NAMIBIA UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Department of Human Capital

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT POLICY

GOAL SETTING

PLANNING AND ALIGNMENT

ONGOING PERFORMANCE

FEEDBACK AND DEVELOPMENT

RECOGNITION AND REWARD



PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT POLICY

Human Capital Department

Policy Number	1/P/4/6	
Policy Custodian	*Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Human Capital and Student Services*	
Contact Person and Contact Details	*Ms Riette Duvenhage rduvenhage@nust.na*	
Status	*Approved*	
Legal Scrutiny	*Chief Legal Adviser*	
Date Recommended by Senate to Council	*20 July 2026*	
Date of Approval by Council	*07 August 2026*	
Effective Date	*07 August 2026*	
Date of Review	*Every 5 years or when deemed necessary*	
Related Policies and Other Documents (Internal and External)	**External**	**Internal**
	Namibian Constitution (Articles 10, 18 and 95)	*NUST Act, 2015 (Act No. 7 of 2015)*
	Namibia University of Science and Technology, Act No. 7 of 2015	*NUST Statutes and Regulations*
	Labour Act, No. 11 of 2007	*Integrated Strategic Business Plan (ISBP) 2026–2030*
	Affirmative Action (Employment), Act No. 29 of 1998	*Policy on Policy Development and Review*
	Public Enterprises Governance, Act No. 1 of 2019)	*Conditions of Service and applicable collective agreements*
	Higher Education Act, 2003 (Act No. 26 of 2003);	*Academic Promotion and Career Pathing Framework*
	ILO Convention No. 111: Discrimination (Employment and Occupation), 1958	*Learning and Development Framework*
	ILO Convention No. 100: Equal Remuneration, 1951	*Disciplinary Code and Grievance Procedure*
	UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	*Conflict of Interest Policy*
		Anti-Corruption Policy
		Community Engagement Policy
		Delegation of Decision-Making Authority Framework
		Performance Management Guidelines (accompanying this Policy)
		NUST Act, 2015 (Act No. 7 of 2015)

Version Control and Change History			
Version	*Date Approved/ Recommended*	*Approved/ Recommended by*	*Amendment/New Policy*
1	20 July 2026	Senate	Amendment
1	07 August 2026	Council	Amendment

AUTHENTICATION

Vice-Chancellor's Signature: _____ _____Date: _____08/10/2026____

Registrar's Signature: _____ Date: ____17/09/2026_____

University Seal



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PREAMBLE 4
1.1 Purpose 4
1.2 Background 4
1.3 Objectives 4
2. SCOPE OF APPLICATION 5
3. POLICY STATEMENT 5
4. LEGAL FRAMEWORK 6
4.1 National legislation 6
4.2 International instruments 7
5. PRINCIPLES GUIDING PRACTICES AT NUST 7
6. POLICY CONTEXT 8
7. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK 8
7.1 The performance cycle 8
7.2 Performance agreements 9
7.3 Continuous feedback and coaching 10
7.4 Mid-year review 10
7.5 Annual assessment and rating 10
7.6 Moderation and calibration 11
7.7 Outcomes: recognition, reward and development 11
7.8 Managing underperformance 11
7.9 Probation and confirmation 12
7.10 Reviews of supervisors and upward feedback 12
7.11 Appeals and disputes 13
7.12 Records, confidentiality and systems 13
7.13 Capability, monitoring and compliance 13
8. STRUCTURES GOVERNING THE POLICY 14
9. IMPLEMENTATION 14
9.1 Roles and Responsibilities 14
9.2 Support and Advice 15
9.3 Communication 15
9.4 Non-compliance 15
10. COMMENTS 16
11. REVIEW 16
ANNEXURE A: BENCHMARKING REPORT 17
A.1 African universities 17
A.2 International universities 17
A.3 Cross-cutting findings 18

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Abbreviation	Meaning
DVC: HCSS	Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Human Capital and Student Services
DVC: TL	Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Teaching and Learning
HC	Human Capital
HoD	Head of Department
ISBP	Integrated Strategic Business Plan
KPI	Key Performance Indicator

Acronym	Meaning
EXCO	Executive Committee of Management
ILO	International Labour Organisation
NUST	Namibia University of Science and Technology
PIP	Performance Improvement Plan
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound

