



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

DECEMBER 2014

PUBLISHED BY:



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

EXECUTIVE S	UMMARY	v
ACRONYMS		ix
LIST OF TABL	ES	x
CHAPTER 1:		
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	
3.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	7
CHAPTER 2:	MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT	8
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	8
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	8
3.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	10
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	14
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	14
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	14
CHAPTER 3:	MONITORING OF WRITING	15
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	15
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	15
3.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	16
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	18
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	18
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	19
CHAPTER 4:	MONITORING OF MARKING	21
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	21
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	21
3.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	

CHAPTER 5:	MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS	24
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	24
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	24
3.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	26
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	27
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	27
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	28
CHAPTER 6:	VERIFICATION OF MARKING	29
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	29
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	29
3.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	29
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	32
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	32
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	32
CHAPTER 7:	STANDARDISATION AND VERIFICATION OF RESULTS	33
1.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	33
2.	SCOPE AND APPROACH	33
3.	DECISIONS: IEB	33
4.	AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE	34
5.	AREAS OF CONCERN	34
6.	DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT	34
CONCLUSIO	N	35
ACKNOWIF	OGEMENTS	38

Executive Summary

The General Education and Training Certificate (GETC) for Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET L4) – hereinafter referred to as GETC: ABET L4 – as conducted by the Independent Examinations Board (IEB), is quality assured and certificated by Umalusi. The quality assurance regime implemented by Umalusi 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 'requirements for compliance', both of which are intended to offer feedback to role-players involved in the processes of assessment. These, in turn, should lead to improvements in the assessment system.

This report dedicates a chapter to each of the key processes in 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's moderators evaluated question papers (QPs) for all eight learning areas offered by the IEB for the 2014 November examinations. Six of the eight QPs submitted (75%) required a first moderation only to gain approval by the relevant Umalusi moderator. The two QPs that required further moderation were Human and Social Sciences and Technology. The external moderator did not approve the question paper for <u>Human and Social Sciences</u> for three reasons:

- (a) A full newspaper report in its entirety was included as a text. The article was too long for learners at ABET L4 to read and comprehend, the content of the article was largely irrelevant and questions relating to the content were not directly connected to the content.
- (b) The second concern was a short essay/paragraph question allocated 30% of the total marks. The weighting was inappropriate.

(c) The third concern was that some alternatives provided in the multiplechoice question were not plausible.

The external moderator for <u>Technology</u> conditionally approved the question paper, with suggestions for improvement. Some of the concerns included:

- (a) The examiner used line-type pictures as diagrams in some questions.
- (b) Inappropriate mark allocations with a high percentage of marks allocated to calculations more appropriate to a Math question paper.
- (c) All questions were compulsory with no choice questions.
- (d) The memorandum did not include the learning and assessment outcomes.

The internal moderators amended the QPs based on the recommendations of the external moderators and submitted the revised question papers for second moderation. The QPs were approved at second moderation. The evaluation process showed that the approved QPs were of good quality and standard and met the minimum standards.

CHAPTER 2: MODERATION OF SBA PORTFOLIOS

The external moderation of SBA portfolios for the 2014 November examination was conducted on-site at St John's College on 22–23 November 2014. Four learning areas (50%) were selected for external moderation: Economic and Management Sciences, Life Orientation, Human and Social Sciences and Natural Sciences.

Evidence submitted showed that internal assessment in the Adult Education and Training sector remained a challenge, as 24% of the portfolios evaluated were below the acceptable compliance range. It was of concern that some training and assessment centres did not submit the Educator Portfolio of Assessment and marksheets for external moderation. The Directives for Compliance and Improvement guide the IEB towards implementing mechanisms to ensure that all centres submit educator portfolios and marksheets for internal and external moderation.

CHAPTER 3: MONITORING OF WRITING

Umalusi deployed monitors to assess the conduct and administration of the GETC: ABET L4 examinations at seven examination centres in four provinces. The monitoring of the

writing phase identified areas of concern, as the administration of the conduct of the examinations did not meet the required standards in some of the centres monitored. However, these concerns did not compromise the credibility of the examinations. The IEB must peruse the *Directives for Compliance and Improvement* noted in this report and introduce measures to effectively address the concerns raised.

CHAPTER 4: MONITORING OF MARKING

The marking centre was well run by a competent and experienced centre manager. Marking was systematic and markers were well trained. The number of scripts was small and marking finished on time. The process was credible. The monitoring of the marking phase confirmed that the IEB met, and exceeded, the minimum quality standards. All marking was seen to be largely fair and valid, with no incident that could compromise the integrity of the marking process.

CHAPTER 5: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS

Verification of marking took place in two stages: firstly, observing and evaluating the memorandum discussions and, secondly, the moderation of marked scripts at St John's College. The process for the finalisation of the marking guidelines succeeded in meeting the desired outcome of developing a comprehensive marking memorandum that was well understood by all markers, who displayed competence in the use of the marking memorandum.

CHAPTER 6: VERIFICATION OF MARKING

The external moderator for *Life Orientation* (A4LIFO) reported an alleged irregularity concerning four candidates who wrote the question paper at a particular centre. The IEB investigated the incident and submitted a report to Umalusi. The investigation did not find sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations. Excluding this incident, the moderation of marking confirmed that the marking process was sound, that question papers were marked in accordance with the marking memoranda and that marking was, therefore, fair, valid and reliable.

Umalusi is satisfied that the IEB has thoroughly investigated each irregularity reported and accepts the findings that the credibility of the examination was not compromised at any stage.

CHAPTER 7: STANDARDISATION

The pre-standardisation and standardisation meetings for the IEB took place on 19 and 20 December 2014 respectively. Eight learning areas were presented for standardisation: Communication in English, Economic and Management Sciences, Human and Social Sciences, Life Orientation, Mathematical Literacy, Natural Sciences, Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises, and Technology. Raw scores were accepted for all eight learning areas.

The ASC recommended that the IEB adhere to the Umalusi Requirements and Specifications for Standardisation, Statistical Moderation and Resulting policy document of 2013, and to put measures in place to quality assure the booklets prior to submission.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, notwithstanding the few concerns raised above, Umalusi Council approved the release of the IEB 2014 GETC: ABET L4 results at the approval meeting held on Monday, 29 December 2014. The results were approved on the basis that, after careful consideration of all the qualitative reporting on the quality assurance conducted, Umalusi found no reason to suggest that the credibility of the IEB 2014 GETC: ABET L4 November 2014 examinations was compromised in any way.

