



Assessment Policy for UCT 2024

Policy Title	Assessment Policy for UCT
First Policy Approved	2004 (PC09/2004); 2015 (PC08/2015)
Latest Policy Approved	2024 (PC02/2024)
Policy Approved by	Senate, after review and submission by the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee
Latest Policy Review by	University Capacity Development Grant Project 10 Team and the Assessment Framework Working Group
Review changes	Substantial changes made Minor changes made
Review cycle	5 Years Revision for approval by 30 Jun 2028
Policy Owner	Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning
Policy implementation monitoring	Senate Teaching and Learning Committee, on behalf of Senate Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, on behalf of Faculty Boards
Enquiries	Chair of Senate and Teaching and Learning Committee
Scope	The Assessment Policy for UCT applies to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All institutional, faculty, departmental, programme, and course level assessment systems and practices at undergraduate and postgraduate level. • All students, staff, and others who are responsible for assessment. • All statutes, rules, and guidelines that have a bearing on assessment, irrespective of delivery mode.
Related Policies, Guidelines and Procedures	Vision 2030 Curriculum Change Framework (2018) University of Cape Town Teaching and Learning Charter (2017) UCT Online Education Policy (update in progress) Disability Policy (2021)

	<p>Examinations Policy and Procedures Manual (2019) Language Policy 2023 (forthcoming) Programme Review Framework (in development) Course evaluation guidelines / policy (in development) Recognition of Prior Learning Policy (2016) Student Mental Health Policy (2018) Deferred Examinations Rules (Handbook 3) and Guidelines (updated biannually) Academic Misconduct Policy (in development) Graduate Attributes (in development)</p>
--	---

Assessment Policy for UCT 2024

Preamble and Context

This assessment policy has been developed in the context of a new vision within the University's strategic plan. UCT's Vision 2030 sets out Excellence, Transformation and Sustainability as the three key pillars of the academic project. This policy aims to provide a framework to enable the conditions to achieve this vision through assessment. To this end, the policy presents seven foundational principles. In operationalising these principles, it is important that **faculties relate these principles** to their own disciplinary contexts.

Three main points of departure serve as the foundation for this policy:

1. Assessment as an educational practice.

This policy recognises assessment as an integral component of the curriculum and a means to project what we value. The success of students is at the heart of achieving excellence in teaching and learning but success must mean more than the ability to navigate exams. For UCT, success is not only indicated quantitatively through pass rates and throughputs, but also qualitatively through the roles that our students and graduates play in contributing towards the public good as outlined in Vision 2030.

This policy assumes that educationally, assessment embodies both an ethos and a tool. As an ethos, the policy acknowledges that assessment can enable the conditions to positively foster learning and practices that powerfully shape learning - what is learned; why it is learned; how it is learned and what learning enables. This policy sets out the strategic intent to steer the UCT community towards embracing models of assessment that foreground an ongoing process of gathering and interpreting information about student learning both by staff and the students themselves. Timely [formative assessment](#), along with feedback that empowers students to identify areas for improvement and refine their learning strategies, is a key element of assessment practice. It enhances the learning process by affording students the opportunity to cultivate valued knowledge, skills, attitudes and competences associated with the discipline.

Educational practice that responds dynamically to information about student learning also facilitates informed decisions about what and how to teach to support students' learning towards the achievement of the [learning outcomes](#). By embracing an ethos that promotes and supports student learning as a goal of assessment equal in importance to decision-making, we seek to foster a [growth mindset](#) and encourage staff and students to view assessments as opportunities for self-reflection and continuous improvement.

As a **tool**, this policy understands that assessment can be used to gauge and measure both the depth of student learning but also the effectiveness of teaching. [Summative assessments](#) are used to judge students' achievements for the purposes of, for example, admission, progression and certification. Such assessments and the powerful - often negative - impacts they can have on student learning and wellness must be seen as a component rather than a goal of an [assessment system](#).

