



**Report on the  
Quality Assurance of the  
DHET examination of the  
GETC: ABET L4  
December 2014**

U MALUSI



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

REPORT ON THE  
QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE  
DHET EXAMINATION  
OF THE GETC: ABET L4

---

DECEMBER 2014

PUBLISHED BY:



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

---

37 General Van Ryneveld Street, Perseus Technopark, Pretoria  
Telephone: 27 12 349 1510 • Fax: 27 12 349 1511 • info@umalusi.org.za

COPYRIGHT 2014  
UMALUSI COUNCIL FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE  
IN GENERAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

*While all reasonable steps are taken to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the information contained herein, Umalusi accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever if the information is, for whatsoever reason, incorrect, and Umalusi reserves its right to amend any incorrect information.*

# Table of Contents

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: QUESTION PAPER MODERATION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	1
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	2
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	3
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	10
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	10
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT .....	11
<b>CHAPTER 2: MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT</b> .....	<b>12</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	12
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	12
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	14
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	27
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	28
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT .....	28
<b>CHAPTER 3: MONITORING OF WRITING</b> .....	<b>29</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	29
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	29
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	31
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	35
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	35
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE/IMPROVEMENT .....	36
<b>CHAPTER 4: MONITORING OF MARKING</b> .....	<b>37</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	37
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	37
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	38
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	41
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	41
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT .....	41

<b>CHAPTER 5: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS</b> .....	<b>42</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	42
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	42
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	44
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	47
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	48
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT .....	48
<b>CHAPTER 6: VERIFICATION OF MARKING</b> .....	<b>49</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	49
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	49
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS .....	51
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	54
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	54
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT .....	54
<b>CHAPTER 7: STANDARDISATION AND VERIFICATION OF RESULTS</b> .....	<b>55</b>
1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....	55
2. SCOPE AND APPROACH .....	55
3. DECISIONS: DHET .....	55
4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	56
5. AREAS OF CONCERN .....	56
6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT .....	56
<b>CHAPTER 8: STATUS OF CERTIFICATION</b> .....	<b>57</b>
1. BACKGROUND .....	57
2. CURRENT STATUS .....	58
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>60</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>64</b>

# Executive Summary

---

Umalusi quality assures the assessment for the General Education and Training Certificate (GETC) for Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET L4) – hereinafter referred to as GETC: ABET L4 – conducted by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET).

Quality assurance of the assessment of the GETC is meant to give a broad overview of key processes that will have been dealt with during the examination cycle. The intention of these quality assurance activities is to determine whether all assessments and all assessment processes in the examination cycle meet the required standards. These standards are judged against various criteria appropriate to the particular assessment or assessment process.

Umalusi is committed to the ongoing improvement of assessment to ensure the validity, reliability and fairness of examinations. This report therefore identifies areas for improvement, with *Directives for Compliance and Improvement*, both of which are intended to offer feedback to role-players involved in the processes of assessment. Umalusi believes that judicious consideration of the proposed areas for improvement and *Directives for Compliance and Improvement* can lead to improvement when assessment personnel, educators and officials consider these in relation to the context in which they operate.

This report dedicates a chapter for each of the key processes of quality assurance of assessment, namely:

1. Moderation of question papers;
2. Moderation of Site-Based Assessment (SBA);
3. Monitoring of both the writing and marking phases of the examinations;
4. Moderation of marking;
5. Standardisation of results.

## CHAPTER 1: QUESTION PAPER MODERATION

Umalusi moderators evaluated 26 question papers (QPs) for the November 2014 examinations, as offered by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). Table 1.3 shows that 46% (12/26) of the question papers were approved during first moderation, with two QPs conditionally approved as there was no need for second moderation. However, 11 QPs (42%) were conditionally approved, to be resubmitted for second moderation. One question paper was rejected as the questions did not meet the Subject and Assessment Guidelines (SAGs).

Second moderations were required as a result of poor internal moderation, insufficient content coverage as per the SAGs, questions not properly aligned to the cognitive levels as required in the SAGs, poor marking guidelines and poor attention to technical detail.

Umalusi was concerned with the poor quality of marking guidelines. Some 11 marking guidelines were permeated with errors; additionally, provision had not been made for alternative answers. External moderators reported that many examiners continued to be challenged by interpretation and analysis of cognitive levels. These problems were compounded by a range of grammatical errors and incorrect use of subject terminology/data across some question papers, which could potentially have confused learners. However, Umalusi is satisfied that all question papers submitted for second moderation were in principal approved, or conditionally approved with no requirement for resubmission.

## **CHAPTER 2: MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT**

Umalusi externally moderated Site-Based Assessment (SBA) for 17 learning areas (LAs) requested from all nine Provincial Education Departments (PEDs). The sample consisted of 67 Educator Portfolios of Assessment and 492 Learner Portfolios of Evidence.

An analysis of the evidence found in educator portfolios was that many educators and district officials were meticulous in ensuring that educator portfolios contained all relevant documents, as per policy requirements. This was an improvement, since this had been raised as a concern in previous evaluation reports. However, this did not mean that the quality and standard of internal assessment had improved.

The presentation of learner portfolios can be improved. Insufficient attention was given to technical aspects, such as the inclusion of copies of learner IDs and signed declarations to verify the authenticity of the work presented. If the authenticity of candidates' SBA marks cannot be guaranteed, the integrity of the marks awarded is undermined. Assessment schedules should also be included in the learner portfolios.

Some aspects of internal moderation, as with all quality assurance of assessment processes, remain a concern. Although there was evidence of internal moderation at different levels, the internal moderation report remained merely a checklist. Feedback to educators was rare and, where reports had contained feedback, the quality of the

feedback would not ensure improvement in the formal recognition system.

It must be noted that SBA marks were subject to a computerised standardisation process.

### **CHAPTER 3: MONITORING OF WRITING**

Umalusi deployed 68 monitors to visit a sample of 125 examination centres for the writing phase of the examination. The monitoring reports submitted identified areas of good practice, but also areas of concern regarding the writing phase of the GETC: ABET L4 examinations.

Many AET centres offering the examination still require support in preparing for, and conducting, the national examinations. The training of invigilators should be monitored at national level as evidence suggests this as an area for improvement. The state-of-readiness to conduct the national examinations should focus on key administrative issues at examination centre level.

In the main, the monitoring of the writing phase of this examination confirmed that, apart from policy deviations and problem areas mentioned in this report, the examinations in all provinces were conducted in accordance with prescribed policies, procedures and regulations.

### **CHAPTER 4: MONITORING OF MARKING**

Umalusi monitors visited eight marking centres in seven provinces to monitor the marking of the GETC: ABET L4 Level 4 scripts. Generally the marking centres were very well managed and the quality and standard of marking was very good.

Two provincial marking centres started with a shortage of markers, but this issue was quickly resolved with no negative impact on the marking process in these centres. The marking process in Limpopo was disturbed by demonstrations by some markers.

Umalusi is satisfied that marking met the minimum quality requirements, as marking was generally consistent and fair with no reported incident that could compromise the credibility of marking.

## **CHAPTER 5: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS**

The standardisation of the marking guidelines was conducted at Indlela, in Johannesburg, in November 2014. All stakeholders with access to pre-marked answer scripts agreed that this practice improved understanding of the variables that impact on marking. Unfortunately, not all PEDs ensured that markers pre-marked dummy scripts in preparation for the memorandum discussion workshops. The memorandum discussions served to strengthen and improve the quality and standard of marking at the provincial marking centres.

## **CHAPTER 6: VERIFICATION OF MARKING**

Umalusi performed both on-site and centralised verification of marking. The centralised verification of marking was based on a sample of 702 answer scripts, which included 9/26 LAs (35%) from eight provinces. Centralised moderation took place at Umalusi's premises from 11–13 December 2014.

Umalusi also conducted on-site moderation of marking in three provinces, i.e. KwaZulu-Natal (KZN), Limpopo (LP) and Mpumalanga (MP). The moderation sample of 392 scripts included AAAT4 (MP), LCEN4 (KZN), TECH4 (KZN), INCT4 (KZN) and MLMS4 (LP). Most marking was seen to be largely fair and valid, with specific incidents of irregularities noted in KwaZulu-Natal (5) and Limpopo (3) as detailed in Table 6.4. Umalusi moderators remarked a bigger sample for the learning areas and provinces implicated. The external moderators could not find additional evidence of any irregularities.

The provinces implicated in the alleged irregularities must investigate and submit detailed reports to Umalusi through the DHET. Further action will be considered based on the findings.

## **CHAPTER 7: STANDARDISATION AND VERIFICATION OF RESULTS**

The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) presented a total of 26 learning areas for standardisation at the standardisation meeting held on 19 December 2014. The committee accepted raw marks for 11 LAs, but adjusted marks mainly upwards for 10 LAs and mainly downwards for 5 LAs.



# Acronyms

---

ABET	-	Adult Basic Education and Training
AET	-	Adult Education and Training
ASC	-	Assessment Standards Committee
CASS	-	Continuous Assessment
CLC	-	Community Learning Centres
DBE	-	Department of Basic Education
DHET	-	Department of Higher Education and Training
EA	-	Examination Assistants
EC	-	Eastern Cape Province
EAG	-	Examination and Assessment Guideline
FS	-	Free State Province
GETC	-	General Education and Training Certificate
GP	-	Gauteng Province
KZN	-	KwaZulu-Natal Province
LA	-	Learning Area
LP	-	Limpopo Province
MP	-	Mpumalanga Province
NC	-	Northern Cape Province
NQF	-	National Qualifications Framework
NW	-	North West Province
PALC	-	Public Adult Learning Centre
PED	-	Provincial Education Department
PEIC	-	Provincial Examination Irregularities Committee
QAA	-	Quality Assurance of Assessment Unit
SAQA	-	South African Qualifications Authority
SBA	-	Site-Based Assessment
UMALUSIq	-	Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training
WC	-	Western Cape Province

## List of tables and figures

---

TABLE 1.1	DHET LEARNING AREAS FOR THE GETC: ABET L4 .....	2
TABLE 1.2	APPROVAL STATUS OF QUESTION PAPERS MODERATED .....	4
TABLE 1.3	ANALYSIS OF EXTERNAL MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS .....	5
TABLE 1.4	QUESTION PAPER COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA AT FIRST MODERATION .....	9
TABLE 1.5	QUESTION PAPER COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA AT SECOND MODERATION .....	10
TABLE 2.1	SBA PORTFOLIOS SAMPLE REQUESTED .....	12
TABLE 2.2	SBA PORTFOLIOS SAMPLE MODERATED .....	15
TABLE 2.3	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EDUCATOR PORTFOLIOS .....	17
TABLE 2.4	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNER PORTFOLIOS .....	20
TABLE 3.1	MONITORING OF WRITING .....	29
TABLE 4.1	MONITORING OF MARKING .....	37
TABLE 5.1	NUMBER OF SCRIPTS PRE-MARKED .....	45
TABLE 6.1	CENTRALISED MODERATION OF MARKING .....	49
TABLE 6.2	ON-SITE MODERATION OF MARKING .....	50
TABLE 6.3	QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF MARKING VERIFICATION FINDINGS .....	51
TABLE 6.4	IRREGULARITIES REGISTER .....	53
TABLE 7.1	STANDARDISATION DECISIONS .....	55
TABLE 8.1	STATUS OF CERTIFICATION OF THE GETC: ABET L4 .....	59

# Chapter 1

---

## Question Paper Moderation

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Quality assurance of assessment for the GETC: ABET L4 requires an engagement with every process in the examination cycle. The intention of such quality assurance activities is to determine whether all assessments and all assessment processes in the examination cycle have met the required standards.

The examination cycle commences with the preparation of question papers for the written examination. The first step in the process of quality assurance is, therefore, the external moderation of question papers.

The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) appoints individuals with the requisite subject knowledge to set question papers for the General Education and Training Certificate (GETC). Examiners, therefore, are the starting point in the development of examination question papers. Assessment bodies appoint internal moderators to moderate the question papers before they are presented to Umalusi for external moderation.

Umalusi moderates question papers to confirm that the standard is comparable with that of previous years and adheres to current policy requirements. To maintain public confidence in the national examination system, the question papers must be seen to be relatively:

- Fair;
- Reliable;
- Representative of an adequate sample of the curriculum;
- Representative of relevant conceptual domains;
- Representative of relevant levels of cognitive challenge.

Umalusi employs external moderators who have relevant subject matter expertise to scrutinise and carefully analyse the question papers, based on a set of standardised evaluation criteria.

The GETC: ABET L4 has 26 learning areas (LAs). The DHET offers examinations for all 26 LAs in all nine Provincial Education Departments (PEDs), as detailed in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 DHET Learning Areas for the GETC: ABET L4

No	LEARNING AREAS	LA CODE
1	Ancillary Health Care	ANHC4
2	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	AAAT4
3	Arts and Culture	ARTC4
4	Early Childhood Development	ECD4
5	Economic and Management Sciences	EMSC4
6	Human and Social Sciences	HSSC4
7	Information Communication Technology	INCT4
8	Language, Literacy and Communication: Afrikaans	LCAF4
9	Language, Literacy and Communication: English	LCEN4
10	Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiNdebele	LCND4
11	Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiXhosa	LCXH4
12	Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiZulu	LCZU4
13	Language, Literacy and Communication: Sepedi	LCSP4
14	Language, Literacy and Communication: Sesotho	LCSO4
15	Language, Literacy and Communication: Setswana	LCTS4
16	Language, Literacy and Communication: siSwati	LCSW4
17	Language, Literacy and Communication: Tshivenda	LCVE4
18	Language, Literacy and Communication: Xitsonga	LCXI4
19	Life Orientation	LIFO4
20	Mathematical Literacy	MLMS4
21	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	MMSC4
22	Natural Sciences	NATS4
23	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	SMME4
24	Technology	TECH4
25	Travel and Tourism	TRVT4
26	Wholesale and Retail	WHRT4

## 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The DHET presented question papers and the accompanying marking memoranda for the 26 LAs it offered for moderation by Umalusi in preparation for the November 2014 GETC: ABET L4 examinations.