Notes			

Acronyms

ABET - Adult Basic Education and Training

AET - Adult Education and Training

ASC - Assessment Standards Committee

CASS - Continuous Assessment

CLC - Community Learning Centres

EAG - Examination and Assessment Guideline
GETC - General Education and Training Certificate

LA - Learning Area

NQF - National Qualifications Framework

PALC - Public Adult Learning Centre

QAA - Quality Assurance of Assessment

QP - Question Paper

SAGs - Subject and Assessment Guidelines

SAQA - South African Qualifications AuthoritySBA-Site-Based Assessment

UMALUSI - Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education

and Training

List of tables and figures

TABLE 1.1	IEB LEARNING AREAS FOR THE GETC: ABET L4	1
TABLE 1.2	APPROVAL STATUS OF QUESTION PAPERS MODERATED	3
TABLE 1.3	ANALYSIS OF EXTERNAL MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS	3
TABLE 1.4	QUESTION PAPER COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA	4
TABLE 2.1	SBA PORTFOLIOS SAMPLE REQUESTED	8
TABLE 2.2	SBA PORTFOLIO COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA	10
TABLE 3.1	MONITORING OF WRITING	16
TABLE 4.1	MONITORING OF MARKING	21
TABLE 5.1	VERIFICATION OF MEMORANDA DISCUSSIONS	26
TABLE 6.1	NUMBER OF SCRIPTS MODERATED	
TABLE 6.2	MARKING IRREGULARITY REGISTER	31

Chapter 1

Question Paper Moderation

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Quality assuring the assessment of 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 quality assurance step in the process is, therefore, the external moderation of question papers.

Umalusi moderates question papers to ensure that the standard is comparable with that of previous years and 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 with the relevant subject matter expertise to scrutinise and carefully analyse the question papers, based on a set of standardised evaluation criteria.

The GETC: ABET L4 consists of 26 learning areas. The IEB offers examinations for eight of these learning areas, as detailed in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 IEB Learning Areas for the GETC: ABET L4

LA No	LEARNING AREAS	LA CODE
1	Communication in English	A4CENG
2	Economic and Management Sciences	A4EMSC
3	Human and Social Sciences	A4HSSC
4	Life Orientation	A4LIFO
5	Mathematical Literacy	A4MATH
6	Natural Sciences	A4NTSC

1

LA No	LEARNING AREAS	LA CODE
7	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	A4SMME
8	Technology	A4TECH

2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The IEB presented question papers and the accompanying marking memoranda for the eight learning areas (LAs) it assesses, for moderation by Umalusi in preparation for the 2014 November GETC: ABET L4 examinations.

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

- 1. Technical quality
- 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 against 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 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.

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 and the qualitative feedback of the reports from external moderators.

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

		NOVEMB	ER EXAM
FULL LEARNING AREA DESCRIPTION	LA CODE	1st Mod	2nd Mod
1.Communication in English	A4CENG	А	
2.Economic and Management Sciences	A4EMSC	А	
3.Human and Social Sciences	A4HSSC	R	А
4.Life Orientation	A4LIFO	А	
5.Mathematical Literacy	A4MATH	А	
6.Natural Sciences	A4NTSC	А	
7.Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	A4SMME	А	
8.Technology	A4TECH	CAR	А

[|] A = Approved | CANR = Conditionally Approved > No Resubmit | CAR = Conditionally Approved > Resubmit | R = Rejected |

Table 1.3 summarises the status of question papers after first and second external moderation.

Table 1.3 Analysis of External Moderation of Question Papers

MODERA-	APPRO-	CANR	% APPROVED	CAR	%	REJECTED	%	TOTAL
TION	VED		+ CANR	(Resubmit)	CAR		REJECTED	MODS
1ST Mod	6	0	75%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	8
2ND Mod	2	0	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2
TOTAL	8	0		2		0		10

An analysis of both Tables 1.2 and 1.3 shows that the eight QPs set for the 2014 November examinations resulted in a total of 10 external moderations. *Human and Social Sciences* was rejected and *Technology* was conditionally approved, to be resubmitted.

The external moderator did not approve the question paper for <u>Human and Social</u> <u>Sciences</u> for three reasons:

- A newspaper report in its entirety was included as a text. The article was too
 long for learners at ABET L4 to read and comprehend, the content of the
 article was largely irrelevant and questions relating to the content were not
 directly connected to the content.
- The second concern was a short essay/paragraph question that was allocated 30% of the total marks. This was inappropriate and unacceptable.
- The third concern was that some alternatives provided in the multiple-choice question were not plausible.

The external moderator for <u>Technology</u> conditionally approved the question paper, with suggestions for improvement. Some of the concerns included:

- The examiner used line-type pictures as diagrams in some questions.
- Inappropriate mark allocations, with a high percentage of marks allocated to calculations more appropriate to a Math question paper.
- All questions were compulsory and there were no 'choice' questions.
- The memorandum did not include learning and assessment outcomes.

The internal moderators amended the question papers based on the recommendations of the external moderators, and submitted the revised question papers for second moderation. Both QPs were approved at second moderation.

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

Table 1.4 Question Paper Compliance with Criteria

		COMPLIANCE FREQUENCY (10 moderations)			
		NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL
C1.	Technical Criteria	0	0	4	6
C2.	Internal Moderation	0	2	1	7
C3.	Content Coverage	0	0	4	6
C4.	Cognitive Demand	0	0	5	5
C5.	Marking Guidelines	0	1	6	3
C6.	Language and Bias	0	0	4	6
C7.	Adherence to Policy	0	1	3	6
C8.	Predictability	0	0	4	6
C9.	Overall Impression of QP	0	0	6	4
		4		86	
		4%		96	5%

The quality and standard of the question papers were very good, with the 10 QPs achieving an overall compliance rating of 96%. There were two instances of poor compliance regarding internal moderation, and one instance each for marking guidelines and adherence to the subject and assessment guidelines (SAGs).

Below is a synopsis of the evaluation of the question papers based on the moderation criteria used. The synopsis reflects on first and second moderation processes.

C1. Technical criterion

- The technical criteria were not met fully at first moderation, as 4/10 QPs complied with MOST of the sub-criteria while the other six QPs scored an ALL compliance rating.
- Most of the problems identified in these question papers had to do with inappropriate or unclear visuals (illustrations, pictures, diagrams and graphs), ambiguous or incomplete instructions, ambiguous language and typing errors.
- Overall the question papers were neat and well presented.

C2. Internal moderation

- Internal moderation improved compared with previous years. Two QPs, i.e. A4HSSC and A4TECH, were given a *LIMITED* compliance rating; seven QPs (70%) met all the sub-criteria with an *ALL* rating.
- The external moderator noted that the internal moderator could have addressed some of the issues in the A4HSSC question paper.