DEFINITIONS

Term	Definition
Annual Performance Assessment	The formal, documented end-of-cycle assessment of a staff member's performance against the performance agreement, resulting in a rating on the approved rating scale.
Balanced Scorecard	The University's strategy-execution instrument that cascades institutional objectives to portfolio, faculty, departmental and individual level.
Continuous Feedback	Regular, documented, two-way performance conversations between a staff member and their supervisor, held throughout the cycle and distinct from the formal mid-year and annual reviews.
Fixed-Term Staff Member	A staff member employed on a contract for a stated period, as distinct from permanent or continuing employment.
Key Performance Indicator	A measurable value that demonstrates progress against an agreed objective, meeting the University's KPI Quality Test as set out in the ISBP.
Mid-Year Review	The formal, documented review of progress against the performance agreement conducted at the midpoint of the performance cycle.
Moderation	The structured process by which assessment ratings are reviewed across a faculty, department or institution to ensure consistency, fairness and the integrity of rating distributions before outcomes are confirmed.
Performance Agreement	The written agreement concluded between a staff member and their supervisor at the start of each performance cycle, recording the objectives, key performance indicators, standards, behavioural expectations and development plan for the cycle.
Performance Cycle	The twelve-month period, aligned to the University's financial year, over which performance is planned, monitored, reviewed and assessed under this Policy.
Performance Improvement Plan	A structured, time-bound plan of support, development and monitoring agreed where a staff member's performance does not meet the requirements of the role.
Performance Management	The continuous, integrated process of planning, monitoring, reviewing, assessing, developing, recognising and improving the performance of staff members so that individual contributions advance the University's strategic objectives.
Probation	The initial period of employment during which a new staff member's suitability for confirmation is assessed under the applicable conditions of service.
Staff Member	Any person employed by the University, whether academic or professional/support, permanent or fixed-term, full-time or part-time.

Supervisor	The person to whom a staff member reports and who is accountable for managing that staff member's performance, including a Line Manager, Head of Department, Director or Dean.
Task Performance	The effectiveness with which an employee executes the core duties and responsibilities of their job. It involves the quality, accuracy, timeliness, and efficiency of work outputs directly linked to the individual's job description and organisational objectives.
Underperformance	Performance assessed as not meeting the agreed objectives and standards of the role, established through the processes of this Policy and not through unverified impression.

1. PREAMBLE

The Namibia University of Science and Technology exists to deliver excellent teaching, research, innovation and service to society. That mission is carried by its people. Performance management is the discipline through which the University translates its Integrated Strategic Business Plan into individual objectives, supports every staff member to meet them, recognises those who excel, and addresses underperformance fairly and early. This Policy replaces informal and uneven appraisal practice with a single, transparent framework applied to all staff.

1.1 Purpose

This Policy establishes a uniform, fair and development-oriented performance management framework for all University staff. It defines the annual performance cycle, the instruments used at each stage, the link between individual performance and institutional strategy, the consequences of performance outcomes, and the safeguards that protect staff against arbitrary or inconsistent assessment.

1.2 Background

The ISBP 2026–2030 commits the University, under Strategic Objective 4.2 (Performance Culture), to implement and institutionalise a high-performance and recognition-driven culture, supported by a Performance Management System to be implemented and trained across the University in 2026–2027 under the leadership of the DVC: HCSS and the Human Capital Directorate.

The University's monitoring and evaluation architecture cascades institutional performance through the Balanced Scorecard: Council reviews the Governance Oversight Scorecard biannually; the Vice-Chancellor's scorecard is reviewed monthly; portfolio, faculty and unit scorecards are reviewed monthly and quarterly. Individual performance management is the final link in this chain, connecting each staff member's work to a scorecard objective.

Benchmarking against leading African and international universities (Annexure A) shows that mature institutions treat performance management as a continuous developmental conversation anchored in written agreements, formal mid-cycle and annual reviews, moderated ratings, explicit links to reward, promotion and probation, and structured support where performance falls short. This Policy incorporates those lessons as substantive clauses.

1.3 Objectives

The objectives of this policy are to enable the University to:

1.3.1 Align individual objectives with the ISBP, portfolio and unit scorecards, so that every staff member knows how their work contributes to institutional strategy.

1.3.2 Ensure that every staff member has a written performance agreement, receives continuous feedback, and is formally reviewed at mid-year and at the end of each cycle.

1.3.3 Provide a consistent, moderated and evidence-based rating system that is applied fairly across academic and professional/support staff.

1.3.4 Link performance outcomes to recognition, reward, development, promotion readiness, probation confirmation and, where necessary, structured performance improvement.

1.3.5 Build supervisory capability so that performance conversations are competent, honest and developmental.

1.3.6 Ensure procedural fairness consistent with the Labour Act, 2007 in every process that may affect a staff member's employment, remuneration or career progression.

2. SCOPE OF APPLICATION

This Policy applies to:

2.1 All staff members of the University, academic and professional/support, at all levels including executive management.