2. Assessment as a social practice.

[The Curriculum Change Framework](#) (2018) made explicit that assessment practices can inadvertently perpetuate disparities and foregrounded the need to view assessment as a social practice. Embracing assessment as a social practice highlights the imperative to practice assessment in ways that are sensitive to the social, cultural, economic and political contexts in which it is used. This is essential to creating a supportive educational climate for transformation and to advance social justice and equity in higher education. While assessment practices can inadvertently perpetuate disparities, they can also be harnessed to dismantle barriers and empower our diverse student population. This policy supports a commitment to designing assessments that are culturally sensitive, unbiased, equally accessible to all students and that allow all students to perform to their full potential, irrespective of their backgrounds. The policy endorses assessment design that critically interrogates the challenges posed by inappropriate assessment-related barriers to success, where academic performance inordinately reflects persistent historical disadvantages and systemic inequalities and implements measures to mitigate their impact. Not only does the policy endorse practices that are flexible, diverse and inclusive but also practices that can contribute towards producing a more equitable, just and sustainable social order. This policy thus provides the grounds for teaching staff to reflect on and critique the underlying values of their assessment practices; and serves as an invitation to students to engage in the conversation about assessment.

3. Assessment design must transcend individual [assessment events](#).

Course, programme and graduate outcomes need to be multifaceted if they are to be aligned with the complex societal issues our graduates must engage with. Individual assessment events cannot meaningfully represent achievement of these outcomes. This requires a shift towards the design of [assessment systems](#) that consider the interconnectedness of [learning outcomes](#) across courses within programmes. By focusing on systems of assessment, we aim to capture the richness of student learning experiences and promote a holistic understanding of their achievements.

While it is desirable to assess course outcomes as comprehensively as possible, the design of assessment systems also creates a combined and cumulative assessment load on students. That load is relative to the credit load that curriculum design mandates for courses and the time period over which those courses are run. Overly ambitious assessment design combined with timetabling resulting from a truncated academic year and unrealistic credit loads can yield over-assessment and unrealistic assessment loads for students to deal with, with resultant perverse assessment effects on students.

To achieve both meaningful assessment of programme and institutional outcomes and ensure that just enough and not too much assessment is undertaken, this policy encourages collaborative curriculum design and assessment alignment, fostering a coherent educational journey.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this policy is to provide a framework for assessment practices that would enable conditions for the UCT community to unleash human potential to create a fair and just society. The policy aims to do this by fostering

- a collective understanding of what constitutes sound assessment practice;
- a positive climate and culture of assessment - at institutional, programme, departmental and course level - that is engaging and productive from a student perspective, and that supports students' success and well-being;
- assessment practices that optimally reflect student achievement of outcomes and that, as far as possible, do not mask performance levels and inappropriately hinder academic progress, but rather provide valid, reliable, fair and transparent evidence of learning;
- assessment practices that promote desirable learning effects of assessment and limit undesirable assessment effects, such as surface approaches to learning and mental health issues;
- assessment practices that are not focused on individual [assessment events](#) but rather organised into coherent [systems of assessment](#) that optimally balance promotion of academic growth with sound decision-making

For UCT to thrive and be sustainable, it is important to foster curricula that are able to adapt and respond to the changes and challenges of contemporary society. This policy provides the space and permission for teaching staff to be bold and innovative with methods and systems of assessment that respond to both the needs of their disciplines as well as emerging and changing modes of teaching across the continuum of in-person, [blended](#) and fully online learning.

Principles of Assessment

To this end, this policy advocates intentional design of assessment that is underlined by seven interrelated principles:

- 1) Assessments should have their purpose clearly communicated
- 2) Assessments should promote and support student learning
- 3) Assessment decisions should be [valid](#)
- 4) Assessments should be [reliable](#)
- 5) Assessments should be [fair](#)
- 6) Assessment should be [feasible](#)
- 7) Assessment [integrity](#) should be assured

It is accepted that these principles **cannot all be achieved equally** with any single [assessment event](#). The design of assessment events should strive to **achieve an informed compromise** between principles. Collectively, however, the design of [systems of assessment](#) should strive to achieve an optimal balance between how different principles are honoured. The criteria outlined below serve to support the application of the principles.