C3. Content coverage

- The examiners covered the content well in the QPs as 6/10 QPs scored an ALL compliance rating and the remaining four QPs complied in MOST respects.
- The examples and illustrations used in the A4HSSC QPs, after first moderation, were inappropriate, irrelevant and not fit-for-purpose. These issues had been addressed when the QP was presented for second moderation.
- The memorandum for A4TECH did not include the learning and assessment outcomes. It also did not offer candidates any choice questions: all questions were compulsory.

C4. Cognitive demand

• All QPs met this criterion very well, with compliance ratings of five MOST and

- five ALL for the 10 QPs moderated.
- The distribution of cognitive levels was inappropriate for the A4EMSC QP. Additionally, mark allocation was not correct as per SAGs.
- The external moderator for A4HSSC believed that alternative answers provided in the multiple-choice questions were not plausible and not sufficiently reasonable or probable to serve as distractors.

C5. Marking guidelines

- The marking guideline for A4NTSC did not meet the minimum requirements. It did not allow for consistent marking and was given a LIMITED compliance rating.
- The marking guidelines for A4MATH, A4NTSC, A4TECH and A4EMSC did not indicate the LOs and ASs that were assessed. The main concern was that the learning and assessment outcomes, although shown on the analysis grid, were not reflected in the marking guidelines.

C6. Language and bias

- The quality and standard of language use in the question papers were very good, with 6/10 QPs given an ALL compliance rating.
- The language register was inappropriate for both sets of QPs for A4HSSC and A4TECH.
- The passages used in the text for A4HSSC were too long and beyond the comprehension of an ABET L4 learner.

C7. Adherence to Subject and Assessment Guidelines (SAGs)

- Two QPs, i.e. A4HSSC and A4TECH, were given *LIMITED* compliance ratings; three QPs met the *MOST* sub-criteria and five QPs met the *ALL* rating.
- Concerns raised by the external moderators included misalignment of subject outcomes with the relevant unit standards. The design of unit standards-based qualifications lends itself to this type of challenge.

C8. Predictability

- The examiners did very well regarding this criterion as no QP was found to be predictable, in the sense that questions were not copied and pasted from previous examinations, nor could questions be easily 'spotted'.
- Examiners must be complimented as many questions were original, innovative and creative.

C9. Overall impression

 The external moderators raised some concerns regarding alignment to unit standard-specific outcomes and offered suggestions for improvement. The alignment of SAGs with unit standard-specific outcomes is technical and structurally flawed. It must be noted that most of the aforementioned shortcomings were resolved after second moderation.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- 1. With the exception of the *Human and Social Sciences* and the *Technology* question papers, the question papers submitted for external moderation showed a high level of commitment to good practice by the examiners and the internal moderators.
- 2. The questions in the eight QPs submitted for first moderation were within the broad scope of the curriculum statements.
- 3. The external moderators found the question papers to be original and creative.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

- 1. The depth and breadth of internal moderation can improve. Two question papers did not meet the minimum standards. This accounts for 25% of the eight QPs initially moderated.
- 2. External moderators found during first moderation that the A4HSSC and A4TECH QPs did not provide opportunities to assess learners' reasoning ability, ability to compare and contrast, see causal relationships, and express an argument clearly.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

- 1. The IEB must explore strategies to improve the rigour and depth of internal moderation. Rigorous internal moderation is critical in any quality improvement cycle.
- Examiners and internal moderators, particularly for the A4HSSC and A4TECH QPs, should receive further training and attend workshops on constructing questions and tasks aligned to specific cognitive levels; and to become sufficiently skilled to interpret and analyse the cognitive levels of their question papers.

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 and contributes 50% towards the final mark required for certification.

The IEB is responsible for presenting Site-Based Assessment (SBA) marks that have been quality assured and which accurately reflect the competence of each candidate. To manage the SBA process, the IEB 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 IEB 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 SBA portfolios requested included six of eight learning areas for the November 2014 examinations, as noted in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 SBA Portfolios Sample Requested

LEARNING AREA	CODE	# PORTFOLIOS
1.Economic and Management Sciences	A4EMSC	20
2.Life Orientation	A4LIFO	20
3.Communication in English	A4CENG	20
4.Mathematical Literacy	A4MATH	20
5. Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	A4SMME	20

LEARNING AREA	CODE	# PORTFOLIOS
6. Technology	A4TECH	20
		120

The external moderators for *Small*, *Medium and Micro Enterprises* and *Technology* could not attend the moderation sessions due to prior commitments. Umalusi therefore, moderated only four learning areas.

Please note that this sample was used for the standardisation of the marking guidelines as well as for the moderation of marking, as these moderation sessions were conducted during the same two days.

The external moderation of portfolios for the November examination was conducted on-site at St John's College on 22–23 November 2014.

The external moderators evaluated the SBA portfolios using an instrument designed for this purpose. The evaluation also considered the 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?
- 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 tasks **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**?

3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Table 2.2 gives a summary of the compliance ratings based on evaluating the evidence against the evaluation criteria. The two indicators of NONE and LIMITED broadly means that the assessment body did not comply with the minimum requirements.

Table 2.2 SBA Portfolio Compliance with Criteria

	COMPLIANCE FREQUENCY (out of 68)				
	NONE	LIMITED	MOST	ALL	
C1.	1	3	0	0	
C2.	2	1	0	1	
C3.	0	0	0	4	
C4.	1	0	0	3	
C5.	0	1	3	0	
C6.	1	1	2	0	
C7.	0	0	0	4	
C8.	0	0	1	3	
C9.	0	1	1	2	
C10.	0	0	0	4	
C11.	0	1	2	1	
C12.	0	0	2	2	
C13.	0	1	2	1	
C14.	0	1	1	2	
C15.	0	0	1	3	
C16.	0	0	1	3	
C17.	1	0	0	3	
	1	6	52		
	24%		76	%	

The external moderators' findings were based on their analyses of learner and educator portfolios; however some learning centres did not submit educator portfolios. The evaluation of educator portfolios is imperative as it assists in contextualising the evaluation of the learner portfolios. The educator portfolios help external moderators to understand the educators' understanding and implementation of the SBA tasks.

An analysis of Table 2.2 clearly illustrates that internal assessment remains a concern, as

24% of portfolios evaluated fell below the acceptable compliance range, with 16 instances of *NONE* and *LIMITED* compliance. The first four criteria evaluated the educator portfolios for evidence of competence and assessment planning. The low ratings were due to the poor submission rate of educator portfolios.