2.2 Permanent staff members and fixed-term staff members employed for twelve months or longer participate in the full annual performance cycle set out in Section 7.

2.3 Fixed-term staff members employed for less than twelve months conclude a performance agreement at the commencement of the contract, and the supervisor conducts a documented performance review no later than two weeks before the expiry of the contract. Such reviews inform any decision on renewal or reappointment.

2.4 Staff members on probation are managed under the probation provisions of the applicable conditions of service; performance objectives set at appointment and probation review outcomes transition into the annual performance cycle upon confirmation, in accordance with clause 7.9.

2.5 Part-time and hourly-paid staff enter proportionate performance arrangements determined by the supervisor in consultation with the Human Capital Directorate, consistent with the principles of this Policy.

2.6 Where a staff member holds a joint, seconded or acting appointment, the performance agreement records the objectives of each role, and the supervisor of the substantive post coordinates a single consolidated assessment.

2.7 This Policy governs the management of performance. Misconduct is dealt with under the Disciplinary Code, and nothing in this Policy limits the University's disciplinary authority; clause 7.8.7 governs the boundary between the two processes.

3. POLICY STATEMENT

The University requires this Policy because sustained institutional performance is impossible without managed individual performance. NUST commits itself to a performance management system that is

universal (every staff member, every year), aligned (every objective traceable to the ISBP through the Balanced Scorecard), developmental (feedback and growth before sanction), fair (written agreements, evidence-based assessment, moderation, representation and appeal), and consequential (outcomes genuinely inform recognition, reward, development, promotion readiness, probation confirmation and the management of underperformance). Performance management at NUST is a management responsibility, not an administrative form-filling exercise: supervisors are accountable for conducting it, and their own performance is assessed partly on how well they do so.

4. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

This policy is underpinned by the following legislation:

4.1 National legislation

4.1.1 The Namibian Constitution underpins this Policy: Article 10 guarantees equality and freedom from discrimination, requiring that performance assessment be applied without discrimination; Article 18 requires administrative bodies to act fairly and reasonably, informing the procedural-fairness safeguards of this Policy; and Article 95 commits the State to policies promoting the welfare of the people, including fair labour practices.

4.1.2 The NUST Act, 2015 (Act No. 7 of 2015) establishes the University and empowers the Council to appoint staff and determine their conditions of service. Performance management is exercised under that employment authority, and this Policy gives effect to Council's duty to ensure the effective and efficient administration of the University.

4.1.3 The Labour Act, 2007 (Act No. 11 of 2007) governs the employment relationship. In particular, dismissal for poor work performance is lawful only where there is a valid and fair reason and a fair procedure. The performance improvement provisions of this Policy (clause 7.8) are designed to satisfy those requirements: clear standards communicated in advance, an opportunity and support to improve, a reasonable time, representation, and a documented process before any employment consequence is contemplated.

4.1.4 The Affirmative Action (Employment) Act, 1998 (Act No. 29 of 1998) requires that employment practices, including assessment, development and advancement, support equitable representation. Performance data shall be monitored for adverse impact on designated groups.

4.1.5 The Archives Act, 1992 (Act No. 12 of 1992) governs the creation, retention and disposal of performance records, which are official University records managed under the NUST File Plan.

4.1.6 The Public Enterprises Governance Act, 2019 (Act No. 1 of 2019) sets governance and accountability standards applicable to public entities, including performance agreements and reporting disciplines at the governance level; the ISBP's monitoring framework is expressly aligned to it. Its precise application to NUST is subject to written confirmation by the Chief Legal Advisor.

4.2 International instruments

4.2.1 Namibia is a member State of the International Labour Organization. ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination (Employment and Occupation), 1958, ratified by Namibia, obliges the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment, including terms, conditions, and advancement; performance assessment, reward, and improvement processes under this Policy shall be free of discrimination on any prohibited ground.

4.2.2 ILO Convention No. 100 on Equal Remuneration, 1951, ratified by Namibia, requires equal remuneration for work of equal value; where performance outcomes affect remuneration, the assessment and moderation processes of this Policy safeguard against gender-based differentiation.

4.2.3 The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, ratified by Namibia, requires reasonable accommodation in employment; performance objectives, instruments and assessments shall be reasonably accommodated to disability without lowering the substance of the standards of the role.

4.2.4 These instruments are cited as binding international commitments of Namibia where ratified, and otherwise as persuasive standards; the Chief Legal Advisor confirms ratification status under clause 4.1.7.

5. PRINCIPLES GUIDING PRACTICES AT NUST

5.1 Alignment: every individual objective derives from, and is traceable to, the ISBP through the cascade of institutional, portfolio, faculty and unit scorecards.