All question papers were moderated according to the 2014 *Umalusi Instrument for the Moderation of Question Papers*. This requires that moderators assess the question papers according to the following nine criteria:

1. Technical
2. Internal moderation
3. Content coverage
4. Cognitive skills
5. Marking memorandum
6. Language and bias
7. Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guidelines
8. Predictability
9. Overall impression.

Each criterion has a set of quality indicators against which the question papers are evaluated and assessed. The moderator makes a judgement for each criterion, considering four possible levels of compliance:

- No compliance (Met < 50% of criteria);
- Limited compliance (Met > 50% but <80%);
- Compliance in most respects (Met > 80% <100%);
- Compliance in all respects (Met 100%) of the criteria.

The moderator evaluates the question paper based on overall impression and how the requirements of all eight criteria have been met. A decision is then taken on the quality and standard of the question paper as a whole, considering one of four possible outcomes:

- Approved
- Conditionally approved – no resubmission
- Conditionally approved – resubmit
- Rejected – if the standard and quality of the question paper is entirely unacceptable.

The external moderation of question papers was conducted centrally at the offices of the Department of Basic Education (DBE) in Pretoria during April and June 2014.

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The external moderators completed evaluation reports based on the moderation instrument. The moderation reports included both statistical information as well as qualitative feedback. This report will reflect on the statistical as well as the qualitative feedback of the external moderator reports. The Table below provides a breakdown of the status of the question papers after all external moderation exercises were completed.

Table 1.2 Approval Status of Question Papers Moderated

FULL LEARNING AREA DESCRIPTION	NOVEMBER EXAM			
	LA CODE	1ST MOD	2ND MOD	3RD MOD
Ancillary Health Care	ANHC4	CAR	CANR	
Applied Agriculture & Agricultural Technology	AAAT4	A		
Arts and Culture	ARTC4	A		
Early Childhood Development	ECD4	CAR	CANR	
Economic and Management Sciences	EMSC4	CANR		
Human and Social Sciences	HSSC4	A		
Information Communication Technology	INCT4	CAR	A	
LLC: Afrikaans	LCAF4	A		
LLC: English	LCEN4	A		
LLC: IsiNdebele	LCND4	CAR	A	
LLC: IsiXhosa	LCXH4	A		
LLC: IsiZulu	LCZU4	A		
LLC: Sepedi	LCSP4	A		
LLC: Sesotho	LCSO4	CAR	A	
LLC: Setswana	LCTS4	R	A	
LLC: Siswati	LCSW4	A		
LLC: Tshivenda	LCVE4	A		
LLC: Xitsonga	LCXI4	CAR	A	
Life Orientation	LIFO4	A		
Mathematical Literacy	MLMMS4	CAR	A	
Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	MMSC4	CAR	A	
Natural Sciences	NATS4	A	A	
Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	SMME4	CAR		
Technology	TECH4	CANR		
Travel and Tourism	TRVT4	CAR	CAR	A
Wholesale and Retail	WHRT4	CAR	A	

A = Approved | CANR = Conditionally Approved – No Resubmit | CAR = Conditionally Approved – Resubmit | R = Rejected

Table 1.3 summarises the status of question papers after all external moderation exercises were completed.

Table 1.3 Analysis of External Moderation of Question Papers

MODE- RATION	APPRO- VED	CANR	% APPROVED + CANR	CAR (Re-submit)	% CAR	REJECTED	% REJECTED	TOTAL MODS
1ST Mod	12	2	54%	11	42%	1	4%	26
2ND Mod	9	2	92%	1	8%	0	0%	12
3RD Mod	1	0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	22	4		12		1		39

An analysis of both Tables 1.2 and 1.3 shows that the 26 QPs set for the November 2014 examinations resulted in a total of 39 external moderations. The Table above shows that 46% (12/26) of the question papers were approved during the first moderation, with two QPs conditionally approved with no need for second moderation.

The question paper for LCTS4 was rejected as the mark allocations were not aligned to the cognitive spread of the questions as per the subject and assessment guidelines. The memorandum also did not meet the required standards.

It is noted with concern that 11 QPs (42%) were conditionally approved to be resubmitted, and 4% were rejected. The 12 QPs required second moderation as a result of poor internal moderation, insufficient content coverage as per the SAGs, questions not properly aligned to the cognitive levels as required in the SAGs, poor marking guidelines and poor attention to technical details.

The internal moderators implemented the recommendations of the external moderators and resubmitted the revised question papers for second moderation. Nine of these question papers were approved. Travel and Tourism (TRVT4) was reworked and resubmitted for a third moderation, after which it was finally approved.

Below is a synopsis of the evaluation of the question papers based on the moderation criteria used. It reflects on the **first** moderation process.

### C1. Technical Criteria

- Technical criteria were not fully met at the first moderation: six QPs met *LIMITED* compliance requirements and 10 QPs met *MOST* compliance requirements.
- Most problems identified in the question papers related to inappropriate or unclear visuals (illustrations, pictures, diagrams and graphs), ambiguous or incomplete instructions, ambiguous language and typing errors.
- In respect of the QPs that scored *LIMITED* compliance (INCT4, LCND4, WHRT4

and TRVT4), it was found that the assessment body did not submit a file with the full history of the question paper with all drafts, internal moderators' comments, etc.

- In the case of Wholesale and Retail (WHRT4) the examiner and internal moderator did not provide a completed analysis grid. In the final analysis, all the aforementioned shortcomings were resolved after second moderation.

## **C2. Internal Moderation**

- Internal moderation was an area of concern: only 8/26 QPs (31%) complied fully with all the sub-criteria governing internal moderation of QPs. The remaining 18 QPs were appraised as follows: three *NO* compliance, six *LIMITED* compliance and nine *MOST* compliance.
- This spread in appraisal was permeated by the following deficiencies: lack of evidence that the question paper was moderated internally (for example, in INCT4 and ECD4); inappropriate quality, standard and relevance of input from the internal moderator (for example, in ARTC4, ECD4, INCT4, LCSO4, LCND4, LCX14, LCTS4, MLMS4, MMSC4, SMME4, WHRT4 and TRVT4); and non-consideration of the internal moderator's *Directives for Compliance and Improvement* (for example, in ECD4, INCT4, LCSO4, LCND4, WHRT4 and TRVT4).
- Internal moderation remained a challenge after second moderation, with three question papers, namely ANHC4, ECD4 and TRVT4, not achieving full compliance ratings, and INCT4 receiving a *NO* compliance rating.

## **C3. Content Coverage**

- Only 14 QPs complied with all the sub-criteria governing content coverage. The remaining 12 QPs were appraised as follows: four *MOST* compliance, seven *LIMITED* compliance and one *NO* compliance. Across these latter 12 question papers, it was found that some of the questions needed greater variety. In others the content was incorrect.
- In particular it was found that some QPs, such as EMSC4, WHRT4 and TRVT4, did not adequately cover the LOs and ASs as prescribed in the policy guideline documents. In the same vein, some papers, such as EMSC4, MMSC4, LCND4, LCSO4, WHRT4 and TRVT4, had inappropriate weighting and spread of content of LOs and ASs.
- Furthermore, some question papers, like EMSC4, MMSC4, SMME4 and WHRT4, lacked reasonable correlations between mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation.
- Examples and/or illustrations were found to be not suitable and irrelevant in

QPs for EMSC4, MMSC4 and TECH4.

- However, all of the aforementioned defaults in compliance were resolved after second moderation.

#### **C4. Cognitive Demand**

- Only 11 QPs complied with all the sub-criteria governing cognitive demand. The remaining 15 QPs were appraised as follows: three *NO* compliance, six *LIMITED* compliance and six *MOST* compliance. No compliance was evident in the EMSC4, LCND4 and WHRT4 QPs. Limited compliance applied to the INCT4, LCSO4, LCX14, MLMS4, MMSC4 and TRVT4, mainly because they did not satisfy the norms for the distribution of questions across cognitive levels as suggested in the respective learning area examination guidelines.
- The DHET should ensure that all chief examiners and internal moderators are familiar with the use of the relevant taxonomies and analysis grids. In EMSC4, INCT4 and WHRT QPs, the level of difficulty across the choice questions was not equal.
- External moderators also found that ECD4, LCSO4, TRVT4, LCND4 and WHRT4 QPs did not provide opportunities to assess reasoning ability; and the ability to compare and contrast, see causal relationships, and express an argument clearly.
- Most of the aforementioned deficiencies, across minimum standards pertaining to this criterion, were resolved after the second moderation.

#### **C5. Marking Guidelines**

- For various reasons, 20/26 QPs (77%) were not fully compliant across the quality indicators, and hence could not be considered accurate and reliable. This is worrisome, as errors in the marking guidelines accounted for the largest number of corrections required.
- While the marking guidelines were generally well laid out, it was expressed that the marking guidelines for MMSC4, LCSO4, LCX14 and INCT4 did not enable consistent marking. However, the errors in the marking guidelines were resolved after second moderation.
- The marking memoranda were subsequently enhanced to facilitate consistent marking across respective scripts at various marking centres.

#### **C6. Language and Bias**

- A total of 65% of the QPs were not in compliance with this criterion, mainly because they did not satisfy the language requirements. This involved

subtleties in grammar that might have created confusion for learners, incorrect use of subject terminology/data and inappropriate language register for the level of candidates.

- Problems involving various types of bias and stereotyping were limited to LCSO4. Generally there appeared to be a growing sensitivity among examiners and internal moderators to issues of bias.

### **C7. Adherence to Policies**

- Only 12 QPs (46%) complied with all the minimum standards (criteria) and associated policy requirements. The remaining 14 QPs were appraised as follows: two NO compliance, nine *LIMITED* compliance and three *MOST* compliance.
- NO compliance was evident in MMSC4 and WHRT4 QPs, and *LIMITED* compliance was expressed in the ARTC4, ECD4, INCT4, LCND4, LCSO4, LCXI4, MMSC4, SMME4 and TRVT4 QPs, in that they did not adequately reflect the prescribed learning outcomes and assessment standards, and/or they did not satisfy the weighting and spread of content of the SOs and ASs as per SAG requirements.

### **C8. Predictability**

- Sixteen of the 26 QPs (62%) were found to be fully compliant across all quality indicators (criteria); two QPs exhibited *NO* compliance, four demonstrated very *LIMITED* compliance and four QPs met *MOST* of the sub-criteria.
- The most common finding relating to the latter cases of *NO/LIMITED* compliance was that the questions were identical, or almost identical, to questions set within the past three years. For example, in SMME4 and TRVT4, some questions were repeated within the paper and/or from the 2014 back-up question paper.
- In some cases, like LCSO4, SMME4 and WHRT4, it was reported that the question papers lacked innovation and freshness. These shortcomings were resolved after second moderation.

### **C9. Overall Impressions**

- First moderation established that only 12 QPs were fully approved, two QPs were conditionally approved with no need to resubmit, 11 QPs were conditionally approved with the compulsion to resubmit for second moderation, and one QP (LCTS4) was rejected. About 12 papers (46%) were found to be not fair, valid or reliable, not of the appropriate standard, or did

not compare favourably with previous years' question papers.

- The 12 QPs had to undergo some intense reworking and were resubmitted for second moderation. After the second round of moderation, nearly all the question papers and memoranda were compliant with the quality indicators under the various criteria.

Table 1.4 gives a summary of the compliance ratings, based on the nine criteria used for the first external moderation of the question papers.

Table 1.4 Question Paper Compliance with Criteria at First Moderation

	COMPLIANCE FREQUENCY (26 QPs)			
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
C1. Technical Criteria	0	6	10	10
C2. Internal Moderation	3	6	9	8
C3. Content Coverage	1	7	4	14
C4. Cognitive Demand	3	6	6	11
C5. Marking Guidelines	2	9	9	6
C6. Language and Bias	1	8	8	9
C7. Adherence to Policy	2	9	3	12
C8. Predictability	2	4	4	16
C9. Overall Impression of QP	6	4	7	9
	<b>20</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>95</b>
	9%	25%	26%	40%

The quality and standard of the question papers after the first round of external moderation was not good, as 34% of the QPs did not meet the minimum requirements. Of particular concern was that 9% of the 26 QPs did not meet any of the compliance criteria. Internal moderation and cognitive demand were concerns after first moderation.

The compliance rating for *MOST* and *ALL* changed from 66% to 93% after second moderation. This meant that 7% of the question papers met only some of the criteria after second moderation. Table 1.5 summarises the compliance ratings based on the nine criteria used for the second external moderation of the 12 question papers.

Table 1.5 Question Paper Compliance with Criteria at Second Moderation

	COMPLIANCE FREQUENCY (12 QPs)			
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
C1. Technical Criteria	0	0	3	9
C2. Internal Moderation	1	2	1	8
C3. Content Coverage	0	1	2	9
C4. Cognitive Demand	0	1	2	9
C5. Marking Guidelines	0	0	8	4
C6. Language and Bias	0	0	3	9
C7. Adherence to Policy	0	0	2	10
C8. Predictability	0	1	1	10
C9. Overall Impression of QP	0	1	2	9
	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>77</b>
	1%	6%	22%	71%

#### 4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. The DHET must be commended for good management and administration of the process of external moderation of question papers. Security measures were tight and no question paper was compromised at any stage during the external moderation process.
2. The questions used in the 26 QPs were within the scope of the curriculum statements of the learning area, with good examples of creativity and innovation.

#### 5. AREAS OF CONCERN

1. Internal moderation was an area of concern. The quality, standard and relevance of internal moderation, across a number of QPs, were inappropriate and did not improve the quality of the question papers presented for external moderation.
2. The cognitive demand of question papers for EMSC4, MMSC4, SMME4 and WHRT4 did not meet minimum requirements at first moderation. These question papers lacked reasonable correlations between mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation. Question papers for ECD4, LCSO4, TRVT4, LCND4 and WHRT4 did not provide opportunities to assess reasoning ability, ability to compare and contrast, ability to see causal relationships, and the ability to express an argument clearly.