Principle 1: Assessments should have their purpose clearly communicated

To apply the principle of *purpose*, there is need to consider:

- **Purpose:** As a social practice that is concerned with judgement, assessment can serve various purposes for various stakeholders. Intentional design of assessment starts with a consideration of what the assessment will be used for. Is the purpose of the assessment for identifying knowledge and skills in order to make informed decisions and take action ([diagnostic assessment](#)); for developmental purposes to support students' learning ([formative assessment](#)); for the purpose of making judgements about students' achievements relative to goals and standards ([summative assessment](#)); or will assessment also be used to inform judgements about the quality of a course or programme for purposes of, for example, programme accreditation and departmental review. It is important to consider purpose in relation to course, programme and graduate outcomes.
- **Transparency:** Assessment information must be clearly communicated. It must be made clear why students are being assessed, what the marks will be used for, who is assessing, when will students be assessed, what methods will be used to assess, what criteria will be used to assess, how the final mark is derived, and appropriate appeal mechanisms.

Principle 2: Assessments should promote and support student learning

To apply the principle of *supporting student learning*, there is need to consider the following:

- **Feedback:** Assessment tasks should generate information that is useful to students. This is a key element of [formative assessment](#). Assessments should, where feasible, be accompanied by feedback that is: 1) timely and 2) relevant and 3) constructive. That is, feedback must be presented to students while it still matters - in time to further learning, and/or receive assistance, or allow for revision. In addition, feedback provided must be relevant to the task, on learning and actions under the student's control and not on the student themselves and their characteristics. The spectrum of ways in which feedback is seen and used in different cultures should inform feedback design. Feedback framed as respectful dialogue can contribute to humanising assessment practice.
- **Peer and self-assessment:** Students can be encouraged to be active in and take responsibility for their learning by providing opportunities for them to evaluate their own and their peers' work, including assessment of work by teams and individuals; and providing students with the opportunity to contribute to the development of assessment tasks.
- **Time:** Assessments should be designed so that: 1) time and effort are evenly distributed and 2) there is sufficient time between assessments. Sufficient time must be allocated between assessment tasks so that students are prepared to receive and act upon feedback. The workload of assessment across courses should be feasible for students to navigate. Following the principle of collaborative curriculum design, cognisance should be taken during planning of the clustering of in-course assessment deadlines across courses. Where a course follows [continuous assessment](#), provision can be made for submission deadlines during university exams.
- **Balance between purposes:** an appropriate balance of multiple purposes of assessment ([diagnostic](#), [formative](#), [summative](#)) should also be encouraged to

provide a multi-layered understanding of student learning and effectiveness of teaching.

- **Consequences and interventions:** There should be mechanisms in place to monitor intended and unintended consequences resulting from assessment design and implementation. When an unintended consequence is detected, appropriate interventions must be devised to remedy the situation.

Principle 3: Assessment decisions should be [valid](#)

To apply the principle of *validity* and ensure that judgements based on assessments - both in terms of interpretation and use - are justifiable and proportionate, there is a need to consider the following:

- **[Alignment](#):** It is important to ensure that decisions based on assessment data are justified. There must be alignment among institutional, programme and course objectives/aims, the teaching activities (teaching methods and materials), and the assessment practices (methods, criteria, feedback). This may include institutional or profession level graduate attributes.
- **Appropriate methods:** The range of assessment methods that are used should be selected based on being educationally appropriate for the different [learning outcomes](#) being assessed.
- **Diverse methods:** Assessment methods should be used to enable students to express their knowledge and skills in different ways. This supports an inclusive approach to assessment by preventing students from being disadvantaged by the extensive use of particular assessment formats.
- **[Authenticity](#):** Where possible and appropriate to the discipline, assessment design should incorporate tasks that assess students' ability to effectively apply their knowledge or skills in response to tasks that reflect realistic demands and what a practitioner might do.
- **Incorporate social values:** Current notions of authenticity encompass social values, rather than a focus solely on tasks that have economic value. Assessment design should not only benefit individual students, but also the larger society they are part of. In other words, designing assessments to contribute to greater *social justice*.
- **Cultural and linguistic differences:** These should not negatively influence assessment data and assessment decisions. Where appropriate and feasible, provision should be made to have assessments administered and completed in a language other than English.
- **Legitimacy:** Those who are being assessed, those doing the assessing and those who rely on decisions based on the assessment data should perceive the assessment to be an appropriate and worthwhile exercise.
- **Proportionality:** The quantity and quality of assessment data that a decision is based on should be proportionate to the stakes associated with that decision.