5.2 Universality and consistency: the same framework, cycle and rating scale apply to all staff, with instruments differentiated only to reflect the legitimate differences between academic and professional/support work.

5.3 Development first: the primary purpose of performance management is to grow capability; assessment and consequence follow support, not the reverse.

5.4 Fairness and transparency: standards are agreed in writing in advance; assessment is based on evidence against those standards; ratings are moderated; staff may respond, be represented and appeal.

5.5 Continuous conversation: performance feedback is regular and two-way throughout the year; the formal reviews contain no surprises.

5.6 Whole-role assessment: what is achieved and how it is achieved both count; conduct and behaviour consistent with the University's values form part of every assessment.

5.7 Accountability of supervisors: Conducting honest, timely, and well-documented performance management is itself a performance objective of every supervisor.

5.8 Confidentiality: performance records are confidential staff records, accessible only to those with a legitimate need, and managed under the University's records framework.

5.9 Non-discrimination and accommodation: assessment is free of bias and discrimination, and reasonably accommodates disability and other protected circumstances.

5.10 Integrity: performance information is accurate and honest; the falsification or manipulation of performance records or ratings is misconduct.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 This Policy operationalises ISBP Strategic Objective 4.2 (Performance Culture) and supports Strategic Objective 4.1 (Faculty Excellence), the staff satisfaction, retention and competency measures of Theme 4, and the ISBP's monitoring and evaluation framework, which subjects every institutional KPI to the seven-point KPI Quality Test. Individual KPIs set under this Policy meet the same test.

6.2 The Policy sits within an integrated human capital framework: recruitment and probation establish role expectations; performance management assesses and develops delivery against them; the Learning and Development Framework addresses identified needs; the Academic Promotion and Career Pathing Framework uses performance evidence for advancement; recognition and reward instruments respond to assessed excellence; and the Disciplinary Code addresses misconduct. This Policy is the connecting instrument and does not duplicate those frameworks.

6.3 For academic staff, performance covers the full academic role: teaching and learning; research, innovation and postgraduate supervision; community engagement (recognised in performance agreements under the Community Engagement Policy); and academic leadership, administration and citizenship. For professional and support staff, performance covers service delivery objectives, operational standards and behavioural competencies.

6.4 Performance management under this Policy also serves the University's external accountability: institutional performance reporting to Council and, where applicable, under the Public Enterprises Governance Act framework, draws on the cascaded performance system this Policy completes.

6.5 The design of this Policy reflects verified benchmarking against the University of Cape Town, Stellenbosch University and the University of Nairobi in Africa, and the University of Melbourne, the Australian National University and the University of Edinburgh internationally, summarised in Annexure A and incorporated in the clauses cross-referenced there.

7. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

7.1 The performance cycle

7.1.1 Performance is managed over an annual cycle aligned to the University's financial year and the ISBP review calendar. The cycle comprises four phases:

Phase	Timing	Key actions and instruments
1. Performance planning	Within the first month of the cycle	Supervisor and staff member conclude the performance agreement: objectives cascaded from the unit scorecard, KPIs meeting the KPI Quality Test,

Phase	Timing	Key actions and instruments
		standards, behavioural expectations, and a personal development plan.
2. Continuous feedback and coaching	Throughout the cycle	Regular documented performance conversations; progress tracked; obstacles, workload and support needs addressed; objectives varied in writing where circumstances change materially.
3. Mid-year review	Month six of the cycle	Formal documented review of progress against the agreement; provisional indication of trajectory; development plan updated; early initiation of support where performance is at risk.
4. Annual assessment and moderation	Within two months of cycle end	Staff member self-assessment; supervisor assessment with evidence; rating on the approved scale; moderation; feedback of confirmed outcome; outcomes applied to recognition, development, and improvement processes.

7.1.2 The Human Capital Directorate publishes the dates of each phase annually before the start of the cycle, aligned to the ISBP quarterly and mid-year review calendar.

7.1.3 Where a staff member joins, transfers or changes role during a cycle, a performance agreement for the remainder of the cycle is concluded within one month of assumption of duty, and the assessment covers the period served.

7.2 Performance agreements

7.2.1 Every staff member within the scope of clause 2.2 concludes a written performance agreement with their supervisor at the start of each cycle. No staff member may be assessed against objectives that were not recorded in the agreement or its documented variations.

7.2.2 Objectives shall be SMART, limited in number to what is materially important (normally five to eight), weighted to reflect the role, and cascaded from the relevant portfolio, faculty or unit scorecard so that alignment to the ISBP is traceable.

7.2.3 For academic staff, the agreement covers the domains in clause 6.3, weighted in accordance with the applicable workload model and the staff member's agreed work focus; community engagement and postgraduate supervision are recognised as assessable work, not voluntary extras.