3. The weighting and spread of content of the specific outcomes and assessment standards for 11/26 QPs was not in accordance with the range suggested in the respective SAGs.
4. The illustrations and diagrams in question papers for EMSC4, MMSC4 and TECH4 were unsuitable and irrelevant.
5. Marking guidelines contained numerous errors and/or did not allow for alternative answers.

## **6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT**

1. The DHET must implement a strategy to improve the depth and quality of internal moderation as this concern has been raised in the past three quality assurance reports.
2. Examiners and internal moderators, particularly those responsible for ECD4, INCT4, LCZU4, LCSO4, LCXI4, TECH4, TRVT4 and WHRT4, must receive training and attend workshops on constructing questions/tasks that are aligned to specific cognitive levels. They also require appropriate skills training to interpret and analyse the cognitive levels of question papers.
3. The DHET must implement a strategy to ensure that question papers presented for approval have the correct cognitive weightings and spread of content to comply with the SAGs.
4. The DHET must implement a process to ensure that all illustrations, diagrams and sketches are suitable, professionally developed and of an acceptable standard.
5. The DHET must implement a process to ensure that marking guidelines and memoranda meet the required standard, consider alternative responses and adhere to marking principles.

### **Notes**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Chapter 2

---

# Moderation of Site-based Assessment

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Internal assessment (called Site-Based Assessment in the AET sector) is an important component of examinations, contributing 50% towards the final mark required for certification.

The DHET is responsible for presenting Site-Based Assessment (SBA) marks that have been quality assured and accurately reflect the competency of each candidate. To manage the SBA process, the DHET is required to develop SBA tasks that fulfil all requirements of the relevant unit standards and assessment guidelines, and that encourage authenticity. In addition, the DHET must ensure that the completed tasks are internally moderated.

The external moderation of SBA is an important aspect of the quality assurance process because such moderation:

- Ensures that the SBA tasks comply with national policy guidelines and Umalusi directives;
- Establishes the scope, extent and reliability of SBA across all assessment bodies offering the qualification;
- Verifies internal moderation of both the set tasks and the completed tasks;
- Identifies challenges to this aspect of assessment and recommends solutions;
- Reports on the quality of SBA within the assessment bodies.

### 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The sample of 3760 SBA portfolios requested included 17/26 (65%) LAs for the November 2014 examinations, as noted in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 SBA Portfolios Sample Requested

LA CODE	EC	FS	GP	KZN	LP	MP	NC	NW	WC
1. AAAT4	40			40	40	40			
2. ANHC4				40	40	40	40	40	40
3. ARTC4	40		40	40	40	40		40	40
4. ECD4	40	40	40	40		40			
5. EMSC4	40	40			40		40	40	40

LA CODE	EC	FS	GP	KZN	LP	MP	NC	NW	WC
6. HSSC4		40	40			40	40	40	40
7. INCT4	40	40	40	40					40
8. LCEN4	40	40					40	40	40
9. LCTS4			40		40	40		40	
10. LIFO4		40		40	40	40	40	40	40
11. MLMS4	40	40		40	40		40	40	40
12. MMSC4	40	40	40	40		40			
13. NATS4	40		40	40	40				
14. SSME4		40	40		40	40		40	40
15. TECH4	40		40	40	40	40			
16. TRVT4		40	40	40	40		40	40	40
17. WHRT4	40	40	40			40			
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>400</b>

The Table indicates that, with the exception of Northern Cape, North West and Western Cape, each PED was required to submit portfolios for 11 LAs. Each LA sample was selected from four to seven provinces. It was imperative for the PEDs to complete their internal moderation processes before the Umalusi verification process.

All PEDs were requested to submit a total of **40 portfolios per learning area** as indicated in Table 2.1 above. These samples had to be comprised of **nine learner portfolios** plus the **educator portfolio** from the same centre per learning area; and had to be from **four centres and from four different districts**. The provinces were thus requested to submit a total of 40 portfolios spread across four centres and districts. The requested sample totalled **3720 portfolios**.

The moderation of SBA tasks was conducted at Umalusi's premises from 22–28 October 2014. The external moderators evaluated the SBA portfolios using an instrument designed for this purpose. The evaluation also considered reports from internal moderators. The evaluation instrument provides for qualitative feedback as well as quantitative analysis of the responses. SBA moderation takes into account the following criteria:

- C1. Does the Educator Portfolio of Assessment (POA) contain all **relevant policy and assessment guideline documents**?
- C2. Is there an **Assessment Plan** in the educator POA, aligned to policy?
- C3. Is there **evidence** that the educator **implemented** the three tasks as per the Assessment Plan/Schedule?
- C4. Is there **evidence** that the educator **has completed marksheets** for all learners for each task?

- C5. Is there any **evidence** that **internal moderation** was conducted at the following levels?
- C6. Does the Learner Portfolio of Evidence contain all **relevant documents**?
- C7. Is there any evidence that the learners **completed the tasks**?
- C8. Are the tasks **assessed according** to the agreed **criteria**?
- C9. Did the educator **use** the **marking guidelines/rubrics appropriately** to allocate marks?
- C10. Did the learners **complete** the assessment tasks?
- C11. Did the learners **interpret** the assessment task **correctly**?
- C12. Did the **learners' responses meet the expectations/demands** of the tasks?
- C13. Were the learners able to **respond to the different cognitive levels** as set in the tasks?
- C14. Was the **marking consistent** with the marking tools?
- C15. Is the **quality and standard** of the marking **acceptable**?
- C16. Is the **mark allocation in line** with the **performance of the learner**?
- C17. Is the **totalling and transfer of marks** to the marksheets **accurate**?

Please note that the external moderation instrument was amended. In essence, the questions were the same as those of the previous instrument, but minor changes were made to improve the instrument and what it evaluates.

### 3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Umalusi randomly selected a sample for moderation from the portfolios received, as illustrated in Table 2.2 below. The sample was selected **per learning area per centre**. The portfolios selected represented **seven** of the **nine** provinces as no portfolios were selected from the Eastern Cape and Gauteng provinces.

Between **two** and **nine** LAs were selected per province and this accounted for the 41 districts and 66 centres verified. Of the 67 batches that were verified, 48 (72%) submitted the requested one educator portfolio and nine learner portfolios. The others, 19 (28%), submitted between one and eight learner portfolios. It must be noted that **Limpopo** submitted only two portfolios per centre for eight centres and one portfolio per centre for the remaining three centres. The province **did not comply with the Umalusi directives** as outlined in the circular pertaining to the composition of the samples.

Table 2.2 SBA Portfolios Sample Moderated

PED	LEARNING AREA	DISTRICT /REGION	AET CENTRE	EDUCATOR PORTFOLIOS	LEARNER PORTFOLIOS
Free State	EMSC4	Lejweleputswa	Tlamanang	1	8
	LCEN4	Motheo	Sekgabo	1	9
	MMSC4	Fezile Dabi	NGN	1	9
	SMME4	Thabo Mofutsanyana	Phatsima PALC	1	9
	TRVT4	Xhariep	Madikgetla	1	9
	WHRT4	Motheo	Agang PALC	1	9
KZN	AAAT4	Sisonke	Inzamezethu PALC	1	9
	AAAT4	Amajuba	Vukuzenzele AET	1	9
	ANHC4	Umzinyathi	Manthatsi	1	9
	ECD4	Amajuba	Khombindlele PALC	1	9
	ECD4	Sisonke	Didliland PALC	1	9
	INCT4	Ugu/ Port Shepstone	HRD Port Shepstone AET	1	9
	INCT4	Umlazi	Dokkies	1	9
	MMSC4	Umlazi	Enduduzweni PALC	1	9
	NATS4	Pinetown	Umzamo	1	7
	NATS4	Umkhanyakude	Jondotiba	1	3
	NATS4	Umkhanyakude	Embonisweni	1	3
	NATS4	Umkhanyakude	Sizamile	1	3
	NATS4	Zululand	Sakhokusha	1	2
	TRVT4	Pinetown	Buhle PALC	1	9
Limpopo	AAAT4	Vhembe	Tshiombo	1	2
	AAAT4	Vhembe	Mutsetweni	1	2
	AAAT4	Vhembe	HOJI	1	2
	AAAT4	Vhembe	Masungi	1	2
	AAAT4	Vhembe	Mbokota	1	2
	LCTS4	Waterberg	Sefitlholo	1	2
	LCTS4	Waterberg	Nelsonskop	1	2
	LCTS4	Waterberg	Motlhasedi	1	2
	NATS4	Mogalakwena	Tselapedi	1	1
	NATS4	Waterberg	Ramotlhatwane	1	1
	NATS4	Waterberg	Chumana	1	1
Mpuma- langa	AAAT4	Ehlanzeni	Phola	1	9
	AAAT4	Nkangala	Rekwele	1	9
	ANHC4	Bohlabela	Holandi	1	9

PED	LEARNING AREA	DISTRICT /REGION	AET CENTRE	EDUCATOR PORTFOLIOS	LEARNER PORTFOLIOS
Mpuma- langa	ANHC4	Ehlanzeni	Schagen	1	9
	ARTC4	Gert Sibande	Chesire ABET	1	4
	ECD4	Ehlanzeni	B6608034	1	9
	HSSC4	Ehlanzeni	Sibanjane ABET Centre	1	9
	LCTS4	Nkangala	Eamogetswe	1	9
	LIFO4	Ehlanzeni	Mandudu	1	9
	MMSC	Ehlanzeni	Vulamehlo AET	1	9
	WHRT4	Bohlabela	Nkangala	1	9
	WHRT4	Ehlanzeni	Mhwayi Centre	1	9
Northern Cape	ANHC4	Pixley ka Seme	Ikhwezi Lomso	1	9
	ANHC4	John Taolo Gaetsewe	Thuto ke Lesedi	1	9
	EMSC4	ZF Mgcawu	Upington Correctional Centre	1	6
	HSSC	Pixley ka Seme	Nomathembe	1	9
	LCEN4	ZF Mgcawu	Retsweletse PALC	1	9
	LCTS4	John Taolo Gaetsewe	Thuto ke letsedi	1	9
	LCTS4	Frances Baard	Ithathoseng	1	1
	TVRT4	Frances Baard	Galeshewe PALC	1	9
TVRT4	Pixley ka Seme	Nonzwakazi	1	9	
North West	LCEN4	Dr Kenneth Kaunda	Sedibeng Thutong	1	9
	LCST4	Dr Kenneth Kaunda	Tsholetsang	1	9
	LCST4	Dr Ruth S Mompoti	Tshipidi	1	9
	LCST4	Ngaka Modiri Molema	Kopano (Isago)	1	9
	LCST4	Bojanala	Lethabo	1	9
	SMME4	Dr Kenneth Kaunda	Ikaheng AET	1	9
	SMME4	Dr Ruth S Mompoti	Lorato	1	9
Western Cape	ARTC	West Coast	Malmesbury CLC	1	9
	EMSC4	Cape Winelands	Drakenstein Youth	1	9
	HHSC4	Metro East	Masakhane CLC	1	9
	INCT4	West Coast	Clanwilliam (Fuga)	1	9
	LCEN4	Overberg	Bredasdorp CLC	1	9
	LCEN4	Eden & Central Karoo	Mosselbay CLC	1	9
	LIFO4	Eden & Central Karoo	Wellington CLC	1	9
	SMME4	Metro North	Zanokhanyo	1	9
<b>Total Portfolios Moderated</b>				<b>67</b>	<b>492</b>

Some of the portfolios submitted did not make educational sense. It was not possible to draw logical conclusions from such samples. The examples below emphasise this concern.

- The 11 centres from Limpopo did not comply with the request: eight centres submitted only two learner portfolios and three centres only one learner portfolio.
- The Northern Cape submitted only one learner portfolio for LCTS4 from a centre in the Frances Baard district.
- Five centres from KZN submitted between two and seven learner portfolios for NATS.
- The Chesire ABET Centre in Mpumalanga submitted four learner portfolios for ARTC4.

The findings, based on the moderation instrument used, can be subdivided into two categories: the Educator Portfolio of Assessment and the Learner Portfolio of Evidence.

## A. EDUCATORS' PORTFOLIOS OF ASSESSMENT

The instrument used to evaluate the portfolios of both educators and learners is based on 17 criteria. The first five focus on the educator portfolio; the last 12 are more concerned with the learner portfolio. It is important to note that the findings must be read as a whole.

The findings for the moderation of educator portfolios, based on the criteria, are indicated in Table 2.3 below.