C1. Does the Educator Portfolio of Assessment (POA) contain all **relevant policy and Assessment Guideline documents?**

- The few portfolios submitted suggest that educators did not keep copies of the relevant assessment policies in their files. This can result in poor understanding of the assessment policies.
- C2. Is there an **Assessment Plan** in the Educator POA, aligned to policy?
 - With the exception of one educator (EMSC) the evidence provided showed that educators did not have assessment plans. The absence of assessment plans may suggest that educators did not know and/or understand the key issues of formative assessment.
- C3. Is there **evidence** that the educator **implemented** the three tasks as per the Assessment Plan/Schedule?
 - In contrast with the previous two sub-criteria, all educators complied fully with this criterion. This must be understood against the background that the IEB develops User Guides (assessment manuals) and that the educators implemented the tasks without any assessment plans.
- C4. Is there **evidence** that the educator **has completed marksheets** for all learners for each task?
 - The educator for EMSC did not provide a marksheet, but all the other educators did, and complied with ALL of the sub-criteria.
 - The educators did well when given frameworks or templates to use. The challenge is that they did not show any innovation or creativity in the absence of templates.
- C5. Is there any **evidence** that **internal moderation** was conducted at the following levels?
 - Internal moderation was conducted and was given a compliance rating of MOST, with the exception of EMSC, which obtained a LIMITED compliance rating. The main concern was that the educator did not provide a marksheet, but wrote the marks on the front of the portfolios.
- C6. Does the Learner Portfolio of Evidence contain all **relevant documents**?
 - Learner portfolios for EMSC and LIFO did not comply with this criterion. Not a

- single learner of either EMSC or LIFO included copies of their IDs, making it difficult to authenticate the work of the learners as their own. The files also did not contain copies of marksheets.
- Compliance with this criterion varied across centres, educators and learners.
 Educators and learners should be better disciplined and take the time to ensure that they submit portfolios that are carefully compiled and verified for completeness and correctness.

C7. Is there any evidence that the learners completed the tasks?

 All learners completed all the tasks in the sample moderated. The sample fully met the sub-criteria with an ALL rating.

C8. Are the tasks **assessed according** to the agreed **criteria**?

The educators performed very well against this criterion, as all but one met ALL
the sub-criteria. The exception was LIFO, which satisfied MOST of the
compliance sub-criteria. This was due to the absence of the Educator
Portfolio of Assessment.

C9. Did the educator **use** the **marking guidelines/rubrics appropriately** to allocate marks?

- The educators for EMSC used the appropriate marking guidelines and rubrics to allocate marks.
- The external moderator for CENG reported that the educators over-assessed the Written Speech as they did not use the marking guidelines to mark this section of the work
- The moderator for MATH was satisfied that the educator knew and understood the use of the marking guidelines.

C10. Did the learners **complete** the assessment tasks?

• All learners completed all the tasks in the sample moderated. The sample met the sub-criteria fully, with an ALL rating.

C11. Did the learners **interpret** the assessment task **correctly**?

- The learners of EMSC interpreted Activity 1 correctly and scored good marks, but had difficulties with Activities 2 and 3.
- The learners of LIFO did very well in all three activities.
- The learners had difficulty with the *Written Speech* activities. Learners did not sustain the speech writing conventions in this task. The written speech of the learners was like a formal essay instead of a speech.
- The MATH learners did well in all the activities, except for two learners who did not complete sections 1.3 (e) and 1.3 (i) of Activity 1.

C12. Did the learners' responses meet the expectations/demands of the tasks?

• The learners doing LIFO, CENG and MATH did very well and demonstrated understanding of the tasks, except for two EMSC learners who had difficulties with sections of Activities 2 and 3 respectively.

C13. Were the learners able to **respond to the different cognitive levels** as set in the tasks?

- The learners for EMSC responded well to the cognitive demands for Activity 1, but had challenges with the cognitive demands of Activities 2 and 3.
- All LIFO learners coped well with the cognitive demands in all three activities.
- Learners doing MATH obtained marks of 80% plus in Activities 1 and 2 and, on average, 65% for Activity 3. The external moderator believed that the cognitive demands were correct and appropriate for the level.
- CENG learners had difficulty with the cognitive demands of Activity 5
 (Listening Comprehension) and sections of Reading Comprehension (Activity
 1). Learners were not able to answer the middle order (inferential) type of
 questions. The lower order questions were generally answered correctly.

C14. Was the **marking consistent** with the marking tools?

- The evaluation reports showed that marking of the portfolios for EMSC and MATH were consistent and complied with the marking guidelines and rubrics.
- The portfolios for LIFO did not include any marking guidelines or rubrics, making it difficult for the external moderator to make a judgement.
- Educators marking CENG used the marking tools provided, except for Activity 2 (Formal Writing). The essays were over-assessed and, as such, inconsistent with the rubrics.

C15. Is the quality and standard of the marking acceptable?

- Evidence suggests that the quality and standard of marking of the EMSC, LIFO and MATH portfolios were good and complied with ALL the sub-criteria.
- The marking of *Formal Writing* (CENG) proved to be a challenge as the essays were over-assessed and therefore inconsistent with the rubrics.

C16. Is the mark allocation in line with the performance of the learner?

Marks allocated for EMSC, LIFO and MATH were in line with the performance
of the learners, but again the section on Formal Writing proved a challenge
for the reasons cited above.

C17. Is the totalling and transfer of marks to the marksheets accurate?

 The educators for MATH, CENG and LIFO were accurate. All mark allocations and totals were correct. The marking of the EMSC portfolios did not meet the minimum standards and
was given a NONE compliance rating. The activities that were marked with a
rubric had only a single tick per paragraph, thus making it difficult to see how
and why the marks were allocated.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. The SBA *User Guides* developed by the IEB were helpful in structuring the content of the common assessment tasks. The *User Guides* set a national standard for the SBA tasks.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

- 1. It is of concern that some training centres did not submit educator portfolios with the SBA sample requested. It was difficult for external moderators to evaluate some criteria in the absence of the educator portfolios.
- 2. The submission of marksheets with the portfolios was inconsistent and ad hoc.
- 3. Evidence or the lack thereof suggests that learning and teaching centres, assessment centres and the assessment body did not implement a monitoring and control system to validate the work of the learners.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

- 1. It is imperative for evaluation purposes that the IEB ensures that educator portfolios are submitted with the requested moderation sample.
- 2. The IEB must implement a policy and system to ensure that all centres submit marksheets with all portfolios submitted for internal and external moderation.
- 3. It is a national policy requirement that the assessment body, and the learning and teaching and assessment centres, implement stringent measures to validate the authenticity of work submitted by learners.