7.2.4 Every agreement includes behavioural expectations drawn from the University's values, so that how results are achieved is assessed alongside what is achieved.

7.2.5 Every agreement includes a personal development plan identifying the competencies to be developed during the cycle and the development actions agreed, linked to the Learning and Development Framework.

7.2.6 Where agreement cannot be reached on the content of a performance agreement, the next-level supervisor decides after hearing both parties, and the decision and reasons are

recorded. A staff member's refusal to sign does not suspend the cycle; the disputed agreement remains in effect pending resolution.

7.3 Continuous feedback and coaching

7.3.1 Supervisors hold regular performance conversations with each staff member throughout the cycle, at intervals appropriate to the role, and record the material points. Formal reviews shall contain no assessment that the staff member hears for the first time at the review.

7.3.2 Either party may request a documented performance conversation at any time, including to raise workload, resourcing or support obstacles to delivery.

7.3.3 Material changes to objectives, standards or weightings during the cycle are recorded as written variations to the performance agreement, signed by both parties.

7.4 Mid-year review

7.4.1 A formal mid-year review is conducted for every staff member in month six of the cycle, documented on the prescribed instrument, covering progress against each objective, behavioural expectations, the development plan, and any support required.

7.4.2 Where the mid-year review indicates that performance is at risk of not meeting requirements, the supervisor initiates support measures immediately and records them; a staff member shall not be rated as underperforming at annual assessment on grounds that were evident at mid-year but never raised.

7.5 Annual assessment and rating

7.5.1 At the end of each cycle the staff member completes a self-assessment with evidence, and the supervisor completes a written assessment of performance against each objective and the behavioural expectations of the agreement.

7.5.2 Performance is rated on the following five-point scale, applied to the overall weighted outcome of the agreement:

Rating	Descriptor
5 – Outstanding	Exceeds all objectives and behavioural standards to an exceptional level; delivers high-quality outcomes well beyond the requirements of the role, including stretch goals; performance recognised beyond the immediate unit.
4 – Exceeds expectations	Achieves all objectives and regularly exceeds a number of them; consistently delivers above the standard expected of the role, with commendable behaviour.
3 – Fully meets expectations	Achieves the objectives and behavioural standards of the role; the solid, fully competent performance on which the University depends and which the majority of staff are expected to attain.
2 – Partially meets expectations	Achieves some but not all material objectives or standards; improvement is required and is addressed through the development plan and, where warranted, a Performance Improvement Plan.
1 – Does not meet expectations	Fails to achieve the material objectives or standards of the role; a Performance Improvement Plan under clause 7.8 is mandatory.

7.5.3 Ratings are justified in writing with evidence. An objective that could not be pursued for documented reasons beyond the staff member's control is excluded from the weighted outcome, not scored as a failure.

7.5.4 A staff member who has not had a reasonable time or opportunity in the cycle to demonstrate performance (for example, recent appointment or approved long leave) is recorded as 'not rated' for the affected period rather than assigned a default rating.

7.6 Moderation and calibration

7.6.1 Before any rating is confirmed, ratings are moderated: at the faculty or department level by a moderation panel chaired by the Dean or Director, and at the institutional level by an Institutional Performance Moderation Committee chaired by the DVC: HCSS or nominee.

7.6.2 Moderation tests the consistency of standards across units, the sufficiency of evidence for ratings at the extremes of the scale, the distribution of ratings against reasonable expectations, and any indication of bias or adverse impact on designated groups. Moderation may adjust ratings, with written reasons communicated to the concerned staff member and supervisor.

7.6.3 No performance outcome (reward, increment, or improvement process) is applied until moderation is complete and the confirmed rating has been communicated to the staff member in writing.

7.7 Outcomes: recognition, reward and development

7.7.1 Confirmed performance outcomes inform: (a) recognition and reward instruments approved by Council, including performance-linked increments, awards or bonuses where the applicable remuneration framework so provides; (b) prioritisation of development opportunities under the Learning and Development Framework; (c) evidence of readiness for promotion under the Academic Promotion and Career Pathing Framework and equivalent professional pathways; and (d) succession and talent management decisions.

7.7.2 The University maintains an annual institutional recognition programme celebrating outstanding individual and team performance, aligned to the ISBP's recognition-driven culture commitment.

7.7.3 Consistent performance above the requirements of a role is rewarded through performance instruments; where the requirements of the post itself have grown, the position is evaluated through job-grading processes. The two mechanisms are not interchangeable.

7.7.4 No reward consequence may be applied to an unmoderated rating, and reward differentiation shall be free of discrimination consistent with clauses 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.