Table 2.3 Quantitative Analysis of the Educator Portfolios

	LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE (out of 67)			
1. Adherence to SAG	1 instance 1NATS4 (KZN)	12 Instances 2EMSC (NC) 1INCT (KZN) 1LCEN4 (NW) 4NATS (KZN) 2SMME (1FS; 1 WC) 1TRVT(KZN) 1WHRT (FS)	37 Instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs	17 Instances 7AAAT (2MP; 5LP) 3ANCH (KZN; MP; NC) 1ARTC (WC) 1EMSC (FS) 2LCTS (NW) 1MLMS(FS) 2WHRT (MP)

LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE (out of 67)				
2. Assessment planning	<b>2</b> instances: 1LCTS (NC) 1NATS (KZN)	<b>10</b> instances 1EMSC (NC) 1INCT (WC) 1LCTS (NC) 4NATS (KZN) 2TRVT (FS; NC) 1WHRT (FS)	<b>21</b> instances 2ECD (KZN) 1EMS (NC) 3MSSC (WC; MP; NC) 2INCT (KZN) 3LCEN (NW;FS NC) 3LCTS (NW) 1LIFO (WC) 1MMSC(KZN) 3NATS(LP) 1SMME (WC) 1TRVT (NC)	<b>34</b> instances 10 MP; 8 LP; 5 KZN, the rest fairly spread across all PEDs and Las
3. Implementation of plan	<b>10</b> instances 4 INCT (2KZN; 2WC) 1 LCEN (NC) 1 MMSC (KZN) 2 TRVT (KZN; FS) 2 WHRT (FS; MP)	<b>1</b> instance 1 LCEN (WC)	<b>16</b> instances 3 ANCH (1KZN; 2NC) 3 ECD (2KZN; MP) 3 LCEN (WC; NW; FS) 5 NATS (KZN) 2 SMME (FS; WC)	<b>40</b> instances 9 AAAT (2KZN; 2MP; 5LP) 10 LCTS (1MP; 2NC; 4NW; 3LP) The rest fairly spread across all PEDs and Las
4. Completion of marksheets	<b>6</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 1 LCEN (NC) 3 MMSC (KZN; FS; MP) 1 WHRT (FS)	<b>1</b> instance 1LCEN (WC)	<b>4</b> instances 3 ECD (2KZN; MP) 1 LCEN (NW)	<b>56</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs
5. Internal moderation	<b>4</b> instances 1 LCTS (LP) 1 SMME (WC) 2 TVRT (MP, KZN)	<b>8</b> instances 1 ECD (MP) 2 INCT (WC; NW) 1 MMSC (MP) 1 NATS (KZN) 3 TVRT (KZN; FS; NC)	<b>38</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs	<b>17</b> instances 8 AAAT (2KZN; 1MP; 5LP) 1 ARTC (MP) 2 EMSC (FS; WC) 2 LCEN (NW;NC) 1 LIFO (MP) 2 SMME (NW, FS) 1 WHRT (MP)

In 17 instances, the educator portfolios contained outdated Subject and Assessment Guidelines. **Nine (53%)** of these centres were in KZN, **four (24%)** in Northern Cape, **three (18%)** in Mpumalanga and **one** from a Western Cape centre. The SAGs provide the educator with the necessary guidelines to facilitate internal and external assessment according to quality assurance requirements.

A further concern relates to the non-submission of daily/monthly/weekly planning documents and assessment schedules. It is a matter of concern that in **28 instances**, or **42%** of the total sample verified, the planning documents were either incomplete or non-existent. While such **planning documents** relate to daily, weekly and monthly planning, together with assessment planning, non-compliance related largely to daily planning. In **60%** of the cases the assessment tasks were implemented as planned. There was evidence that **89%** of the centres **complied** in **MOST** and in **ALL criteria** relating to the completion of learners' marksheets.

While there has been a marked improvement in internal moderation, with **82% of** the centres compliant in *MOST* or in *ALL* respects, there is still room for improvement. Feedback to educators and learners, which is imperative to improving the understanding and application of SBA tasks, is still lacking.

The 55 instances of *NONE* and *LIMITED* compliance account for only 16% of the total evaluation. Overall, the educators met 280/335 (84%) of the sub-criteria, considering the four possible outcomes.

Please note that instances of *LIMITED* compliance can potentially be converted to 'most' compliance if the PEDs identify the LAs and AET centres affected, and work closely with the educators to implement an improvement strategy.

## B. LEARNERS' PORTFOLIOS OF EVIDENCE

The findings for the moderation of the learner portfolios, based on four criteria, are indicated in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4 Quantitative Analysis of the Learner Portfolios

CRITERION	LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE (out of 67)			
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
6. Structure of content	<b>0</b> instances	<b>6</b> instances 1 EMSC (NC) 1 LCEN (WC) 1 LCTS (LP) 1 MLMS (FS) 1 MMSC (KZN) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>54</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs	<b>7</b> instances 1 AAAT (MP) 2 ANCH(2MP) 4 NATS (KZN; 3 LP)
7. Assessment tasks	<b>2</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 1 NATS(KZN)	<b>6</b> instances 1 LCEN (WC) 1 LCTS (NC) 4 NATS (KZN)	<b>15</b> instances 1 ANCH (NC) 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 1 EMSC (FS) 1 HSSC (MP) 2 LCEN (NW; NC) 1 MLMS (FS) 3 MMSC (KZN; FS; MP) 2 SMME (FS; WC) 2 WHRT(FS; MP)	<b>44</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs
8. Assessment according to agreed criteria	<b>3</b> instances 1 ECD (MP) 1 LCEN (NW) 1 NATS (KZN)	<b>11</b> instances 4 LCTS (NC;3NW) 7 NATS (4KZN; 3LP)	<b>14</b> instances 1 ARTS (MP) 1 ECD (KZN) 1 EMSC (NC) 2 HSSC (MP; NC) 1 INCT (KZN) 1 MLMS (FS) 1 MMSC (FS) 1 NATS (KZN) 1 SMME (WC) 1 TVRT (KZN) 3WHRT (FS; 2MP)	<b>39</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs

CRITERION	LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE (out of 67)			
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
9. Appropriate use of marking guidelines	<b>5</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 2 LCEN (NW, NC) 1 TVRT (KZN)	<b>17</b> instances 1 LCEN (WC) 9 LCTS (NC; 2NC; 3NW; 3LP) 2 NATS (KZN) 1 SMME (FS) 3 TVRT (1FS; 2NC) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>18</b> instances 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 1 EMSC (NC) 3 HSSC (MP; NC; WC) 1 LCEN (NC) 2 LIFO(MP) 1 MMSC (FS) 3 NATS(KZN) 3 SMME (1WC; 2NW) 2 WHRT (FS; MP)	<b>27</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs
10. Completion of assessment tasks	<b>1</b> instance 1 INCT (KZN)	<b>3</b> instances 2 LCEN (WC; NC) 1 NATS (KZN)	<b>22</b> instances 1 ARTS (WC) 1 ECD (MP) 2 EMSC (FS; NC) 3 HSSC (2MP; NC) 3 LCEN (WC; NC; NW) 1 LCTS (NC) 1 MLMS (FS) 1 MMSC (NC) 3 NATS(KZN) 3 SMME (FS; 2WC) 3 WHRT (FS; 2MP)	<b>41</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs
11. Interpretation of tasks	<b>3</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 1 MMSC (NC) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>8</b> instances 1 ECD (MP) 1 MLMS (FS) 1 MMSC (FS) 4 NATS(KZN) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>17</b> instances 3 ANCH (KZN; MP; NC) 1 ECD (KZN) 3 EMSC (FS; 2NC) 2 HSSC (MP; NC) 1 LCEN (WC) 1 MMSC (KZN) 1 NATS(KZN) 4 TVRT(KZN; FS; 2NC) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>39</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs

CRITERION	LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE (out of 67)			
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
12. Demands of task	<b>2</b> Instances 1 INCT (KZN) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>10</b> instances 3 LCEN (WC; 2NW) 1 MLMS (FS) 1 MMSC (MP) 4 NATS (KZN) 1 WHRT (FS)	<b>26</b> instances 3 ANCH (KZN; MP; NC) 1 ARTS (WC) 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 3 EMSC (FS; 2NC) 3 HSSC (MP; NC; WC) 1 LCEN (NC) 2 MMSC (FS; KZN) 3 NATS (LP) 2 SMME (FS;WC) 4 TVRT (KZN; FS; 2NC) 2 WHRT (MP)	<b>29</b> Instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs
13. Response to cognitive levels	<b>5</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 1 LCEN (WC) 1 MMSC (MP) 1 NATS (KZN) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>3</b> instances 1 MMSC (FS) 2 WHRT (FS; MP)	<b>20</b> instances 3 ANCH (KZN; MP; NC) 1 ECD (KZN) 2 EMSC (FS; NC) 3 HSSC (MP; NC; WC) 1 INCT (KZN) 1 LCEN (NW) 1 MLMS (FS) 1 MMSC (KZN) 4 NATS (KZN; 3LP) 1 SMME (WC) 2 TVRT (NC)	<b>39</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs
14. Consistency of marking with tool	<b>3</b> instances 1 LCEN (NW) 2 TVRT (KZN; NC)	<b>6</b> instances 2 LCEN (WC; NW) 1 NATS (KZN) 2 TVRT (NC) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>23</b> instances 1 ANCH (MP) 2 ARTS (MP; WC) 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 1 EMSC (NC) 3 HSSC (MP; NC; WC) 1 LCEN (NC) 1 MMSC (FS) 6 NATS (3KZN; 3LP) 4 SMME (1FS; 1WC; 2NW) 2 WHRT (FS; MP)	<b>35</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs, with the exception of ARTS; LCEN; SMME; TVRT; and WHRT

CRITERION	LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE (out of 67)			
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
15. Quality and standard of marking	<b>6</b> instances 2 LCEN (NW) 1 NATS (KZN) 2 TVRT (FS; NC) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>13</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 1 LCEN (WC) 6 LCTS (2NC; 2NW; 2LP) 4 NATS (3KZN; LP) 1 SMME (WC)	<b>23</b> instances 1 ANCH (MP) 1 ARTS (MP) 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 1 EMSC (NC) 3HSSC (MP; NC; WC) 1 LCEN (NC) 4 LCTS(MP; 3NW) 1 MMSC(FS) 3 NATS (KZN; 2LP) 3 SMME (FS; 2NW) 1 TVRT (NC) 2 WHRT (FS; MP)	<b>25</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs, with the exception of HSSC; LCEN; NATS; SMME; TVRT; and WHRT
16. Learner performance	<b>4</b> instances 1 LCEN (NW) 2 TRVT (KZN; NC) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>6</b> instances 1 INCT (KZN) 5 NATS (3KZN; 2LP)	<b>17</b> instances 1 ARTC (MP) 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 1 EMSC (NC) 3 HSSC (MP; NC; WC) 1 INCT (KZN) 1 LCEN (NW; WC) 1 MMSC (FS) 1 NATS (KZN) 3 SMME (FS; 2NW) 1 TVRT (NC) 2 WHRT (FS;MP)	<b>40</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs, with the exception of HSSC; LCEN; SMME; TVRT; and WHRT
17 Accuracy of recording and transfer of marks	<b>5</b> instances 1 LCEN (NC) 1 MMSC (KZN; MP) 2 TRVT (KZN; NC) 1 WHRT (FS)	<b>4</b> instances 1LCEN (WC) 1MMSC (FS) 1NATS (KZN) 1TVRT (KZN)	<b>17</b> instances 2 ANCH (MP) 2 ARTC (MP;WC) 2 ECD (KZN; MP) 1 EMSC (NC) 2 NCT (KZN) 2 LCEN (NW) 1 NATS (KZN) 4 SMME (FS; WC; 2NW) 1 WHRT (MP)	<b>41</b> instances Fairly spread across all PEDs and LAs, with the exception of HSSC; LCEN; SMME; TVRT; and WHRT

## QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF LEARNER PORTFOLIOS

### C6. Structure of content

- The portfolios were generally structured and presented well. There were concerns because some portfolios did not contain copies of IDs, signed declarations of authenticity and assessment plans.

### C7. Assessment tasks

- This criterion evaluates the completeness, correctness and quality of the work presented by the learners.
- Overall the portfolios presented met the minimum requirements in all respects, with a compliance rating of 44/67.
- In the cases where portfolios met *MOST* of the criteria, the judgement was based on learner portfolios not containing sufficient evidence of all tasks.
- There were some serious concerns in respect of the portfolios presented for INCT4 and NATS4 regarding learners' copying tasks.
- Overall, the moderators were satisfied with the portfolios presented.

### C8. Assessment according to agreed criteria

- During the preparation of learners for assessment, the assessment process, tasks and tools are discussed with the learners to ensure that the principles of assessment are met. This criterion measures whether the manner in which the assessments were conducted were aligned with the assessment criteria agreed upon.
- In the 14 instances of *LIMITED* and *NO* compliance, educators deviated from the agreed assessment tools, in particular in disregarding the criteria in rubrics and allocating marks in a random fashion.

### C9. Appropriate use of marking guidelines

- The inappropriate use of marking guidelines was a concern as reports indicated a total of 10 instances of *NO* compliance and another 17 of *LIMITED* compliance. This accounted for 40% of the sample.
- The findings show that inappropriate use of marking guidelines related to educators finding it difficult to interpret and apply rubrics and matrices correctly. This led to educators inflating marks and allocating marks for inappropriate responses from learners, and inconsistencies in marking.
- The LAs affected were INCT4; LCEN4; LCTS4; NATS4; SMME4; TRVT4; and WHRT4.

### **C10. Completion of assessment tasks**

- The level of compliance with this criterion was very good, with 41 instances of compliance in ALL respects and 22 instances of compliance in MOST respects. This accounts for 63/67 (94%) instances where learners had completed all the tasks, with a few exceptions where learners did not complete all tasks sufficiently.
- In the four instances where the centres scored NO and LIMITED compliance, there was no evidence of some tasks and limited evidence that all tasks were completed sufficiently.

### **C11. Interpretation of tasks**

- Overall learners interpreted tasks adequately; however, some learners were challenged by task interpretation. The misinterpretation could have been a result of lack of proficiency in English.
- Evidence suggests that the interpretation of tasks deemed to be problematic related directly to questions that required interpretation, reasoning and problem solving.
- In the instances of LIMITED compliance for NATS4, there was evidence that suggested that the learners interpreted the tasks with assistance. The EM therefore could not, with certainty, determine that learners were able to interpret tasks adequately.
- Lack of evidence in some portfolios led to the EM not being able to pass valid judgement on the interpretation of tasks.

### **C12. Demands of task**

- The 55 instances of compliance in MOST and in ALL respects indicated that most learners met the demands of the tasks.
- Misinterpretation of questions accounted for the 12 instances where learners did not meet the demands of the tasks.

### **C13. Response to cognitive levels**

- In most instances 59/67 (88%) were able to respond appropriately to the cognitive demands of the tasks.
- In MMSC4 in both the FS and MP, learners did not cope well with activities that required complex procedures and problem solving abilities.
- It was difficult for the EM of NATS4 to determine the learners' ability to respond to higher level cognitive activities because there was evidence of learners having completed tasks with assistance.