Notes			

Chapter 3

Monitoring of Writing

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The writing of the GETC examinations was administered from 3–12 November 2014. Centralised marking was conducted nationally at St John's College in Johannesburg. Umalusi monitored the writing and marking phases of this examination.

The monitoring exercise was conducted to determine the level of compliance with applicable policies, procedures and regulations by the assessment body. Furthermore, the monitoring process provided Umalusi with an opportunity to identify challenges, best practices and to report on the conduct and administration of examinations as conducted by the IEB.

2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The purpose of this chapter is to report on the effectiveness of systems that have been put in place by the IEB for the administration of the GETC examinations, including but not limited to:

- The appointment of key examination personnel including chief invigilators and invigilators
- The measures taken to ensure the safekeeping of the question papers, answer scripts and any other examination material
- The processes related to the administration and conduct of the examination
- The processes involved in the marking of scripts.

This section will further reflect on areas for improvement and areas of good practice regarding the writing and marking phases of the GETC: ABET L4 examination.

Umalusi, through its contracted monitors, visited seven examination centres across provinces to monitor the writing of examinations as administered by the IEB. Table 3.1 below represents the seven examination centres visited.

Table 3.1 Monitoring of Writing

PROVINCE	EXAMINATION CENTRE	DISTRICT	# OF
			CANDIDATES
Western Cape	Saldanha Municipality	West Coast	8
	Siphakame Skills	West Coast District	5
	Development: Moorreesburg		
KwaZulu-Natal	Tastic Rice Corporation	Durban	1
	Tembaletu Trust - Corkwood	Pentrich,	13
	Academy	Pietermaritzburg	
Mpumalanga	Kriel Colliery/ Nompumelelo	Nkangala	1
	Adult Centre		
	TGM Clinic	Ehlanzeni	1
Free State	Letjhabile Adult Centre	Lejweleputswa	34

These seven centres were spread across four provinces. It was a concern that very few candidates wrote the examinations. The only exception was Letjhabile Adult Centre in Free State with 34 candidates.

Each monitor who visited the examination centre was required to complete a predesigned monitoring instrument. This instrument requires the monitor to record all relevant observations in the examination centre as well as verbal responses from the chief invigilator/delegated personnel on the conduct, management and administration of the examinations.

3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(a) Delivery and storage of examination material

The IEB couriered the examination material to the examination centres on a weekly basis. This requires the centres to have secure storage facilities for the question papers until they are written. In five of the seven centres monitored the examination material was stored in safes, lockable steel cabinets and strong rooms.

The storage facility at TGM Clinic in Mpumalanga was totally inadequate and did not meet the minimum security requirements. It was reported that the examination materials for this centre were delivered to the registered address of the owner of the centre in Thohoyandou, Limpopo. He delivered the question papers to the IEB centres registered in his name on the day they were written. The distance between Thohoyandou and the TGM Clinic is approximately 425 kilometres. The status of security measures at the address where the question papers were stored is unknown.

At Moorreesburg in the Western Cape, the question papers were stored in a safe at the home of the chief invigilator. The security measures at the chief invigilator's home could not be verified.

(b) Invigilators' training

Only one centre could provide evidence that they conducted training for the chief invigilator and invigilators. The remaining centres claim that training was provided, but could not provide any evidence.

(c) Preparation of the examination room

The Siphakame Adult Centre did not have any examination policies and regulations on record. The centre also did not have any evidence of planning for the conduct of the examination. There were no copies of the examination timetable, invigilation timetable, attendance registers and other related documents. The other centres monitored had some of the relevant policies and planning documents.

The invigilator at TGM Clinic only arrived at 09:06 at the examination venue. This impacted negatively on the starting time of the examination and on the candidates, who were anxious.

It was a concern that centres did not conduct the examination according to the scheduled date and/or starting time. At Corkwood Academy, the question paper was scheduled to be written on 6 November, but was instead written on 5 November because the venue was to be used for pension pay-outs on the 6th.

It was also a concern that examination venues were often changed without proper notice to the candidates, resulting in uncertainty and chaos. Centres that were implicated in this practice include Corkwood Academy, Saldanha Municipality, Kriel Colliery and Thanda Primary School.

Candidates were allowed to write the examination without proper identification at two examination centres. At TGM Clinic, a candidate did not have any documents whatsoever that could be used to identify him: neither ID document nor examination permit. One candidate at Kriel Colliery had no identification documents.

(d) Time management

The examinations started late at TGM Clinic and at Siphakame Adult Centre because the invigilators arrived late. The examinations started on time at the other examination

centres monitored.

(e) Activities during writing

The chief invigilators opened the question papers in the examination venue in all centres visited. In only two centres, i.e. Tastic Rice Corporation in KwaZulu-Natal and Letjhabile Adult Centre in Free State, did the invigilators read out the examination rules, check the question papers for correctness of follow other rules.

The examinations were conducted without incident. The level of competence displayed by most invigilators was commendable. They were attentive and vigilant, making sure that all the necessary registers were completed. The collection of scripts after the completion of the examination was organised and controlled.

(f) Packaging and transmission of scripts after writing

The packaging and dispatch of scripts to the assessment body could improve at TGM Clinic, as the centre did not have any special container or security bag. The question papers and scripts were placed together in a plastic bag that was not tamper proof.

(g) Monitoring by the assessment body

There was no evidence of any monitoring by the assessment body at the centres visited by Umalusi monitors.

(h) Irregularities

None of the centres monitored had recorded or reported irregularities, such as the changing of examination dates and times and the late starting of examinations at two centres.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. None noted.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

- 1. The examination material for TGM Clinic was stored at the home of the owner of the business in Thohoyandou, approximately 425 kilometres from the centre where the examination was conducted.
- 2. At Moorreesburg in the Western Cape, question papers were stored at the

- home of the chief invigilator.
- 3. Two centres, i.e. Corkwood Academy and TGM Clinic, could not provide any evidence that chief invigilators and invigilators attended training regarding examination rules, regulations and the conduct of examinations.
- 4. The invigilators at TGM Clinic and Siphakame Adult Centre 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.
- 5. Examination dates at the Corkwood Academy were changed without any evidence that this was authorised by the IEB.
- 6. The venues where the examinations were written at Corkwood Academy, Saldanha Municipality, Kriel Colliery and Thanda Primary School were changed without evidence that this was authorised by the IEB.
- 7. The Siphakame Adult Centre had no evidence of planning for the conduct of the examination.
- 8. Candidates allowed to write without proper identification documents were serious irregularities.
- 9. Answer scripts were not properly secured in security bags/containers after the writing of the examination at TGM Clinic.
- 10. There was no evidence that the IEB monitored any of the centres visited by Umalusi monitors.
- 11. There was no evidence of a process to report and record irregularities at the centres monitored.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

- 1. All examinations material destined for TGM Clinic must be delivered and stored at a secure storage facility in Hectorspruit where it can be verified by monitors.
- 2. The chief invigilator at Moorreesburg must stop the practice of storing question papers at her home.
- 3. The practice of changing exam venues must stop immediately as this was still being practiced at Corkwood Academy, Saldanha Municipality, Kriel Colliery and Thanda Primary School.
- 4. The training of all chief invigilators and invigilators must be given top priority, especially at Corkwood Academy and TGM Clinic.
- 5. The assessment body must implement policy to ensure that examination centres adhere to the scheduled examination dates. All changes must be verified by the IEB in writing and copies kept at the examination centre for auditing purposes.