Principle 4: Assessments should be [reliable](#)

To apply the principle of *reliability*, there is the need to consider:

- **Consistent design:** There should be consistency in assessment design over time. Whether a student passes or fails should not be a function of variability in expectations from one year to the next. To ensure consistency across time, courses should specify how assessment is designed and administered in the format of an

assessment planning matrix (also known as an assessment blueprint or specification).

- **Consistent marking:** There should be consistency in marking student performance. This includes consistency from an individual marker (e.g., between Friday morning and Saturday night), consistency among multiple markers in the same course, consistency within a department and faculty, and consistency among external examiners.
- **Uniform application of assessment criteria:** Grading should reflect the degree of achievement of the outcomes being assessed and not extraneous factors that could disadvantage particular groups of students.

Principle 5: Assessments should be [fair](#)

To apply the principle of *fairness*, there is need to consider the following:

- **Biases:** Precautions must be taken to minimize conscious and unconscious discrimination for or against students on the basis of race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, language, religion or any other characteristic. In the design of assessments, it is important that assessments are suitably understood and interpreted by all students. Regular engagements with students to identify potential or real bias should form part of continuous quality [improvement of assessment](#) practice and can help mitigate the power differential inherent in assessment that can vary across subgroups of students. Where elements of conscious and unconscious discrimination for or against students is found to be present, reasonable and timeous action should be taken to address the identified issue.
- **Sensitivity and respect:** All aspects of the assessment process should be in keeping with the values of the institution as well as the fostering of an environment where everyone feels included and respected.
- **Access to resources:** Assessment should not obscure student performance or perpetuate inequality in performance of different subgroups of students by virtue of the process of or materials required for assessment, or access to learning opportunities that varies across subgroups of students.
- **Practice:** All students should have adequate exposure to and practice with assessment methods or task types, so as to prepare them for [high stakes](#) or final assessment. This will ensure that subgroups of students are not disadvantaged by lack of experience with the course's required assessment methods.
- **Accommodation:** Reasonable accommodations should be made for students who, for reasons beyond their control, are unable to undertake assessment as scheduled e.g., deferred examinations, or who experience particular challenges with a specific assessment task and require accommodations like extra time, alternate formats e.g., oral or assistive technology. Where appropriate, staff and students can consult the Disability Service. This could be for a permanent or temporary set of circumstances.

Principle 6: Assessments should be [feasible](#)

To apply the principle of *feasibility*, when designing or redesigning and implementing assessments, it is important to consider whether the assessments can be delivered in a way that is achievable and practical for all involved. These include the availability of institutional level infrastructure and systems; all types of resources required to implement assessments for the department or course; the cumulative workload of assessment across courses for any given student; resource and cost implications for students to complete assessments, and

logistics in terms of administration and marking requirements; external examining; and processing and ratification of examination marks

Principle 7: Assessment [integrity](#) should be assured

To apply the principle of *integrity*, there is need to consider:

- **[Academic integrity](#)**: Ensuring that the process or product offered for assessment meets the criteria stipulated for that assessment is crucial for valid decision-making. Steps should be taken to promote a culture of integrity and assessment practices that promote integrity. When required, collaboration should be stipulated. The challenges posed by [generative artificial intelligence](#) require thoughtful and creative responses in assessment design. Appropriate mechanisms should be in place to ensure that assessment tasks that should be unseen, do not leak. [Academic misconduct](#) can undermine the learning process and even compromise the credibility of the institution. The nature of and responses to academic misconduct are outlined in a separate Academic Misconduct Policy.
- **[Data security](#)**: It is important to ensure that necessary procedures and systems are in place to ensure the integrity of assessment data and prevent unauthorised access to and editing of that data. This holds for course and departmental procedures and systems as well as institution-level procedures and systems.