#### **C14. Consistency of marking with assessment tool**

- Adherence to the marking tool was a challenge for some educators in tasks that required the use of rubrics. In the case of ECD4 and INCT4 there was no evidence to support judgement on the rubric. In general, where the use of a rubric was problematic, educators either misinterpreted or did not understand the criteria of the rubric and thus used it inappropriately, or opted not to use it at all.
- Marking was generally inconsistent with the marking tool for Tasks 3, 4 and 5 of the NATS4 SBA tasks.
- In TRVT4, non-compliance with the demands of the marking tool was especially evident in interpretative questions. Educators steered away from the marking guidelines and awarded marks according to their own interpretation. It was of particular concern to the external moderator that this was not discovered by the internal moderators.
- Adherence to the marking instruments for LCEN4 was a major challenge not only for the educator, but also for the moderators. Educators tended to ignore most task instructions, which led to instances of gross over-marking and inconsistencies in marks for the same work.

#### **C15. Quality and standard of marking**

- In 19/67 (28%) instances, marking was not up to standard. This was mostly due to inappropriate use of marking guidelines, matrices and rubrics.
- The absence of learner evidence that matches the rubrics used makes it difficult to verify the quality of marking in ECD4 and INCT4.
- Incorrect use of rubrics to evaluate the writing pieces in LCEN4 in WC compromised the quality and standard of marking and made it impossible to evaluate the performance of the learner. The educator and internal moderators of two sites in WC ignored the rubric and awarded learners credit for substandard work.
- In the moderation sample for LCTS4, the quality of marking of nine of the 10 sites was compromised because the required matrix was not used.

#### **C16. Learner performance**

- Moderator reports show that learner performances were good. However, it is a fair assumption that the PEDs sent the best portfolios for moderation. These, therefore, may not have been a true reflection of the learner population.
- Moderation reports for ECD4; LCEN4; EMSC4; INCT4; LCEN4; NATS4; TRVT4; and WHRT4 indicate that marking errors may have inflated the results of some learners.

## **C17. Accuracy of recording and transfer of marks**

- This criterion measures the accuracy of calculations, recording and transfer of marks.
- The majority of sites, 58/67, complied *FULLY* or in *MOST* respects with this criterion. The instances of *LIMITED* or *NO* compliance account for sites where marksheets were not included in educator or learner portfolios.

An analysis of both Tables 2.3 and 2.4 indicates that LCEN4; MMSC4; NATS4; TVRT4; and WHRT4 were areas of concern as educators and learners had insufficient evidence to prove compliance in most criteria.

The 22 instances of *NO* compliance or *LIMITED* compliance in the appropriate use of marking guidelines, together with the lack of consistency and quality in marking as a result of inappropriate use of rubrics and matrices, indicates that the quality of marking did not meet the criteria. Given the weighting of the SBA mark, this non-performance has critical implications.

Learner performance is another concern. Although only 10 of the instances of non-compliance with this criterion have been identified, the moderator reports relating to this criterion indicated that inappropriate use of marking guidelines resulted in educators having difficulty interpreting and applying rubrics and matrices correctly. This led to educators inflating marks and allocating marks for inappropriate responses from learners, resulting in inconsistencies in marking. The LAs affected were INCT4; LCEN4; LCTS4; NATS4; SMME4; TRVT4; and WHRT4. Learners had difficulties in both LCAF4 and LCEN4.

## **4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

1. The external moderators agreed that there had been a decided improvement in the quality of the educator and learner portfolios presented. However, they could identify few examples of particularly good practice.
2. An analysis of the evidence found in educator portfolios was that many educators and district officials were meticulous in ensuring that educator portfolios contained all relevant documents as per policy requirements. This was an improvement, since this issue had been raised as a concern in previous evaluation reports. However, this did not mean that the quality and standard of internal assessment had improved.

## **5. AREAS OF CONCERN**

1. The presentation of learner portfolios can be improved. Insufficient attention was given to technical aspects, such as the inclusion of copies of learner IDs and signed declarations that verify the authenticity of work presented. An inability to guarantee the authenticity of candidates' SBA marks undermines the integrity of the marks awarded.
2. There was no evidence of formal feedback to learners after the educators had assessed the portfolio. Providing feedback is an essential part of formative assessment practices. At best, the feedback provided appeared to have been ad hoc and inconsistent across all provinces and all learning areas.
3. Some aspects of internal moderation, as with all quality assurance of assessment processes, remain a concern. Although there was evidence of internal moderation at different levels, the internal moderation report was still merely a checklist. Feedback to educators was rarely done and, in cases where reports did contain feedback, the quality of the feedback would not ensure an improvement in the assessment system.
4. Evidence suggested that many assessors (educators) did not understand how to interpret and apply marking rubrics.

## **6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT**

1. The DHET must implement a strategy to continuously communicate to all district officials and centre personnel the importance of a properly compiled and presented portfolio of evidence. Internal moderation must be strengthened to ensure that all portfolios contain the relevant supporting documents.
2. The DHET must implement processes to ensure that feedback is provided to learners to improve the quality and standard of formative assessment.
3. The DHET must investigate the ineffective internal moderation across all provinces and implement a strategy to improve the depth and rigour of internal moderation.
4. The main challenges were poor understanding and interpretation of the marking rubrics. As an alternative, the DHET could consider replacing marking rubrics with marking guidelines.

## Chapter 3

### Monitoring of Writing

#### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The DHET offered examinations for 26 LAs towards the GETC: ABET L4 qualification in all nine provinces from 3–25 November 2014. Umalusi monitored the conduct of the writing of these examinations. This report summarises all the activities as they transpired during the writing of examinations, lists areas of good practice and those that need to be improved, and recommends a course of action to improve performance and delivery.

#### 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

Umalusi deployed 68 monitors to visit a sample of 125 examination centres for the writing phase of the examination. All nine provinces were included in the monitoring exercise, as illustrated in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Monitoring of Writing

PROVINCE	DISTRICT	# CENTRES MONITORED
Northern Cape	Namaqua	2
	Mgcawu	2
	Frances Baard	1
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>5</b>
Western Cape	Metro North	4
	Cape Winelands	1
	Eden Central Karoo	2
	Metro Central	1
	Metro South	2
	Overberg	1
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>11</b>
Eastern Cape	East London	3
	King Williams Town	6
	Dutywa	1
	Libode	1
	Queenstown	2
	Port Elizabeth	1

PROVINCE	DISTRICT	# CENTRES MONITORED
Eastern Cape	Uitenhage	1
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>15</b>
Free State	Thabo Mofutsanyana	8
	Lejweleputswa	4
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>12</b>
North West	Bojanala	2
	Ngaka Modiri Molema	2
	Dr Ruth S Mompati	2
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>6</b>
Mpumalanga	Nkangala	9
	Ehlanzeni	2
	Gert Sibande	3
	Bohlabela	1
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>15</b>
Limpopo	Mopani	3
	Capricorn	5
	Vhembe	4
	Waterberg	2
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>14</b>
KwaZulu-Natal	Umlazi	1
	uMgungundlovu	1
	Amajuba	2
	Umlazi	4
	Amajuba	5
	Umzinyathi	1
	uMgungundlovu	2
	Ugu/ Port Shepstone	4
	iLembe	1
	iLembe	3
	uThungulu	2
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>26</b>
Gauteng	Tshwane North	5
	Tshwane South	6
	Tshwane West	4
	Gauteng East	2
	Johannesburg Central	2
	IEB - Parktown	2
	<b>PED TOTAL:</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Number of Centres Monitored:</b>		<b>125</b>

The monitoring exercise involved the observation and evaluation of examination administration activities: the receipt, storage and return of question papers and answer scripts, preparation of examination venues, conduct of candidates, invigilation of the examination, and management of procedures.

Monitors evaluated whether any examination administration procedures were compromised, resulting in an irregularity, and reported on how irregularities were managed and resolved. Monitors reported on how invigilators addressed candidate-related irregularities during the writing process, and how these were reported to the circuit/district offices and PEDs.

Below are some of the key areas that the monitoring instrument for the writing phase of the examination evaluated:

- General management of the examination
- The examination room – seating of candidates
- Before the commencement of the examination
- The writing of the examination
- Packaging and transport of answer scripts
- Internal monitoring.

Each key area had a set of specific questions with which to evaluate the effectiveness of its planning, administration and management. The findings below unpack these key areas into specific sub-deliverables.

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

#### **(a) Delivery and storage of examination material**

Modes of delivery of examination materials to centres varied in the different provinces, ranging from collection from nodal points by chief invigilators, direct delivery to centres by departmental officials and delivery by courier. In all provinces, the chief invigilators were responsible for accepting and recording all materials received and submitted. All centres visited had received sealed question papers and none reported any tampering with the seal. In most centres monitored, proper records were not kept of materials received. Copies of such records were supposedly kept at the nodal point. This could not be verified by the monitors.

Some centres were equipped with strong rooms and rooms secured with burglar bars, while some used steel cabinets in which to store examination material. Most AET centres did not have secure facilities, since many use public schools or community facilities as they do not own their venues.

## **(b) Invigilator training**

The chief invigilators in all provinces were properly appointed and, in most cases, their appointment letters were available. All chief invigilators were trained by the provincial office or district offices and evidence was available in most cases. However, there was no evidence of training at Rand Uranium AET in Gauteng and in many centres in KwaZulu-Natal.

There was evidence that chief invigilators in most centres had trained invigilators and relief invigilators. There was concern, however, about the content and intensity of such training as it was not uniformly applied. Some centres indicated that training had taken about two hours (Legatelle AET Centre) while in others it reportedly took a full day (Seshego Hospital AET). Many centres did not have relief invigilators available, particularly in the smaller centres with fewer educators.

## **(c) Preparation of the examination room**

Invigilators in the centres monitored arrived early at the examination rooms, generally 30 minutes to an hour before writing. There was, therefore, sufficient time to carry out the necessary activities before writing commenced. Most centres had adequate facilities for writing: they were clean, with low levels of noise and sufficient lighting. However, a centre in Lichtenburg in North West used furniture suitable for primary school children, not adults. In Mkhangelisi Adult Centre in Western Cape, two candidates shared a chair. At Mashaeng Adult Centre in Free State and Katinka Adult Centre in Northern Cape, long tables were shared by candidates.

The creation of proper seating plans for an examination written on a particular day presented a challenge in most centres. Many simply used attendance registers as seating plans, while those that had seating plans did not match candidates to desks. This made it difficult to establish where individual candidates were seated.

Most invigilators, across many centres, did not wear name tags, making it difficult for monitors to identify them. Many centres monitored had examination files, many of which were up-to-date. However, many centres in Western Cape had no files available and those that were, were in a serious state of disorganisation. Most also lacked crucial documents required during exams.

Some candidates at some centres did not have ID or admission letters to identify them. In such cases, the candidates were instructed to present these after writing to conclude the process of properly identifying them. There was also a lack of consistency in checking candidates' documentation prior to admission into the exam rooms. In

most centres, documents were checked only once candidates were seated. This was contrary to policy, which stipulates that such documents must be verified before candidates are admitted to the exam room.

Copies of forms for completion and examination reports were lacking in centres in all nine provinces. The importance of including these must be stressed during the training of chief invigilators.

Question papers were opened by chief invigilators in front of the candidates in all centres except Rand Uranium Adult Centre in Gauteng, where the question papers, opened earlier, arrived at the centre unsealed. This demands investigation. The invigilator to candidate ratio was adhered to at all centres except Kwa-Thema AET in Gauteng on 17/11/2014, where the ratio was noted to be 1:50.

#### **(d) Time management**

In most centres monitored, question papers arrived in the examination rooms at least 30 minutes before the stipulated writing time. Exceptions were Bosele Adult Centre in Free State and Hammanskraal Adult Centre in Gauteng. Candidates were admitted to the examination rooms between 30 minutes and one hour before the examination started. Answer sheets were distributed to the candidates at 13:30 in most cases, with variations of a few minutes in some centres. In all centres monitored, candidates were given the required 10 minutes' reading time, with the exceptions of Bosele Adult Centre (Free State) and Hammanskraal Adult Centre (Gauteng) where, due to the late arrival of invigilators, this was not possible.

#### **(e) Activities during writing**

The examinations started at the stipulated times except at Rand Uranium AET in Gauteng, Loubors in Northern Cape and two other centres in Western Cape, where they began 20–30 minutes late. The main reason was poor time management. In all centres monitored, all invigilators were attentive and mobile. Where candidates left the room during the examination to use the toilet, they were escorted by an invigilator or relief invigilator. In some Gauteng centres, candidates were required to complete forms indicating their times of departure and return. However, at Rand Uranium AET in Gauteng and in one centre in Western Cape, candidates were not escorted to the toilets.

Script collection was done correctly by the invigilators while candidates remained seated. In almost all centres, candidates were released after all scripts were collected.

**(f) Packaging and transmission of scripts after writing**

Scripts were counted and packed in the examination rooms where candidates wrote and in all cases only the chief invigilator and invigilators were involved. Scripts were packed in the same sequence as indicated on the marksheet and at all centres, scripts tallied with the candidates confirmed as present in the attendance register. Scripts were sealed in the plastic pockets supplied for that purpose before leaving the room. Dispatch forms, as supplied, were also completed, for submission with the scripts to the nodal points in most centres.

The Umalusi monitor was prevented from observing the packing process at the Chaiwelo Adult Centre in Gauteng. Many centres did not write incident reports for the examinations. Answer books were either dispatched to nodal points immediately after packing, the latest being at 5.45 p.m., or, where a courier service was used, these were locked in a strong room for collection the following day.

**(g) Monitoring by the assessment body**

In general, there was limited monitoring by the assessment body at the GETC centres. In cases where monitoring did take place, no visitor or site reports were provided, so there was no record of issues checked, and/or findings. It was particularly disturbing that centres that experienced many problems, like Rand Uranium AET in Gauteng, had not been monitored in the last two years. It was notable that Umalusi had paid more visits to some AET centres than the assessment body had, especially in rural centres.

**(h) Irregularities**

Almost all examination centres had a provincial/district policy regarding the management of irregularities. There were examples of good practice, but these were exceptions to the rule. Too many centres did not record and/or report all irregularities observed by Umalusi monitors.