7.8 Managing underperformance

7.8.1 Underperformance is addressed as early as it is identified, through support before sanction. Where performance is assessed, at mid-year or annual assessment or through documented continuous feedback, as partially meeting or not meeting expectations, the supervisor initiates a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

7.8.2 A PIP records: the specific performance gaps with evidence; the standards to be attained; the support, resources, coaching and training the University will provide; the review checkpoints; and the reasonable period allowed for improvement, normally three months and not less than the period reasonably required by the nature of the role.

7.8.3 The staff member is given reasonable notice of the PIP meeting, receives the assessment documentation in advance, and may be assisted at the PIP meeting and all subsequent review meetings by a representative of their choice who is a University staff member or a recognised union representative.

7.8.4 PIP review meetings are held at the scheduled checkpoints regardless of interim impressions. Where performance has improved to the required standard, the PIP is closed in writing and ordinary performance management resumes.

7.8.5 Where performance has not improved, the supervisor substantiates the remaining gaps, the staff member responds, and a senior manager chairs any further review. Only after a completed PIP process that has not achieved the required standard may the matter be referred for action under the incapacity (poor work performance) provisions of the applicable conditions of service and the Labour Act, 2007, which may include extension of the PIP, redeployment, or termination following a fair procedure.

7.8.6 A staff member may not be dismissed for poor work performance unless the standards were communicated in advance, support and reasonable opportunity to improve were given, and a fair procedure was followed. The documentation generated under this Policy constitutes the record of that process.

7.8.7 Underperformance is an incapacity matter; deliberate refusal to work, dishonesty or other misconduct is a disciplinary matter under the Disciplinary Code. Where conduct issues emerge during a PIP, the two processes are kept distinct and the staff member is informed which process is being applied.

7. Probation and confirmation

7.9.1 Objectives and standards for probationary staff are set in writing at appointment. Probation reviews are conducted in accordance with the applicable conditions of service, and their outcomes inform the confirmation decision.

7.9.2 Upon confirmation, the supervisor concludes a performance agreement covering the remainder of the current cycle, carrying forward any outstanding development actions, so that the staff member enters the annual cycle without a gap.

7.10 Reviews of supervisors and upward feedback

7.10.1 Every supervisor’s own performance agreement includes an objective on the quality, timeliness and completion of performance management for their staff, assessed with evidence including completion rates and moderation findings.

7.10.2 The University progressively implements structured upward and multi-source feedback for staff in leadership roles, administered confidentially by the Human Capital Directorate, as a developmental input to leadership assessments.

7.11 Appeals and disputes

7.11.1 A staff member who disputes a confirmed rating or a decision under this Policy first raises it with the supervisor; failing resolution, with the next management level; and failing that, through the University's Grievance Procedure. An appeal against a moderated rating is lodged in writing within 10 working days of the confirmed outcome being communicated.

7.11.2 An appeal does not suspend the cycle, but no adverse reward or improvement consequence based on the disputed rating is finalised until the appeal is determined.

7.12 Records, confidentiality and systems

7.12.1 Performance agreements, review records, assessments, moderation records, PIPs and appeal records are official University records, created, classified, retained and disposed of under the NUST File Plan and the Archives Act, 1992 (Act No. 12 of 1992), and held on the staff member's confidential personnel record under the custody of the DVC: HCSS.

7.12.2 Performance information is confidential and accessible only to the staff member, the supervisory line, the Human Capital Directorate, moderation structures, and persons with a legitimate need in processes this Policy authorises.

7.12.3 The performance management process is administered on the University's digital performance management platform, aligned to the ISBP's digital transformation of human capital services, with dashboards reporting participation and completion rates while protecting individual confidentiality.

7.13 Capability, monitoring and compliance

7.13.1 Every supervisor completes prescribed training in this Policy and its instruments within three months of appointment to a supervisory role, and refresher training when the Policy or instruments materially change. Untrained supervisors conduct assessments only under the guidance of the Human Capital Directorate.

7.13.2 Supervisory spans are structured so that performance management is feasible; as a norm, a supervisor is responsible for the performance management of no more than fifteen staff members.

7.13.3 The Human Capital Directorate audits participation annually, reporting completion rates for agreements, mid-year reviews, and annual assessments at the institutional, faculty, and unit levels to EXCO and, through the DVC: HCSS, to the Human Resources Committee of Council. Persistent non-completion is itself a performance issue for the responsible supervisors.

7.13.4 Performance data is analysed annually for rating distributions and for adverse impact on designated groups under the Affirmative Action (Employment) Act, and findings inform moderation guidance and training.