Roles and Responsibilities in the Operationalisation of this Policy

The Institution	
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC): Teaching and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● policy owner - accountable for implementation of policy ● ensure adequate resourcing to implement the policy
Senate Teaching and Learning Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● monitor and evaluate policy implementation on behalf of Senate ● ensure that the Examinations Policy and Procedures Manual reflects the philosophy, principles and intent of the policy ● provide guidance on appointment, probationary and performance criteria related to assessment ● provide guidance to the DVC: Teaching and Learning on resourcing required to implement the policy ● provide guidance to faculties on assessment expertise required to implement this policy ● periodic revision and approval of the assessment policy in line with institutional policy development guidelines ● take steps to ensure that assessments procedures are carried out by way of appropriate subcommittees (e.g. Examination and Assessment Committee).
Registrar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● run examinations at UCT by way of the Examinations Office ● implement the Examinations Policy and Procedures Manual ● maintain institutional systems for examination data ● make the policy available to the university community e.g., university website and governance intranet
Faculty Examinations Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● quality assurance of examination processes and data ● ratify assessment decisions about students on behalf of Senate
Deferred Examinations Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● operationalise requirement for accommodations of various sorts on behalf of Senate
Human Resources (HR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● manage and apply appointment and probation criteria ● ensure that probationary and performance criteria related to assessment are incorporated into the relevant processes
Institutional Planning Department (IPD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ensure during departmental programme and institutional reviews that assessment practice aligns with the philosophy, principles and intent of the policy ● ensure that the university's policy, processes and strategies with regard to assessment comply with the national policy requirements

Supporting Bodies	
Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide guidance and support with implementation of the policy • provide professional development opportunities to extend and support assessment practice aligned with the philosophy, principles and intent of the policy • provide guidance to the Senate Teaching and Learning Committee about the assessment expertise appropriate to different roles e.g., tutors, course convenor, programme convenor, head of department
ICTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish and maintaining the necessary technological infrastructure to enable assessment as envisaged by the policy
Disability Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • process applications for and manage operationalisation of accommodations on the basis of disability
Departmental, Faculty and Central Management	
Deans / Deputy Deans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that procedures are in place to ensure that people have or acquire assessment expertise commensurate with their roles e.g., tutors, course convenor, programme convenor, head of department • ensure appropriate resourcing for support of the implementation of the policy • review external examiner reports on examinations and responses to those reports
Academic Planning Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that planning of courses and programmes is aligned with the philosophy, principles and intent of the policy
Faculty Teaching and Learning or Assessment Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • devise and implement faculty level policy and/or guidelines (as appropriate to the faculty) to support operationalisation of this policy in contextually relevant ways • monitor and evaluate policy implementation on behalf of Faculty Board
Heads of Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • responsible for assessment practice and competence commensurate with roles of all assessors in the department • appropriate resourcing of assessment including tutors, administration • review student feedback on assessment and the response of course conveners to feedback

Departmental, Faculty and Central Management (ctd...)	
Programme Convenors and Programme committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ensure practice of assessment in the courses in the programme reflects the philosophy, principles and intent of the policy ● monitor assessment timetabling and assessment load on students, including clustering of assessment deadlines across courses, especially where a programme includes courses from different faculties ● monitor intended and unintended consequences resulting from assessment; and devise appropriate interventions to remedy the situation as appropriate ● review and respond to feedback on students' assessment experience ● review the response of course convenors to feedback
Course convenors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ensure own competence in assessment ● practice assessment in alignment with the philosophy, principles and intent of the policy ● ensure external examining is undertaken as appropriate ● oversight and quality assurance of assessment in course, including monitoring for intended and unintended consequences resulting from assessment; and devise appropriate interventions to remedy the situation as appropriate ● ensure appropriate competence and briefing of teaching staff and tutors/teaching assistants ● respond to feedback on students' assessment experience ● feed responses to feedback on assessment back to students and up to programme committees and heads of department
Tutors/teaching assistants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● apply guidelines for assessment in course ● ensure familiarity with assessment tasks and instruments ● ensure familiarity with assessment procedures like feedback
Teaching Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● apply guidelines for assessment in course ● ensure familiarity with assessment tasks and instruments ● ensure familiarity with assessment procedures like feedback
Faculty and / or Departmental Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ensure that assessment administration reflects the principles of this policy, particularly integrity in the handling of data at course and faculty level

Students

Individual students	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● ensure familiarity with the rules and regulations about assessment for the university in general and each course they take● exercise integrity in what is submitted for assessment● utilise available and appropriate channels timeously to raise issues being experienced with assessment, including class representatives, student feedback
Class representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● respond to feedback from students about assessment issues and raise these in good time with course conveners
Student Representative Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● ensure familiarity with the rules and regulations about assessment for the university in general and each course they take● bring problematic trends in relation to assessment to the attention of the relevant persons

Glossary

Academic Misconduct:

Academic misconduct includes any behaviour which achieves or tries to achieve, or helps others in achieving or trying to achieve an unfair academic advantage. There are multiple kinds of academic misconduct including plagiarism, cheating, collusion, possessing unauthorised materials during examination, and fabrication of data.