The monitor reported possible cribbing and sharing of desks at Dawn Ridge Centre and Siyakhula Centre in KwaZulu-Natal.

#### **4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

1. None noted.

#### **5. AREAS OF CONCERN**

1. The storage of question papers and examination materials remain a concern as many centres do not have storage rooms with adequate security in place.
2. The transportation of examination material using public transport in Eastern Cape is a serious risk.
3. Inconsistency regarding proper seating plans remains a concern. Too many centres allowed candidates to choose where to sit, recording the end result as a seating plan. Where candidates sat was often inadequately recorded and latecomers were inconsistently recorded.
4. A candidate being allowed to write without proper identification is a serious irregularity.
5. The examinations started late at one centre in the Northern Cape, one centre in Gauteng and at two centres in the Western Cape. These were not reported as irregularities.
6. The invigilators at Bosele Adult Centre in Free State and Hammanskraal Adult Centre in Gauteng demonstrated poor understanding of examination regulations: they arrived late with the question papers, did not check the question papers for technical correctness and did not read the rules and regulations to the candidates before the commencement of the examination.
7. It is a concern that the centres monitored in the Western Cape did not have any copies of examination policies and regulations. The centres also could not provide any evidence of planning for the conduct of the examination.
8. That some centres kept scripts overnight (after the writing phase) and the security thereof is a concern.
9. The opening of question papers other than in the examination room at Rand Uranium AET in Gauteng is a serious concern.
10. The Umalusi monitor was refused permission to witness the packing process at the Chaiwelo Adult Centre in Gauteng.
11. Marksheets were missing at the Siya Phakane Adult Centre in Eastern Cape.

## 6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

1. The DHET must implement a strategy to improve the security of question papers at the examination centres that do not meet the minimum security requirements.
2. The DHET must effectively address the concern in the Eastern Cape where question papers were transported by officials using public transport.
3. The DHET must provide provinces with a template to plan seating arrangements. Provincial examination officials must audit the seating plans during the state-of-readiness visits.
4. The DHET must put measures in place to ensure that no candidate is allowed to write the examination without proper identification.
5. The DHET must enforce policy to ensure that examination centres adhere to the scheduled examination times.
6. The training of all invigilators must be given top priority, especially at Bosele Adult Centre in Free State and Hammanskraal Adult Centre in Gauteng.
7. The state-of-readiness audits must identify centres that are not ready to conduct the national examination and implement adequate measures to address the shortcomings.
8. The DHET must investigate why some centres only submit the answer scripts a day or two after the writing of the examination, and put measures in place to prevent this from happening.
9. The DHET must investigate the incident at Rand Uranium AET in Gauteng where the question papers were allegedly opened prior to their arrival at the examination centre. The DHET must provide Umalusi with a report in this regard.
10. The DHET must provide Umalusi with a report as to why the Umalusi monitor was prevented from doing his duty at Chaiwelo Adult Centre in Gauteng.
11. The DHET must provide Umalusi with a report regarding the missing marksheets at Siya Phakane Adult Centre in Eastern Cape.

### Notes

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Chapter 4

### Monitoring of Marking

#### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This chapter reflects on the monitoring of marking as conducted in seven provinces across the country. It provides an assessment of how marking was conducted in different centres and different provinces, identifies areas of good practice and flags areas of concern that need to be addressed.

#### 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

Umalusi monitors visited eight marking centres in seven provinces to evaluate the marking process of the GETC: ABET L4. Six of the provinces monitored had one marking centre dedicated to the marking of the GETC: ABET L4 scripts, while KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape had three marking centres each.

Table 4.1 Monitoring of Marking

PROVINCE	MONITOR	NAME OF CENTRE	LEARNING AREAS MARKED	# SCRIPTS	# MARKERS
Eastern Cape	SS Nongogo	St John's College	MLMS4 and MMSC4	1 378	3
Free State	GM Masitsa	Paul Erasmus High School	All 26 GETC: ABET L4 LAs	26 782	167
Gauteng	JJ Mabotja	Roosevelt High School	All 26 GETC: ABET L4 LAs offered in Gauteng	30 044	197
KwaZulu-Natal	F Gqabashe	Harding Secondary	LCEN4, AAAT4, NATS4 and EMSC4	21 336	146
	M Sader	Estcourt High School	MLMS4, MMSC4, LIFO, HSSC4, TRVT4, LCXH4, SMME4 and LCAF4	29 746	205
Limpopo	MP Mamabolo	Northern Academy	All 26 GETC: ABET L4 LAs	17 921	70
Mpumalanga	SJ Hlatshwayo	Izimbali Combined School	All 26 GETC: ABET L4 LAs	30 926	121
Northern Cape	M Venter	William Pescod High School	All 26 GETC: ABET L4 LAs	5 692	28

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

#### **(a) Planning for marking**

All marking monitored centres had marking plans which were provided by the provincial office. The plans indicated all marking activities and the dates on which marking was to take place. The marking centre managers adhered to the scheduled dates. Once started, centres proceeded with marking without any disturbance, except at the Northern Academy in Limpopo where markers went on strike on 30 November because of salary issues. However, their concerns were resolved and they returned to work.

#### **(b) The marking centre**

In the seven provinces monitored, schools with boarding facilities were used as marking centres, to accommodate the markers. Additionally, the boarding schools were equipped with kitchens to cater for markers' food requirements. In Northern Cape, markers were accommodated at a guest house. In Gauteng only, markers were not accommodated on the premises of the marking centre and commuted daily from home.

All monitored centres had communication facilities available, such as telephones, fax machines and internet connections, as well as printers and scanners. They had sufficient and suitable class rooms and halls in which to mark and enough desks and chairs.

#### **(c) Safety and security of examination material**

All centres had security personnel at the gates and access was granted only after searches of vehicles and individuals met their requirements.

Only dummy scripts were used for training purposes, with "live" scripts securely locked away to ensure none were lost. Scripts were stored in a scripts control room at all centres monitored. Scripts were carried from the control room to the marking rooms by examination assistants (EAs), closely monitored by chief markers and escorted by security guards.

The chief marker signed off when collecting scripts from the script control room and the official releasing the scripts counter-signed. The whereabouts of scripts were therefore known at all times. Marking personnel were not permitted to remove scripts from the marking rooms at any of the centres monitored.

#### **(d) Marking personnel**

In all provinces monitored the most common criteria for appointing markers was a minimum of two years' experience teaching the learning area at ABET Level 4. Matric and/or current enrolment at a tertiary institution were the minimum criteria for appointing EAs. For administrative work, such as in the scripts control room and as drivers and data capturers, administration clerks from district and circuit offices were considered.

#### **(e) The training of markers**

Training of marking personnel started with the chief markers and internal moderators pre-marking a minimum of 20 scripts, in preparation for the national memo discussions held at Indlela, near Olifantsfontein, in Gauteng. Once the national memorandum was approved and signed, it was taken to the provinces for implementation.

At provincial level, it was the duty of the chief markers, assisted by the internal moderator, to train the markers. Their training generally began on the day of arrival with a discussion, on all subjects, about the question paper and memorandum. The aim was to arrive at a common understanding of both the questions and the memo designed for marking those questions.

Once understanding was reached, the process of marking dummy scripts followed until all marking errors were reduced to an acceptable level. Subsequently, real marking began. Markers were not subjected to competency tests in any provinces as unions are apparently against this practice.

#### **(f) Marking procedure**

All scripts were stored in the script control room. The chief marker of each LA collected a certain number of boxes containing batches of scripts for marking. These were carried by EAs and escorted by security guards who would ensure that the boxes were taken straight to the stipulated marking room.

In all the centres monitored and in all LAs, markers chose the question marking model, whereby each marker was allocated a specific question to mark instead of marking an entire script.

No changes to any subject memoranda were allowed at the marking centres, no matter how genuine the need.

### **(g) Handling of irregularities**

In all centres, markers were trained to identify and report any irregularity during the marking session. Any suspected irregularity should be brought to the attention of the chief marker to determine whether the incident would qualify as an irregularity. Once such a determination was made, the issue must then be reported to the office of the marking centre manager for further action and possible escalation to the Provincial Examination Irregularities Committee (PEIC).

Only in Mpumalanga were a few technical irregularities reported at the time of monitoring the marking process.

### **(h) Marking reports**

All chief markers and internal moderators completed qualitative reports about marking and the general performance of candidates in their respective LAs for submission to the provincial office. Markers did not write individual reports, but their views on general marking were sought and included in the final report, compiled by the chief markers and internal moderators. These reports were written using a template to ensure minimum standards. In some subjects the report was prepared only by the internal moderator.

### **(i) Electronic capturing of marks**

The electronic capturing of marks was centralised at the provincial offices. PED officials collected the scripts and mark sheets from marking centres on a daily basis. The double capturing system was used by all provinces to eliminate errors during the capturing phase.

### **(j) Packing and transmission of documentation**

After scripts and mark allocations were checked by the EAs for errors these were returned to the script control room. The scripts were recorded and packaged for delivery to the provincial offices in the control rooms.

All marksheets were prepared and transported daily to the data capturing centre, with the exception of Limpopo, where marksheets were delivered every second day. All marksheets were photocopied and one copy was included with the scripts. Originals were used for capturing. Most centres kept a copy of the marksheet. An electronic register of dispatched marksheets was kept at the centre.

#### **4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

1. The security arrangements at all marking centres monitored was of an acceptable level.
2. The marking centres had adequate facilities and physical resources to facilitate marking.
3. The provincial marking centres had good management plans that were effectively implemented by the marking centre managers.
4. The collection, packing and dispatch of scripts and other examination material were done very well at the marking centres monitored.

#### **5. AREAS OF CONCERN**

1. The Northern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal experienced a shortage of markers as some did not report for duty. This was created by a situation where markers were appointed for two learning areas and had to choose which learning area to mark.
2. The training process of markers at Limpopo was disturbed on 30 November due to a demonstration by some markers.
3. Internal moderation of scripts was inconsistent across provinces and learning areas. Some chief markers moderated whole scripts while others only selected certain questions to moderate.

#### **6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT**

1. The DHET must ensure that markers are appointed by a predetermined date, giving sufficient time to address any possible issues before the commencement of marking.
2. The DHET must put measures in place to address labour-related issues, such as the payment of markers, to avoid markers demonstrating during the marking phase.
3. The DHET must standardise the internal moderation of scripts across all provincial marking centres.

#### **Notes**

---

---

---

---

---

# Chapter 5

---

## Memorandum Discussions

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The marking process involves a large number of people, each of whom may have a slightly different interpretation of the question paper and marking memorandum. Furthermore, each script marked is unique and a judgement of its adherence to the memorandum has to be made.

The memorandum discussion workshops create a platform for markers, chief markers, internal moderators and Umalusi's external moderators to discuss and approve the final marking instrument. This is the platform where all possible model answers are considered and taken into account.

The purpose of the workshops is to ensure that all possible variables are considered and that all role-players in the marking process adhere to the same marking standard and that all marking is fair, consistent and reliable.

### 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The external moderator for each learning area attended the memorandum discussion workshop to:

- (i) Ensure that the approved question paper was the one presented to candidates writing the examination;
- (ii) Guide the interpretation of the questions and the required answers;
- (iii) Approve the final memorandum to be used by all markers in a specific learning area.

The DHET facilitated memorandum discussions at Indlela, in Olifantsfontein, Gauteng, from 11–27 November 2014 for all 26 LAs. A total of 31 Umalusi moderators attended the memorandum discussion workshops for their specific learning area of expertise. The newly appointed moderators for LCEN4 (2), MLMS4 (2) and TECH4 (1) also attended the workshops.

The workshops are attended by the nine provincial internal moderators and chief markers for the specific learning area. Some provinces also invite the chief markers to attend the workshops. The size of the group for a learning area thus varies from 20–30 role-players.

The standardisation of the memoranda and marking guidelines takes into account the following criteria:

- C1. Outline the **processes and procedures** followed during the memorandum discussion. (Who chaired the session, when did it take place, etc.)
- C2. What **role** did you as **Umalusi moderator** play in the memorandum discussion?
- C3. Do the examination question paper and memorandum represent the **final version of the paper moderated and approved**, or conditionally approved, by Umalusi?
- C4. Were the **changes recommended** by you appropriately **amended in the marking memorandum**?
- C5. **Did the chief marker/s mark a sample of scripts**? Complete the table below.
- C6. Was the **chief marker's report** of the previous examination discussed at the memorandum discussion?
- C7. **Did all markers, examiners and internal moderators attend** the memorandum discussion?
- C8. **Did all markers, examiners and internal moderators come prepared** to the memorandum discussion, e.g. each having worked out/prepared possible answers?
- C9. Did each marker, examiner and internal moderator receive a **sample of scripts to mark**?
- C10. Were there any **changes and/or additions made to the marking memorandum** during the memorandum discussion? List the changes/ additions that were made.
- C11. What **impact** did the changes/additions have **on the cognitive level** of the answer/response required?
- C12. Were clear motivations provided for the changes/additions to the marking memorandum? Elaborate.
- C13. **Did you approve the changes/additions** to the marking memorandum? Elaborate.
- C14. Where a learning area is marked at more than one marking centre, **what measures are in place to ensure that changes to the memorandum are communicated effectively** and the same adjustments are implemented by all marking centres involved?
- C15. Were **minutes of the memorandum discussions** submitted to the marking centre manager/delegates at the memorandum discussion meeting?
- C16. Having gone through the memorandum discussion, **list the concerns/problems that were not appropriately addressed** during the setting and moderation process.
- C17. **Overall impression** and comments.

This report reflects on the findings for the key evaluation criteria used in the moderation instrument.

### **3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Overall the evaluation reports showed that internal moderators, chief markers and markers had a clear understanding of the purpose of the meetings and the role that they play in the marking process. Below is a summary of the findings for each criterion.

