consistency of judgement.
Module Coordinator	An academic responsible for the academic integrity, coherence, and assessment of an individual module.
NQF level	A classification indicating the complexity and depth of learning associated with a qualification on the National Qualifications Framework.
Peer assessment	Assessment in which students evaluate the work of peers using agreed criteria.
Performance-based assessment	Assessment requiring demonstration of knowledge and skills through practical or authentic tasks.
Practical competence	The demonstrated ability to perform tasks effectively in authentic contexts.
Professional body	An organisation representing practitioners in a profession, which may set standards relevant to programme accreditation and assessment.
Programme	A structured set of learning activities leading to the award of a qualification.
Programme Coordinator	An academic responsible for oversight of programme coherence, assessment alignment, and academic administration.
Qualification	A formally recognised and NQF-registered certification of learning achievement awarded by a higher education institution.
Quality assurance	Processes that ensure academic offerings meet defined standards and enable achievement of intended learning outcomes.
Reliability	The extent to which assessment results are consistent across assessors, occasions, and contexts.
Rubric	A structured scoring guide outlining criteria and performance levels used to evaluate student work.
Scaffolding	Structured academic support provided to students to assist progressive development of competence.
Self-assessment	Assessment in which students evaluate their own work against established criteria.
Self-directed learning	Learning in which students take responsibility for planning, monitoring, and evaluating their own learning.
Standards	Agreed norms or benchmarks that define expected levels of achievement and quality.
Summative assessment	Assessment conducted to make judgements about achievement at defined points in a learning programme, often for certification or progression.
Transparency	Refers to making the processes, criteria, and expectations explicit and accessible to all stakeholders, fostering trust, accountability, and fairness.
Validity	The extent to which assessment measures what it is intended to measure and supports meaningful interpretation of results.