Accommodations:

Approved adjustments that are made to assessment administration or scoring for students who for reasons beyond their control are unable to undertake an assessment as scheduled or in the format used.

Alignment:

Alignment of assessment, teaching and learning involves a process where all of the key elements (assessment of learning, learning objectives, and anticipated skills, knowledge, and/or dispositions) of instruction interact and also support learning outcomes.

Assessment Event:

A single point at which student learning is appraised.

Assessment for Improvement:

This is when assessment activities are designed to have the results feed directly, and preferably, immediately, into the revision of the course, programme or institution with the intention of student learning being improved. Data from formative and summative assessments can be used as a means to direct the kinds of improvements that are made.

Assessment System:

This refers to the group of structures, practices, policies, and tools that are used for generating and using information on student learning.

Assessor:

Any person who designs implements and marks assessments, records the results, offers feedback to the students and takes decisions based on assessment

Authenticity:

Assessments are authentic if they are realistic, need judgement and innovation, require students to “enact” the subject, assess their ability to effectively use their knowledge and skills to complete a complex task, mirror contexts which evaluate adults (e.g., workplaces, civic life), and offer opportunities to practise, consult resources, receive feedback and improve performance.

Blended Learning:

A blended approach to education uses a combination of online and in-person teaching and learning modes and methods. Blended learning incorporates content, assessment and the interactions (exchanges, discussions, etc.) between students and staff and amongst students themselves. Other terms used for types of blended learning are ‘hybrid’, ‘hyflex’ and ‘flipped classroom’.

Continuous Assessment:

A model of assessment that foregrounds an ongoing process of gathering and interpreting information about student learning, in order to make informed decisions about what and how to teach and to make judgements about students’ learning progress, so as to provide adequate support in achieving learning objectives; and enable students to manage their own learning more actively

Diagnostic Assessment:

Assessment for *diagnostic* purposes identifies students' strengths and weaknesses for purposes of, for example, recognition of prior learning, selection, admission, and placement.

Fairness:

Assessment that is fair considers the characteristics and needs of students, as well as any reasonable adjustments that need to be made to take account of them. Ideally, assessment should solely differentiate between students based on the skill or ability that is being assessed.

Feasible:

This describes assessment that is practicable in terms of resources, time, staff and student numbers.

Formative Assessment:

Assessment for *formative* purposes serves primarily to enhance the learning process by giving students the opportunity to develop the valued knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the discipline. Crucial to the success of assessment for this purpose is feedback which forms the basis of improvement.

Generative Artificial Intelligence:

This describes algorithms (e.g., ChatGPT) that are able to be used to generate new content such as text, images, code, simulations, videos, and audio.

Growth Mindset:

This kind of mindset reflects the belief that one can develop their talents and skills through working hard, relying on the right strategies, and using guidance from others.

Integrity:

Academic integrity is the commitment to six fundamental values: fairness, honesty, trust, respect, courage and responsibility.

Learning Outcomes:

These are statements that outline the learning that students will or have achieved and can demonstrate reliably. They can include skills, knowledge, and dispositions and are more specific than goals.

Reliability:

The consistency of the results of assessment.

Security:

This includes the measures taken to secure assessment against attempts to cheat, and for detecting any cheating.

Stakes of Assessment:

Student perceptions of the scope of consequences that could accrue from an assessment event or system.

Student:

Includes all full-time or part-time registered students at any level of study at UCT.

Staff:

Any person other than an independent contractor who works for the University, and who receives, or is entitled to receive, any remuneration; and in any manner assists in carrying on or conducting the business of the employer.

Summative Assessment:

Assessment for *summative* purposes serves to inform judgements about students' achievements for purposes of, for example, promotion and certification.

Valid:

The soundness (or trustworthiness) of assessment interpretations and the uses of these interpretations in decision-making. Validity is concerned with the extent to which the assessment measures what it is intended to measure.