- 6. Examination centres must receive authorisation from the assessment body to change examination venues as the state of readiness of the new venue must be confirmed by the assessment body. Candidates must be notified of a change in venue well in advance of the writing date.
- 7. The IEB should audit the Siphakame Adult Centre and confirm whether the centre has the requisite resources and competence to conduct national examinations.
- 8. The IEB must put measures in place to ensure that no candidate is allowed to write the examination without proper identification.
- 9. The IEB must investigate why the answer scripts were not properly secured in security bags/containers at TGM Clinic.
- 10. The IEB must provide Umalusi with an internal monitoring schedule and monitoring reports for all examinations offered.
- 11. The IEB must ensure that all examination centres use a standardised irregularities reporting format to record and report all irregularities. It appears that examination centres consider only candidates' cheating as an irregularity. This must be addressed in policy.

Notes			

Chapter 4

Monitoring of Marking

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of external monitoring of the marking phase of the examination is to evaluate the integrity of the marking process. Marking practices are observed for any anomalies or challenges that may impact on the integrity of the process. At the same time, best practice that will enhance the marking process is identified.

2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

Umalusi monitored the marking phase of the GETC: ABET 4 examination, as offered by the IEB, at St John's College in Johannesburg for the learning areas as listed below.

Table 4.1 Monitoring of Marking

CENTRE	MONITOR	LEARNING AREAS	#	#	# EXAM
		MARKED	SCRIPTS	MARKERS	ASSISTANTS
St John's	Mr Mabotja	Life Orientation	139	08	02
College,		Communication in English	500	17	02
JHB		Mathematical Literacy	210	10	02
		Human & Social Sciences	57	04	02
		Natural Sciences	78	07	01

3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The marking centre was found to be fully functional and managed by an experienced centre manager.

(a) Planning for marking

The IEB has a plan for the management and administration of marking that is based on historical processes, but the plan is not well documented. The plan made provision for the number of markers per learning area, examination assistants per learning area, and logistical arrangements for the flow of scripts and other administrative duties.

(b) The marking centre

The marking centre was well equipped with comfortable desks and chairs, adequate lighting and good ventilation. A section of the school hall was used as the administration office. All scripts were stored and locked in a secure venue leading from the hall. The marking opened at 7 a.m. and closed at 5 p.m. on the marking days.

(c) Safety and security of examination material

All gates leading to the marking centre had security officials on duty on a 24/7 schedule. All vehicles/people entering the premises as markers and officials were required to sign a register detailing certain information.

The security of scripts and other exam material was also given priority. The movement of all scripts was recorded and signed for by relevant parties. This arrangement ensured that every answer script, marksheet and any other examination material was accounted for.

The transportation of examination material was also handled with diligence. A few allocated officials were allowed to transport exam material from various points, using secured bakkies and panel vans pre-selected for this purpose. In all cases, the material was escorted by armed security guards.

(d) Marking personnel

The appointment of marking personnel was made according to set criteria and was completed timeously. Applicants as examination assistants had to have completed matric and preferably be studying at a tertiary institution. Previous appointment as a controller was advantageous. Criminal record and ID verification checks were done on potential appointees.

(e) The training of markers

All markers were trained before marking commenced. Training started with a memorandum discussion, ensuring a common understanding of the question paper and the memo designed to mark it. Once agreement was reached, dummy scripts were used to test the accuracy of marking, before live scripts could be used. Markers were only allowed to start the marking process once the invigilator and/or examiner was satisfied that the marker had the required competence.

(f) Marking procedures

Markers had first to mark a set of exemplars for standardisation purposes. The examiner and invigilator provided support during the marking process. The chief markers moderated a sample of scripts as the markers completed a batch of scripts. The chief marker provided feedback to the markers as necessary. The Umalusi moderator verified a sample of the scripts moderated by the chief marker. The chief marker and external moderator gave feedback as necessary.

The examination assistants assisted in checking the correctness of sub-totals and totals as indicated in the answer scripts. Marks were then transferred to the marksheets.

Marking procedures were in accordance with policy and directives, except that minutes were not kept of memorandum discussions.

(g) Handling of irregularities

Procedures for the handling of irregularities were in place and understood by all markers. There were no irregularities identified at the marking centre at the time of monitoring.

(h) Electronic capturing of marks

Marks were captured at the IEB headquarters using the double capture method.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

 Marking was centralised in Johannesburg and conducted in a prescheduled period. This model worked very well for the IEB as the processes were effective and efficient.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

 The IEB had a plan for the management and administration of marking, which was based on historical processes, but the plan was not well documented.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

1. The IEB must document its plan for the administration and management of the marking centre.

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 IEB facilitated memorandum discussions at St John's College in Johannesburg on 22 November 2014. These workshops created a platform for examiners and internal moderators to discuss the marking instrument, considering all possible model answers.

The external moderator for each learning area attended the marking guideline discussions to:

- (i) Ensure that the approved question paper was the one presented to candidates
- (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.

Umalusi moderated 50% of the eight learning areas for the November 2014 examinations. The four learning areas selected were Economic and Management Sciences, Life Orientation, Communication in English, and Mathematical Literacy.

The external moderators evaluated the standardisation of the memoranda using a

standardised instrument designed for this purpose. This report reflects on the evaluation process based on the key reporting criteria used in the instrument.

The standardisation of the memoranda 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.

The internal moderator, examiner and the markers form the discussion panel for each question paper. The internal moderator and examiner lead the discussions. The markers, examiner and the internal moderator mark a section of exemplar scripts after the memorandum discussions are completed. Marking of the examination scripts starts only once the internal moderator is satisfied that all markers have an acceptable level of understanding and competence to do so.