8. STRUCTURES GOVERNING THE POLICY

8.1 Council

8.2 Senate

8.3 EXCO

8.4 Vice-Chancellor

8.5 DVC: HCSS (Policy Custodian)

8.6 Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Deans, Directors and Heads of Department

8.7 The Institutional Performance Moderation Committee

8.8 Human Capital Directorate

9.1.9 Supervisors

9.1.10 Staff members

9.1.11 Office of the Registrar (Governance and Compliance)

9. IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 The DVC: HCSS shall implement this Policy through the accompanying Performance Management Guidelines, issued on the prescribed Template for Writing Procedures and Guidelines, which set out the step-by-step process, instruments and timelines.

9.2 Implementation shall be phased with the ISBP: system rollout and supervisor training in 2026–2027 under Strategic Objective 4.2, full institutional operation thereafter, and embedding of learning outcomes in performance agreements by 2029–2030 in line with the Skills Development Plan.

9.1 Roles and Responsibilities

9.1.1 Council: approves the Policy; oversees performance culture through the Human Resources Committee, which receives the annual performance management report.

9.1.2 Senate: recommends the Policy; assures academic quality dimensions.

9.1.3 EXCO: reviews institutional performance management implementation as part of its monthly and quarterly scorecard reviews under the ISBP monitoring framework.

9.1.4 Vice-Chancellor: institutional accountability for performance; concludes performance agreements with executive management cascaded from the VC scorecard.

9.1.5 DVC: HCSS (Policy Custodian): executive responsibility for implementation, moderation, reporting, and review of this Policy; chairs the Institutional Performance Moderation Committee.

9.1.6 Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Deans, Directors and Heads of Department: cascade scorecard objectives; conclude, review and assess performance agreements for their staff; chair or

serve on moderation panels; are themselves assessed on the quality of their performance management.

9.1.7 The Institutional Performance Moderation Committee, chaired by the DVC: HCSS or nominee and constituted with representation across portfolios, conducts institutional moderation under clause 7.6 and issues annual calibration guidance.

9.1.8 Human Capital Directorate: administers the cycle, instruments, platform, training, audits, data analysis and secretariat support to moderation structures.

9.1.9 Supervisors: conclude agreements, hold continuous feedback conversations, conduct reviews and assessments honestly and on time, initiate support and PIPs, and maintain records.

9.1.10 Staff members: participate in good faith in every phase of the cycle, complete self-assessments with evidence, pursue agreed development actions, and raise obstacles to delivery as they arise.

9.1.11 Office of the Registrar (Governance and Compliance): policy authentication, gazetting, publication, policy register maintenance and records compliance oversight.

9.2 Support and Advice

9.2.1 Support and advice regarding this policy shall be rendered internally through the Human Capital Directorate (first point of contact for the process, instruments and platform); the Employee Relations function (underperformance, incapacity and disputes); the Learning and Development function (development plans and training); the Chief Legal Advisor (legal compliance); recognised unions (representation).

9.3 Communication

9.3.1 Upon approval, the Office of the Registrar publishes this Policy on the University's policy repository and website and shall communicate the Policy to all staff through a circular.

9.3.2 The Department of Human Capital shall conduct policy sensitisation workshops for staff and shall publish the annual performance calendar.

9.3.2 The Human Capital Directorate provides structured training and change management so that performance management becomes an embedded practice, in accordance with clause 7.13.1.

9.4 Non-compliance

9.4.1 Failure by a supervisor to conduct performance management as this Policy requires is addressed first as a performance matter of that supervisor and, where wilful or persistent, under the Disciplinary Code. Falsification of performance records or ratings is misconduct.

10. COMMENTS

10.1 Any member of the University community may comment on the effectiveness of this Policy or on difficulties in its implementation or interpretation, directed to the Policy Custodian through the Human Capital Directorate, copied to the Registrar through Governance and Compliance. Comments are recorded and inform the next review.

11. REVIEW

11.1 This Policy is reviewed every five years from the effective date, or earlier where legislative change, ISBP revision, moderation findings or audit outcomes so require, through the University's policy development and review processes.

ANNEXURE A: BENCHMARKING REPORT

This report summarises the verified benchmarking evidence on which this Policy draws, thereby satisfying the Policy Checklist's benchmarking requirement. Three leading African and three leading international universities with published, operating performance management instruments were examined. Lessons are incorporated into this Policy as substantive clauses, cross-referenced in the final column.