#### **C1. Outline the process and procedures followed during the memorandum discussion.**

- The memorandum discussion for a learning area is attended by the internal moderator, chief marker and markers from all nine PEDs. The number of participants depends on attendance.
- A DHET official started the sessions with a PowerPoint presentation to highlight marking principles and best practice. These sessions were interactive as attendees were encouraged to participate.
- Each session was chaired by a chief marker or person appointed by the team. The team systematically worked through the memorandum and discussed all possible answers for questions.

#### **C2. What role did you as Umalusi moderator play in the memorandum discussion?**

- The Umalusi moderator was asked to make a final decision when the team could not agree on a proposed answer.
- The external moderator gave advice on quality assurance.
- The external moderator approved the final marking memorandum.

#### **C3. Does the examination question paper and memorandum represent the final version of the paper moderated and approved, or conditionally approved, by you?**

- All external moderators reported that the memoranda and QPs presented at the workshops were the versions approved during the process of moderating the question papers.

**C4. Were the changes recommended by you appropriately amended in the marking memorandum?**

- Except those for LIFO4 and LCZU4, external moderators indicated there were no issues with their Directives for Compliance and Improvement being effected.

**C5. Did the chief markers mark a sample of scripts?**

Table 5.1 is a list of the learning areas and the number of scripts marked per learning area in the provinces by the chief markers and brought to the memorandum discussions.

It must be noted that chief markers did not pre-mark scripts in 15 LAs. The non-marking of dummy scripts and the five scripts per learning area pre-marked in three LAs in the Northern Cape is a concern. The pre-marking of scripts is one of the key responsibilities of chief markers.

*Table 5.1 Number of scripts pre-marked*

LA CODE	GP	EC	FS	KZN	LP	MP	NC	NW	WC
1. INCT4	8	19				10		20	
2. LCAF4	10	9				10	15		33
3. LCZU4	10			10		20			
4. LCVE4					7				
5. LCSO4	20	20							
6. LCTS4						20		20	
7. LIFO4	20	20		20	19	20	5	20	10
8. HSSC4	20			20		20	20		20
9. MLMS4	39	40	20	39	40	40	40		47
10. SMME4		20	20	20	20	18	5	20	33
11. TECH4	20	19	11	11	10	20	5	8	20

**C6. Was the chief marker's report on the previous examination discussed at the memorandum discussion?**

- Most chief markers did not bring their reports to the memorandum discussions. LAs that had reports included were LCTS4 and LIFO4, which highlighted those questions with which learners had encountered difficulties.

**C7. Did all markers/examiners and internal moderators attend the memorandum discussion?**

- The DHET is responsible for ensuring that the chief marker and internal moderators from all provinces attend the memorandum discussions. The attendance registers submitted by Umalusi moderators show that a majority of officials attended. There were no reports of any concern regarding this issue.

**C8. Did all markers, examiners and internal moderators come prepared to the memorandum discussion, e.g. each having worked out/prepared possible answers?**

- All external moderators reported that chief markers, internal moderators and markers involved in the process were well prepared, although not all had marked a sample of scripts.

**C9. Did each marker, examiner and internal moderator receive a sample of scripts to mark?**

- Not all officials marked a sample of scripts before the memorandum discussions. Table 5.1 above records the officials who had marked scripts in preparation for the memorandum discussions.

**C10. Where there any changes and/or additions made to the marking memorandum during the memorandum discussion? List the changes/additions that were made.**

- All external moderators reported that changes/additions were made to the marking guidelines. The changes/additions are listed in their individual reports. The majority of changes were not substantial and the external moderators approved the changes.

**C11. What Impact did the changes/additions have on the cognitive level of the answer/response required?**

- Changes that were made to the marking memorandum did not make significant differences to the cognitive levels of the LAs concerned.

**C12. Were clear motivations provided for the changes/additions to the marking memorandum? Elaborate.**

- Almost all LAs had changes effected, mostly to accommodate alternative responses.

**C13. Did you approve the changes/additions to the marking memorandum? Elaborate.**

- Umalusi's external moderators approved the changes made to the marking memorandum for their respective LAs, since the changes/amendments were mostly to accommodate alternative responses.

**C14. Where a learning area is marked at more than one marking centre, what measures are in place to ensure that changes to the memorandum are communicated effectively and the same adjustments are implemented by all marking centres involved?**

- Umalusi's external moderators approved and signed all marking memoranda. It was the DHET's responsibility to distribute these versions of the memoranda to all provincial marking centres. Marking was centralised in each province. The chief marker and internal moderator met with the markers before marking commenced.

**C15. Were minutes of the memorandum discussions submitted to the marking centre manager/delegates at the memorandum discussion meeting?**

- All external moderators who submitted reports to Umalusi included the minutes of the memorandum discussion process.

#### **4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

1. The planning, administration and management of the memorandum discussion workshops were efficient. The DHET official presented an overview of marking principles at each session. These presentations created a platform for the memorandum discussions.
2. The attendees in the groups of the 11 LAs that had pre-marked scripts agreed that this practice improved understanding of the variables that impact on marking.



## Chapter 6

### Verification of Marking

#### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Verification of marking is a critical process in the quality assurance of an examination because the marking process involves a large number of people, each of whom may have a slightly different interpretation of the question paper and marking memorandum.

Verification of marking validates the process of marking and determines whether marking has adhered to the marking guidelines approved by the external moderators after the memorandum discussions.

#### 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

Umalusi conducted both on-site and centralised verification of marking. The centralised verification of marking was based on a sample of 702 answer scripts, as detailed in Table 6.1. The sample included 9/26 LAs (35%) and was spread across eight provinces. Centralised moderation was conducted at Umalusi's premises, from 11–13 December 2014.

Table 6.1 Centralised Moderation of Marking

LA CODE	NO OF ANSWER SCRIPTS PER PED								LA Total
	EC	FS	GP	LP	MP	NC	NW	WC	
1.ANCH4	30					30		30	90
2.ARTC4			30			.	30	30	90
3.ECD4		30	20		10	.			60
4.EMSC4		30		22		30			82
5.LIFO4						30	30	30	90
6.NATS4		40	30	30					100
7.SMME4	40				20		15		75
8.TRVT4			30				15	30	75
9.WHRT4	10		30						40
<b>PED Total:</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>702</b>

It must be noted that Umalusi sent officials to the provinces to select the samples, at random, from the marksheets. The officials selected 100 scripts per learning area from the provinces indicated in Table 6.1. A total of 2 600 scripts was thus submitted for centralised external moderation. The moderators selected the 702 scripts to re-mark at random from the samples submitted.

Umalusi also conducted on-site moderation of marking in three provinces, as detailed in Table 6.2 below. The moderators for AAAT4, LCEN4, TECH4 and INCT4 live in the province in which they were asked to carry out on-site moderation.

Table 6.2 On-site Moderation of Marking

LA CODE	LP	MP	KZN	LA Total
1.AAAT4		82		82
2.LCEN4 (2 moderators)			180	180
3.TECH4			100	100
4.INCT4			100	100
5.MLMS4	80			80
<b>PED Total:</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>542</b>

#### Notes:

More moderators were identified to conduct on-site moderation but were unavailable for the following reasons:

1. The third moderator for CENG (KZN) was involved in the NSC marking process;
2. The second moderator for TECH4 (KZN) was involved in the NCV marking process;
3. The second MLMS4 (EC) moderator was a residential moderator in the NSC marking process;
4. The third MLMS4 (MP) moderator was involved in the NSC marking process.

The moderation of marking instrument is comprehensive and evaluates all the aspects of marking. Evaluation and reporting of marking focused on the following key aspects:

- C1. Was the marking memorandum adhered to?
- C2. Did the marking memorandum make provision for alternative responses?
- C3. Was there consistency in the allocation of marks and accuracy of totals?
- C4. Were any changes to the marking memorandum effected at the marking centre?
- C5. How do you rate the performance of the marker?
- C6. Was there evidence that marking was internally moderated?
- C7. Were there any questions that were inaccurately presented?

C8. Based on the responses from candidates, how did they find the paper?

C9. What is your recommendation regarding the adjustment of marks?

The moderation process evaluated adherence to agreed marking practices and standards. Moderation focused on the following aspects:

- Adherence to marking memoranda
- Consistency of mark allocations
- Quality and standard of marking
- Accuracy of mark totals
- Internal moderation.

In addition to the aforementioned aspects, the external moderators were asked to scrutinise the answer scripts for possible irregularities.

### 3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table 6.3 gives an overview of the evaluation process of the moderation of marking. The findings were based on the key criteria used in the instrument.

Table 6.3 Quantitative Analysis of Marking Verification findings

LA CODE	PROV	C1	C1.2	C2.1	C2.2	C4.1	C5.1
AAAT4	MP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ANCH4	EC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ANCH4	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ANCH4	WC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ARTC4	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ARTC4	NW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ARTC4	WC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ECD4	FS	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
ECD4	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
ECD4	MP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
EMSC4	FS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
EMSC4	LP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
EMSC4	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
INCT4	KZN	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
LCEN4	KZN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
LIFO4	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
LIFO4	NW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
LIFO4	WC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

LA CODE	PROV	C1	C1.2	C2.1	C2.2	C4.1	C5.1
MLMS4	KZN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NATS4	FS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NATS4	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NATS4	LP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
SMME4	EC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
SMME4	MP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
SMME4	NW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
TECH4	KZN	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
TVRT4	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
TVRT4	NW	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
TVRT4	WC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
WHRT4	EC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
WHRT4	GP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

An analysis of the sample of marking verified by the external moderators shows that overall the quality and standard of marking was very good. It is, however, necessary to give a more detailed explanation of the evaluation findings.

### 1. Adherence to marking memorandum

The moderators reported that markers used the memoranda that were approved and signed-off by Umalusi moderators during the memorandum discussion workshops at Indlela in Gauteng, conducted from 11–27 November 2014.

### 2. Consistency and accuracy

The marking of the GETC: ABET L4 answer scripts was conducted at the centralised provincial marking centres. Collectively, the nine provinces used 13 marking centres. Each province used one marking centre, except for KwaZulu-Natal and Eastern Cape, which had three marking centres each.

Umalusi's moderation of marking confirmed that marking across all provincial marking centres was generally consistent and accurate.

### 3. Quality and standard of marking

External moderators were satisfied that marking was of an acceptable quality and standard. There was, however, evidence of some poor administration regarding the adding and recording of sub-totals and totals.

#### 4. Internal moderation

There was evidence that internal moderation was conducted but that this process did not always note and/or correct incorrect mark allocations. Internal moderation also did not record and report any irregularities, such as learners being assisted during the writing phase of the examination.

#### 5. Candidates' performance

External moderation identified that some learners in the learning areas sampled had difficulty responding to 'True'/'False' and multiple choice questions. The external moderator for NATS4 noted that learner performance in the Free State was below the expected standard.

#### 6. Findings and suggestions

External moderation confirmed that question papers were fair as these covered most of the syllabi. The question papers were pitched at the correct cognitive levels and as such did not disadvantage any learners.

#### 7. Adjustment of marks

External moderators recommended that the raw marks be adjusted, mainly upwards, for ANHC4, INCT4 and MLMS4 by 5, 7 and 6 marks respectively; a downward adjustment of 5 marks was recommended for LCEN4. The external moderators for the remaining 10 LAs recommended that the raw marks be awarded.

#### 8. Irregularities

The samples moderated identified incidents of alleged irregularities, as detailed in Table 6.4 below.

Table 6.4 Irregularities Register

LA CODE	PROVINCE	CENTRE	IRREGULARITY
EMSC4	Limpopo	7642509	EMSC4: Similar handwriting in 5 different scripts
NATS	Limpopo	7642509	NATS4: Similar handwriting as above in 3 scripts
MLMS4	Limpopo	7372501	Identical mistakes in 5 scripts
LCENG4	KZN	5422164	Evidence of cheating
INCT4	KZN	5322412	Evidence of cheating
INCT4	KZN	5123603	Evidence of cheating
INCT4	KZN	5121465	Evidence of cheating
INCT4	KZN	5121442	Evidence of cheating

Umalusi moderators re-marked a bigger sample for the learning areas and provinces implicated. The external moderators could not find additional evidence of any irregularities.

The provinces implicated in the alleged irregularities must investigate and submit detailed reports to Umalusi through the DHET. Further action will be considered based on the findings.

#### **4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

1. Internal moderators must be commended for their commitment to the very important task of quality assuring marking at provincial level.
2. The reports from external moderators confirmed a good quality and standard of marking across all provinces and learning areas.

#### **5. AREAS OF CONCERN**

1. The external moderator for INCT4 reported that the computers at the Mount Currie (Kokstad, KZN) examination centre did not function, which impacted negatively on candidates' performance. The centre did not submit marks for the practical component, i.e. sections A and B, which accounted for 60 marks. This incident was not reported as an irregularity.

#### **6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT**

1. The DHET must investigate the alleged incident, as reported above, of non-functioning computers when candidates wrote INCT4. DHET must submit a detailed report to Umalusi. The DHET must also report on why the practical marks were omitted and what was done with these.

#### **Notes**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Chapter 7

---

### Standardisation and Verification of Results

#### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Standardisation of results and verification of the capturing of marks are quality assurance processes undertaken to ensure fairness and validity of learner attainment through statistical moderation and standard deviation of the actual performance of the learner and the current cohort. There were similarities between the 2013 and 2014 cohorts writing the GETC: ABET L4 examinations.

#### 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The DHET presented a total of 26 learning areas for standardisation at the standardisation meeting held on 19 December 2014.

#### 3. DECISIONS: DHET

The decisions taken for the November 2014 examination of the GETC: ABET L4 qualification were informed by the norm, historical average and the comparison of the pairs-analysis, including the overall performance of the 2014 cohort of learners. The principles underpinning standardisation were applied during the standardisation process.

The table below gives a summary of the decisions taken at the standardisation meeting.