3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The evaluation reports showed that there was a clear understanding of the purpose of the memorandum discussions and the respective roles of the examiners, moderators and markers in the marking process. Table 5.1 gives a summary of the findings of the external moderation process. A 'yes' response is positive and is, therefore, the expected response. A 'no' response is not necessarily a concern as the approach adopted by the IEB must be considered when evaluating the specific criterion.

Table 5.1 Verification of Memoranda Discussions

		EMSC	LIFO	CENG	MATH
1.	Do the examination question paper and	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	memorandum represent the final version of				
	the paper moderated and approved, or				
	conditionally approved, by Umalusi?				
2.	Were the changes recommended by you	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	appropriately amended in the marking				
	memorandum?				
3.	Did the chief marker/s mark a sample of	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	scripts?				
4.	Was the chief marker's report of the previous	No	No	No	No
	examination discussed at the memorandum				
	discussion?				
5.	Did all markers, examiners and internal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	moderators attend the memorandum				
	discussion?				
6.	Did all markers, examiners and internal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	moderators come prepared to the				
	memorandum discussion, e.g. each having				
	worked out/prepared possible answers?				
7.	Did each marker, examiner and internal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	moderator receive a sample of scripts to				
	mark?				

		EMSC	LIFO	CENG	MATH
8.	Were there any changes and/or additions	Yes	No	No	Yes
	made to the marking memorandum during				
	the memorandum discussion?				
9.	Were clear motivations provided for the	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
	changes/additions to the marking				
	memorandum?				
10.	Did you approve the changes/additions to	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes
	the marking memorandum?				
11.	Were minutes of the memorandum	Yes	Yes	No	No
	discussions submitted to the Marking Centre				
	Manager/ delegates at the memorandum				
	discussion meeting?				

The external moderator reports indicated that the examiners and internal moderators for EMSC, LIFO and MATH were well prepared to conduct the discussions. Alternative answers were added to the memoranda for EMSC and MATH. No changes/amendments were made to the memoranda for CENG and LIFO. The amendments to the memoranda did not change the cognitive levels of the questions.

The internal moderators, examiners and markers provided positive contributions during the memo discussions, alternative solutions were provided and recommendations to improve the paper and marking guidelines were submitted. All participants had common understanding on the interpretation of the memoranda.

The internal moderators and examiners noted changes to the memoranda and signed the final memoranda before marking commenced.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. The panel deliberations and the marking of a section of exemplar scripts ensured an acceptable level of competence before marking commenced. This approach works well for the IEB.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

 The internal moderator, examiner and markers for CENG did not, prior to the memorandum discussions, work through the question papers or prepare possible alternative answers. They also did not have a sample of scripts to mark as part of the memorandum discussions. No amendments or additions were made for the CENG memorandum.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

1. The IEB must investigate and address the concerns regarding the poor preparations for the marking of CENG and the fact that no sample scripts were marked. **Notes**

Chapter 6

Verification of Marking

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Moderation 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 the marking memorandum.

Moderation 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. Moderation of marking also determines the standard of internal moderation and whether or not internal moderators have fulfilled their duties responsibly.

2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The moderation of marking took place at St John's College in Johannesburg from 22 to 23 November 2014 and included four LAs, i.e. Economic and Management Sciences, Life Orientation, Communication in English, and Mathematical Literacy.

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 also asked to scrutinise the answer scripts for possible irregularities.

3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The number of scripts moderated varied per learning area depending on the number of learners who wrote the examination.

Table 6.1 Number of Scripts Moderated

	EMSC	LIFO	CENG	MATH
No of scripts moderated	75	45	20*	75**

Notes:

The Umalusi moderators were able to report positively on the moderation of marking as all processes and procedures were adhered to. The quality of marking was deemed to be good in all learning areas that were moderated.

C1. Adherence to marking memorandum

- All external moderators reported that markers adhered to the marking guidelines.
- Marking was centralised and allowed for markers to discuss issues with the examiner, internal moderator and external moderator if necessary.

C2. Consistency and accuracy

- Umalusi's moderation of marking confirmed that marking was generally accurate and consistent. The difference in marks awarded by the marker and internal moderator for EMSC was at maximum 2%.
- Markers took alternative responses into consideration while marking. When
 they were unsure of certain learner answers and the alternative responses,
 they consulted the internal moderator who, in turn, provided the appropriate
 answer and substantiated the response.

C3. Quality and standard of marking

- External moderators were satisfied that marking was of an acceptable standard.
- The IEB provided administrative support to markers in the marking venue to help with checking mark allocations, sub-totals and totals recorded in the answer books.

C4. Internal moderation

Internal moderators were present in the marking venue for all learning areas.
 They re-marked a sample of scripts and gave immediate feedback to the markers.

^{*} New moderator for CENG

^{**} Umalusi used two moderators for MATH

C5. Candidates' performance

- Learner performance in specific learning areas varied quite significantly. In A4EMSC, for example, the highest mark attained in Centre A was 75% and the lowest, 16%.
- It was difficult to ascertain whether performance was because of learning and teaching practices, or whether certain questions were too easy or too difficult. A question-by-question analysis would assist in this regard.

C6. Findings and suggestions

 Generally the question papers were found to be fair. Papers were seen to have covered most of the syllabi content and were pitched at the correct cognitive level to avoid disadvantaging learners.

C7. Irregularities

Table 6.2 Marking Irregularity Register

LA CODE	IRREGULARITY	COMMENTS
A4EMSC	No	There was no evidence of irregularities in the scripts of the
		learners.
A4LIFO	Yes	Centre Name: Tau Nalana Kolobe Agriculture
		Centre No: 6859
		Student No's: 146859359499; 103370201992;
		146859359498; 146859359500
		Specific indicators of cheating: Same/similar responses to
		Questions 5.1; 6.1; 6.2; 9.1; 10.2; 10.5; 11.1.
		All of the candidates also did not answer Question 7.
A4CENG	No	There were no instances of irregularities in the scripts.
A4MATH	No	The response of candidates from the same centre
		indicated that learners responded individually.

Umalusi requested the IEB to investigate the alleged irregularities as reported by the monitors and moderators. The IEB submitted a detailed report regarding each irregularity reported during the writing and marking phases of the examination. There was sufficient evidence in the report that the IEB has adequate systems in place to effectively resolve each incident reported as an irregularity.

The IEB also submitted copies of letters from two examination centres, i.e. TGM Clinic and Project Literacy, requesting permission to conduct the examination on alternative

dates and/or times. The request by TGM Clinic explained the reasons for the concerns, as noted by the monitor.