A.1 African universities

Institution	Instrument benchmarked	Lesson incorporated into this Policy
University of Cape Town (South Africa)	Performance planning, performance reviews and staff development framework for academic staff; Development Dialogue process for professional (PASS) staff; Performance Improvement Plan procedure agreed with the Employees Union	Whole-of-academic-role review covering teaching, research, leadership and social responsiveness (clauses 6.3, 7.2.3); the PIP discipline: written plan, staff-side representation at every review meeting, scheduled follow-ups held regardless of interim impression, senior manager chairing escalated reviews (clauses 7.8.3–7.8.5); distinguishing person-performance from post-grading (clause 7.7.3); 'not rated' treatment where opportunity to perform was absent (clause 7.5.4); performance objectives for fixed-term staff even outside the full cycle (clause 2.3).
Stellenbosch University (South Africa)	Performance Management Policy and Strategy (institutional policy repository)	A single Council-level policy-and-strategy instrument covering all staff, integrating performance management with institutional strategy rather than treating it as an HR form cycle (clauses 3, 6.1); policy custody at senior executive level with institutional moderation (clauses 7.6, 8.4).
University of Nairobi (Kenya)	Performance contracting cascaded from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor to Deans of Faculties and Chairs of Departments under Kenya's public performance contracting framework; annual Staff Performance Appraisal administered on a digital staff appraisal system; annual Staff Performance Awards	Explicit cascade of signed performance commitments down the management line (clauses 6.1, 7.2.2, 9.1.3, 9.1.5); administration of the appraisal on a digital platform with institutional reporting (clause 7.12.3); a visible annual institutional recognition programme celebrating performance (clause 7.7.2).

A.2 International universities

Institution	Instrument benchmarked	Lesson incorporated into this Policy
University of Melbourne (Australia)	Performance, Development and Education Policy (MPF1227) and Performance Planning and Review Procedure (MPF1147); Academic Performance Framework with Academic	Unambiguous scope rules for fixed-term staff, including a documented review at least two weeks before expiry of contracts under twelve months (clause 2.3); mandatory supervisor training within three months of appointment (clause 7.13.1); explicit, controlled links between review outcomes

Institution	Instrument benchmarked	Lesson incorporated into this Policy
	Career Benchmarks and Indicators	and increments, probation confirmation and the unsatisfactory-performance procedure (clauses 7.7.1, 7.8.5, 7.9); defined sharing of review information strictly for authorised decisions (clause 7.12.2).
Australian National University (Australia)	Performance and Development Policy with academic and professional staff procedures; Focus performance development agreement	A single recorded performance agreement ('Focus' equivalent) per staff member per cycle (clause 7.2.1); formal mid-term review at six months (clause 7.4); behaviourally anchored five-point rating descriptors assessing conduct alongside output (clauses 7.2.4, 7.5.2); supervisor span norm of no more than 10–15 staff for feasible performance management (clause 7.13.2); regular institutional audits of participation and completion rates (clause 7.13.3).
University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom)	Annual Review / Performance and Development Review framework completed by 31 July each year and recorded on the People and Money system; Conversations Hub; Behaviours Charter; probation-to-annual-review transition guidance	Continuous, quality conversations throughout the year as the core of the system, with formal reviews holding no surprises (clauses 5.5, 7.3.1); values-based behavioural expectations ('how' as well as 'what') in every review (clause 7.2.4); a fixed institutional completion date recorded on the University system (clauses 7.1.2, 7.12.3); structured transition of confirmed probationers into the annual cycle without a gap (clause 7.9.2).

A.3 Cross-cutting findings

A.3.1 All six institutions anchor performance management in a written agreement or plan concluded at the start of the cycle, and none permits assessment against unrecorded expectations. This Policy adopts the same rule (clause 7.2.1).

A.3.2 Mature systems separate the developmental conversation from the consequences engine: feedback is continuous, but reward and incapacity consequences flow only from moderated, confirmed outcomes. This Policy adopts moderation as a precondition for any consequence (clauses 7.6.3, 7.7.4).

A.3.3 Underperformance is universally managed through a structured improvement plan with representation, support and scheduled reviews before any employment consequence, which is also what the Labour Act, 2007 requires of a fair incapacity process (clause 7.8).

A.3.4 Systems fail on supervisor capability and completion discipline, not on design. The strongest institutions train supervisors compulsorily, cap spans, audit completion and publish the calendar. This Policy adopts all four controls (clauses 7.1.2, 7.13).

Verification note: all instruments cited above were verified against the institutions' published policy libraries and human resources pages at the date of drafting. Web references are retained in the Policy Development Working Group record.

NAMIBIA UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Department of Human Capital



13 Jackson Kaujeua Street
Private Bag 13388
Windhoek
Namibia

Enquiries
Ms Riette Duvenhage
Director: Department Human Capital

T: +264 61 207 2448
E: rduvenhage@nust.na