Table 7.1 Standardisation Decisions

Description	TOTAL
Number of learning areas presented for standardisation	26
Raw marks	11
Adjusted (mainly upwards)	10
Adjusted (mainly downwards)	05
<b>Number of learning areas standardised:</b>	<b>26</b>

#### **4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

1. The committee noted that the quality and standard of marking had improved compared to previous examinations.

#### **5. AREAS OF CONCERN**

Umalusi noted some areas of concern, which were brought to the attention of the DHET. These include, inter alia:

1. Late submission of data sets and booklets, which results in a disruption of the programme for other assessment bodies as well as the Umalusi schedule
2. Late submission of qualitative input reports from the examiners and chief markers
3. Poor performance of learners
4. Very high percentage (30-40%) of candidates not writing the examinations
5. The confusing NQF level for the GETC: ABET L4, which is perceived to be equivalent to the National Senior Certificate (NSC).

#### **6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT**

1. The DHET must implement strategies and systems to ensure that the data sets and standardisation booklets are submitted earlier, but not later than the scheduled date.
2. The DHET must ensure that all reports from examiners and chief markers are submitted at least two days before the standardisation meeting to give Umalusi sufficient time to peruse the documents.
3. The DHET must implement a strategy to improve the performance of learners writing the GETC: ABET L4 examination. The DHET must present its improvement interventions at an Assessment Standards Committee meeting as confirmed at a bilateral meeting.
4. The DHET must implement a strategy to increase the number of candidates who register for the GETC: ABET L4 examination to write the examination.
5. Umalusi and the DHET must embark on an advocacy campaign to inform the public about the differences between an NQF L1 qualification versus a Level 4 qualification.

#### **Notes**

---

---

---

## Chapter 8

---

### Status of Certification

#### 1. BACKGROUND

Umalusi ensures adherence to policies and regulations promulgated by the Minister of Higher Education and Training for the General Education and Training Certificate.

Through its founding Act, Umalusi is also responsible for certifying learner achievements in South Africa for qualifications registered on the General and Further Education and Training (GENFET) Sub-framework of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), which includes the General Education and Training Certificate (GETC).

Certification is the culmination of an examination process conducted by an assessment body, in this instance, the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET).

This process has a number of different steps for the candidate, from registration to writing the examinations. After the candidate has written the examinations, which have been administered by the assessment body, the examination scripts are marked, the marks are processed and, after quality assurance and approval by Umalusi, candidates are presented with individual statements of results. These preliminary documents record the outcome of the examination and are issued by the assessment body. This Statement of Results is, in due course, replaced by the final document, the certificate issued by Umalusi.

To give further effect to its certification mandate, Umalusi must ensure that certification data has been submitted in the format prescribed by the Council, and that it is both valid and reliable. For that reason, Umalusi publishes directives for certification that must be adhered to by all assessment bodies when they submit candidate data for the certification of a specific qualification.

DHET must ensure that all records of candidates who registered for the GETC examination, and those qualifying for a learning area certificate or General Education and Training Certificate in a specific examination cycle, are submitted to Umalusi for certification. The datasets must also include the records of candidates who have not qualified for a certificate, such as the records of candidates who have withdrawn from the course/qualification (candidates who registered to write examinations but did not

write any subjects) and candidates who have failed all subjects (candidates who wrote the examination, but could not pass any subject).

The closing of the examination cycle is confirmed by the issuing of certificates, subject statements, and confirmation of those candidates who have not qualified for any type of certificate, viz. in instances where the candidates failed all subjects or did not write the examinations.

Certification fees are payable by private assessment bodies. Those of public institutions are funded through an agreement with the Department of Basic Education for public assessment bodies.

## **2. CURRENT STATUS**

The GETC: ABET provides an opportunity for candidates to accumulate credits toward the qualification across a number of examinations. Each examination is certified and the candidate receives a learning area certificate for learning areas passed. These results can be combined for the awarding of the GETC qualification.

Therefore in reporting on the status of certification for the GETC: ABET in 2014, it is important to examine the status of certification of the 2013 GETC: ABET cohort.

The DHET, through the nine Provincial Education Departments (PEDs), submitted all records for the 2013 cohort of candidates who wrote the GETC (ABET Level 4). However, the PEDs could not account for the discrepancy between the number of candidates entered for the examination and the number certified.

This situation was created because PEDs did not finalise the examination cycle by completing records and requesting all certificates immediately after the resulting process; PEDs did not adhere to timeframes for the submission of certification data, determined as three months after the release of the results; nor did they re-submit rejected records within the required timeframe.

In respect of the development of the certification system for the GETC: ABET in the DHET, the following remain of concern:

- The provincial certification systems run with little or no coordination and monitoring from the DHET;
- The certification system for combining results for candidates who wrote some subjects under the expired GETC and others under the revised GETC is long overdue;
- The absence, since 2003, of a certification function to assist candidates who

have lost a certificate and wish to have it replaced is a great disservice to adult learners;

- The system for combining results is in a sad state with no means of verifying the processing of combinations; and it is not credible;
- The system is in a state of flux and changes constantly, with marks being recalculated. The data is therefore not credible.

Finally, there is an urgent need for training of PED and DHET officials on the certification module of the GETC: ABET because the certification process is inefficient, due to incapacity and the lack of a stable system. This is a problem that is reported on annually and yet the problem appears to remain the same from year to year.

Table 8.1 below provides statistics regarding the status of certification for the GETC: ABET L4 qualification for the assessment period June to November 2013.

Table 8.1 Status of Certification of the GETC: ABET L4

Assessment Body	Learning Area Certificate		GETC		Failed all subjects		Withdrawn	
	2013 06	2013 10	2013 06	2013 10	2013 06	2013 10	2013 06	2013 10
Gauteng	1 343	7 738	17	3 982	696		672	
Eastern Cape	1 511	7 736	20	3 121	657	1 230	1 433	4 956
Free State	973	2 957	21	1 701	387	530	971	2 403
KZN	2 339	11 160	193	5 356	350	1 215	1 246	7 899
Limpopo	7 200	12 371	86	3 864	4 113	3 269	3 665	5 940
Mpumalanga	2 110	4 922	79	1 803	899	1 044	2 049	5 542
Northern Cape	350	970	0	297	250	337	193	1 316
North West	1 227	4 973	4	1 903	630	1 370	653	1 697
Western Cape	526	2 154	26	535	175	449	376	1 272
IEB	706	707	0	0	141	389	0	0

**Note:** To date no certification has taken place for the June 2014 cohort of learners, except those who wrote through the IEB (214 candidates).

## Notes

---



---



---



---



---

# Conclusion

---

This report has reflected on the key quality assurance of assessment processes, as explained in the various chapters dedicated to each process. An analysis of each process and the various quantitative and qualitative evaluation reports highlighted areas for improvement and noted good practices.

## **CHAPTER 1: QUESTION PAPER MODERATION**

Umalusi is concerned that 46% of the question papers moderated required a second round of external moderation, attributed to poor internal moderation processes. Umalusi is also concerned with the poor quality of marking guidelines, as about 11 marking guidelines were both permeated with errors and had not made provision for alternative answers. External moderators also reported that many examiners remain challenged by interpreting and analysing cognitive levels. This was further compounded by a range of grammatical errors and incorrect use of subject terminology/data across some question papers that could potentially confuse learners. However, Umalusi is satisfied that all question papers submitted for second moderation were in principal approved, or conditionally approved with no need to resubmit.

Despite poor internal moderation processes and poor marking guidelines for a large number of learning areas as identified in this report during first external moderation, all QPs and marking guidelines met the relevant criteria, across each of the nine criteria, to a substantial degree after second moderation.

It is imperative that the DHET puts in place measures to ensure that a high percentage of question papers are approved at first moderation. This requires raising the quality and standard of internal moderation.

The quality and standard of the approved question papers, achieved through the process of external moderation, did not compromise the GETC: ABET L4 examinations and were fit for purpose. In the main, examiners and internal moderators were amenable to suggestions put forth by external moderators and demonstrated an ability to undertake the tasks at hand.

## **CHAPTER 2: MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT**

It was very difficult to evaluate the quality of work done at particular centres because

too many districts submitted only one and two portfolios per centre. It is imperative that provinces ensure that districts submit the sample as requested.

The findings indicate that learners, educators, and district and provincial moderators are, largely, quite conscientious about adhering to the requirements of SBA. However, adherence to policy requirements has neither resulted in quality moderation nor has it supported an improvement in learner performance.

It is imperative that institutional, district and provincial officials view internal moderation as a tool that will, if applied correctly and adequately, help to improve internal assessment practices.

### **CHAPTER 3: MONITORING OF WRITING**

The monitoring reports submitted identified areas of good practice, but also areas of concern regarding the writing phase of the GETC: ABET L4 examinations. Many AET centres offering the examination still require support in preparing for, and conducting, the national examinations. The training of invigilators should be monitored at national level as evidence suggests this is an area for improvement. The state-of-readiness to conduct the national examinations should focus on key administrative issues at examination centre level.

In the main, the monitoring of the writing phase of this examination confirmed that, apart from policy deviations and problem areas mentioned in this report, the examinations in all provinces were conducted in accordance with prescribed policies, procedures and regulations. There was no evidence to indicate that candidates were unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged during any of the examination sessions.

### **CHAPTER 4: MONITORING OF MARKING**

The reports from external moderators confirmed a good quality and standard of marking across all provinces and learning areas.

The external moderator for INCT4 reported that the computers at the Mount Currie (Kokstad, KZN) examination centre did not function, which impacted negatively on candidates' performance. The centre did not submit marks for the practical component, i.e. sections A and B, which accounted for 60 marks. This incident was not reported as an irregularity. Umalusi requested the DHET to investigate and report on this incident.

## **CHAPTER 5: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS**

External moderators reported that the memorandum discussion meetings were professionally managed and the purpose of the meeting was fulfilled, to a large extent, in each learning area.

The memorandum discussions served their intended purpose, viz., to standardise the marking guidelines before the commencement of marking. None of the Umalusi external moderators reported any impediments that may have compromised the smooth running of the memorandum discussions.

Umalusi is satisfied that the concerns raised above did not compromise the integrity and validity of the question papers and the marking guidelines. The memorandum discussions served to strengthen and improve the marking process. Overall, the system met the minimum requirements and all relevant stakeholders were ready for the next phase of marking.

## **CHAPTER 6: VERIFICATION OF MARKING**

Marking was seen to be largely fair and valid, with specific incidents of irregularities noted in KwaZulu-Natal (five) and Limpopo (three) as detailed in Table 6.4. Umalusi moderators re-marked a bigger sample for the learning areas and provinces implicated. The external moderators could not find additional evidence of any irregularities.

The provinces implicated in the alleged irregularities must investigate and submit detailed reports to Umalusi through the DHET. Further action will be considered based on the findings.

## **CHAPTER 7: STANDARDISATION**

The DHET presented a total of 26 learning areas for standardisation at the standardisation meeting. The committee accepted raw marks for 11 LAs, but adjusted marks upwards for 10 LAs and downwards for five LAs.

The committee noted five areas of concern and made *Directives for Compliance and Improvement* in this regard, as detailed in the main report. The DHET was commended on the improved quality of marking.



# Acknowledgements

---

A special word of appreciation to the following individuals and groups of people for their contribution in compiling this report:

- (i) All **colleagues working at the assessment body** for their endeavours to develop and offer credible GETC: ABET L4 examinations.
  
- (ii) The Umalusi team of **external moderators** for their tireless dedication and personal sacrifices made in their endeavours to conduct the moderation work as best they can. Thank you for the comprehensive and analytical reports, resulting in the compilation of this report:
  - Ms Elvie Alman
  - Mr Jayprakash Chhana
  - Ms Natasha Esbach
  - Mr Absalom Fakude
  - Mr Ravin Gayadeen
  - Dr Marimuthy Govender
  - Dr Rajendran Govender
  - Mr Donald Hanneman
  - Ms Zodwa Khumalo
  - Mr Ishmael Kungwane
  - Ms Felicity Louw
  - Mr Jotham Mahlangu
  - Ms Grace Makobane
  - Ms Pumla Maqhude
  - Ms Matlhodi Mathibela
  - Ms Raesetja Mogoroga
  - Mr Malese Mokoko
  - Ms Precious Molepo
  - Dr Reginald Monyai
  - Dr Nkoloyakhe Mpanza
  - Mr Edward Mukwevho
  - Mr Ashley Naicker
  - Ms Louisa Ndobela-Mononyane
  - Mr Jack Ngobeni
  - Ms Johanna Nortje
  - Ms Sibongile Nyanda
  - Ms Phillipine Pila
  - Ms Gourie Reddy

- Mr Sylvester Sibanyoni
  - Ms Jayshree Singh
  - Ms Didri Spingies
- (iii) Dr Rajendran Govender, Ms Hanneljie Nortje, Mr Ishmael Kungwane and Mr Desmond April, who evaluated, synthesised and consolidated the individual reports from the external moderators into the relevant chapters of this report.
- (iv) Mr Kgosi Monageng and Mr Clifford Mokoena and their team of monitors who contributed the chapters on the monitoring of the writing and marking phases of the examination.
- (v) Ms Liz Burroughs and Ms Anne McCallum who provided the chapter on the status of certification.
- (vi) Ms Eugenie Rabe and Ms Faith Ramotlhale for being critical readers.
- (vii) Staff of the QAA: AET Sub-Unit for their commitment and diligence evident in this report:
- Frank Chinyamakobvu
  - Mmarona Letsholo
- (viii) Staff of the PR & Communications Unit for their support and co-ordination of the project:
- Mr Lucky Ditaunyane
  - Mr Sphiwe Mtshali
- (ix) All members of the Umalusi Standardisation Committee, Approval Committee and the Assessments Standards Committee who provided invaluable support and advice.
- (x) Ms Kathy Waddington for the efficient editing of the report under very tight time constraints.
- (xi) Ms Annelize Jansen van Rensburg for the effective layout, typesetting and printing of the report.



37 General Van Ryneveld Street, Persekor Technopark, Pretoria  
Telephone: +27 12 349 1510 • Fax: +27 12 349 1511  
E-mail: [Info@umalusi.org.za](mailto:Info@umalusi.org.za) • Web: [www.umalusi.org.za](http://www.umalusi.org.za)

UMALUSI



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training