Umalusi is satisfied that the IEB has thoroughly investigated each irregularity reported and accepts the findings that the credibility of the examination was not compromised at any stage.

C8. Adjustment of marks

 All external moderators recommended that raw marks be awarded for the November 2014 examination.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

 The internal moderator and examiner were present in the marking room and provided support to the markers during the marking process. All issues related to marking and internal moderation were resolved as and when raised.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

1. The alleged irregularity regarding A4LIFO at centre number 6859 was noted and reported to the IEB.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

 The IEB was asked to investigate the incident regarding the alleged irregularity regarding A4LIFO at centre number 6859 and to submit a report to Umalusi. Umalusi received the irregularities report. This issue will be discussed at a bilateral meeting with the assessment body.

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 the 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 Independent Examination Board (IEB) presented eight learning areas for standardisation at the standardisation meeting held on 20 December 2014.

3. DECISIONS: IEB

The decisions taken for the November 2014 examination of the GETC: ABET L4 qualification were informed by the norm, historical average and 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.

Given the nature of the sector and the low enrolment numbers in all of the learning areas, **raw marks were accepted** for the learning areas listed below:

- 1. Communication in English
- 2. Economic and Management Sciences
- 3. Human and Social Sciences
- 4. Life Orientation
- 5. Mathematical Literacy
- 6. Natural Sciences
- 7. Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises
- 8. Technology.

4. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. The Assessment Standards Committee (ASC) noted the professional presentation of the standardisation booklets as presented by the IEB.

5. AREAS OF CONCERN

The Assessment Standards Committee raised the following concerns with the IEB:

- 1. Non-adherence to the Umalusi prescripts in preparation of the standardisation booklets
- 2. Technical errors in the standardisation booklets.

6. DIRECTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT

The Assessment Standards Committee recommended the following:

- The IEB must adhere to the Umalusi Requirements and Specifications for Standardisation, Statistical Moderation and Resulting policy document of 2013.
- 2. The IEB must establish an internal committee to quality assure and verify the standardisation booklets prior to printing the copies to be submitted for standardisation.

Notes			

Conclusion

This report has reflected on the key quality assurance of assessment processes, as explained in the various chapters. 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 moderators evaluated eight QPs set for the November 2014 examinations. The *Human and Social Sciences* paper was rejected and the Technology paper was conditionally approved, to be resubmitted. The internal moderators amended the question papers based on the recommendations of the external moderators, and submitted the revised question papers for second moderation. Both QPs were approved at second moderation.

Umalusi was satisfied that all question papers approved by external moderators met the Subject Assessment Guidelines, notwithstanding the concerns raised above. The quality and standard of the approved question papers did not compromise the GETC: ABET L4 examinations and were fit for purpose.

CHAPTER 2: MODERATION OF SBA PORTFOLIOS

The sample of SBA portfolios requested included 6/8 learning areas for the 2014 November examinations. It was a concern that some training centres did not submit the educator portfolios with the SBA sample requested. It was difficult for external moderators to evaluate certain criteria in the absence of the educator portfolios.

Internal assessment remains a concern as 24% of portfolios evaluated fell below the acceptable compliance range, with 16 instances of NONE and LIMITED compliance. The IEB must investigate strategies to strengthen internal moderation of SBA portfolios. Internal moderation is an important step in the quality assurance process, as internal moderators must support educators and guide understanding and implementation of the SBA tasks.

Umalusi acknowledges that the implementation and marking of SBA tasks at institutional level is the responsibility of Adult Education and Training Centres and that it is difficult for the assessment body to account for daily operational issues. The IEB must, however, put in place measures to monitor and evaluate the implementation of

internal assessment and the improvement thereof.

CHAPTER 3: MONITORING OF WRITING

Umalusi deployed monitors to assess the conduct and administration of the GETC: ABET L4 examinations. The monitoring of the writing phase identified areas of concern as the administration of the conduct of the examinations did not meet the required standards. The IEB must peruse the *Directives for Compliance and Improvement* noted in this report and introduce measures to effectively address the concerns raised.

CHAPTER 4: MONITORING OF MARKING

The monitoring of the marking phase confirmed that the IEB met and exceeded the minimum quality standards. All marking was seen to be largely fair and valid, with no incident that could compromise the integrity of the marking process.

The marking centre was well run by a competent and experienced centre manager. Marking was systematic and markers were well trained. The number of scripts was small and marking finished on time. The process was credible.

CHAPTER 5: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS

External moderator reports indicated that the standardisation of the marking guidelines met the required standards. This resulted in comprehensive memoranda that were well understood by all markers, who also displayed competence in the use of the marking memorandum.

The memorandum discussion meetings were professionally managed and their purpose fulfilled, to a large extent, in each learning area. The memorandum discussions served their intended purpose in every externally moderated learning area. Umalusi was satisfied that the concerns raised in the main report 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.

CHAPTER 6: VERIFICATION OF MARKING

The moderation and verification of marking confirmed that the process was sound and that the marking of question papers adhered to the marking memoranda. All marking was seen to be largely fair and valid, with no specific incident that could compromise the integrity of the marking process.

CHAPTER 7: STANDARDISATION

Raw marks were accepted for all eight learning areas during the standardisation process. The ASC recommended that the IEB adhere to the Umalusi Requirements and Specifications for Standardisation, Statistical Moderation and Resulting policy document of 2013, and to put measures in place to quality assure the booklets prior to submission.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, notwithstanding the few concerns raised above, Umalusi Council approved the release of the IEB 2014 GETC: ABET L4 results at the approval meeting held on Monday, 29 December 2014. The results were approved on the basis that, after careful consideration of all the qualitative reporting on the quality assurance conducted, Umalusi found no reason to suggest that the credibility of the IEB 2014 GETC: ABET L4 November 2014 examinations was compromised in any way.

Notes			

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
 - Dr Marimuthy Govender
 - Dr Rajendran Govender
 - Mr Donald Hanneman
 - Ms Zodwa Khumalo
 - Mrlshmael Kungwane
 - Dr Reginald Monyai
 - Ms Raesetja Mogoroga
 - Dr Nkoloyakhe Mpanza
 - Mr Sylvester Sibanyoni
 - Ms Jayshree Singh
- (iii) Mr Desmond April, who evaluated, synthesised and consolidated the individual reports from the external moderators into 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 Ramothale 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
 - MrSphiwe 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.

Notes	
	_
	_

Notes		

Notes		



37 General Van Ryneveld Street, Persequor Technopark, Pretoria
Telephone: +27 12 349 1510 • Fax: +27 12 349 1511
E-mail: Info@umalusi.org.za • Web: www.umalusi.org.za

