

REPORT ON THE
QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE
EXAMINATION AND ASSESSMENT
OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION AND
TRAINING CERTIFICATE: ADULT BASIC
EDUCATION AND TRAINING (GETC: ABET)
AT LEVEL 1 ON THE NATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK (NQF)

2010

PUBLISHED BY:



Council for Quality Assurance in
General and Further Education and Training

COPYRIGHT 2010 UMALUSI COUNCIL FOR QUALITY
ASSURANCE IN GENERAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION
AND TRAINING. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------|
| TABLES | v |
| ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS | vii |
| FOREWORD | viii |
| CHAPTER ONE: | 1 |
| 1. Background | 1 |
| 2. Purpose of the Report | 2 |
| 3. Scope of the Report | 2 |
| CHAPTER TWO: MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS | 3 |
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Scope | 3 |
| 3. Approach | 4 |
| 4. Findings | 4 |
| 5. Areas of Good Practice | 6 |
| 6. Areas for Improvement | 6 |
| 7. Conclusion | 6 |
| CHAPTER THREE: MODERATION OF INTERNAL ASSESSMENT | 7 |
| 1. Introduction | 7 |
| 2. Scope | 8 |
| 3. Approach | 9 |
| 4. Findings | 11 |
| 5. Areas of Good Practice | 12 |
| 6. Areas for Improvement | 13 |
| 7. Conclusion | 14 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: MONITORING OF THE EXAMINATION | 16 |
| 1. Introduction | 16 |
| 2. Scope | 16 |
| 3. Approach | 17 |
| 4. Findings | 17 |
| 5. Areas of Good Practice | 20 |
| 6. Areas for Improvement | 20 |
| 7. Conclusion | 21 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| CHAPTER FIVE: MODERATION OF MARKING..... | 22 |
| 1. Introduction | 22 |
| 2. Scope | 22 |
| 3. Approach..... | 23 |
| 4. Findings..... | 23 |
| 5. Areas of Good Practice..... | 26 |
| 6. Areas for Improvement..... | 26 |
| 7. Conclusion..... | 27 |
| CHAPTER SIX: STANDARDISATION OF RESULTS..... | 28 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 28 |
| 2. Scope..... | 28 |
| 3. Approach..... | 29 |
| 4. Findings..... | 29 |
| 5. Areas of Good Practice..... | 30 |
| 6. Areas for Improvement..... | 30 |
| 7. Conclusion..... | 31 |
| CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION..... | 32 |
| ANNEXURES..... | 33 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | 35 |

Tables

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1: Moderation of question papers: DHET..... | 4 |
| Table 2: Moderation of question papers: IEB..... | 5 |
| Table 3: Learning areas included in SBA moderation sample..... | 8 |
| Table 4: Moderation of internal assessment - DHET..... | 11 |
| Table 5: Moderation of internal assessment - IEB..... | 12 |
| Table 6: Monitoring of different phases of the examination..... | 16 |
| Table 7: Monitoring of the examination: DHET..... | 18 |
| Table 8: Monitoring of the examination: IEB..... | 19 |
| Table 9: Learning areas included in moderation of marking sample..... | 22 |
| Table 10: Moderation of marking: DHET..... | 24 |
| Table 11: Moderation of marking: IEB..... | 25 |
| Table 12: Summary of standardisation outcomes..... | 28 |
| Table 13 (a): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Content Learning Areas offered by DHET..... | 33 |
| Table 13 (b): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Language, Literacy and Communication Learning Areas offered by DHET..... | 33 |
| Table 14 (a): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Content Learning Areas offered by IEB..... | 34 |
| Table 14 (b): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Language, Literacy and Communication Learning Area offered by IEB..... | 34 |

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | | |
|---------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ABET | - | Adult Basic Education and Training |
| AET | - | Adult Education and Training |
| ASC | - | Assessment Standards Committee |
| DHET | - | Department of Higher Education and Training |
| EC | - | Eastern Cape Province |
| EAG | - | Examination and Assessment Guideline |
| FS | - | Free State Province |
| GETC | - | General Education and Training Certificate |
| GP | - | Gauteng Province |
| IEB | - | Independent Examinations Board |
| KZN | - | KwaZulu-Natal Province |
| L4 | - | Level 4 |
| LP | - | Limpopo Province |
| MP | - | Mpumalanga Province |
| NC | - | Northern Cape Province |
| NQF | - | National Qualifications Framework |
| NW | - | North West Province |
| PED | - | Provincial Education Department |
| SBA | - | Site-Based Assessment |
| UMALUSI | - | Quality Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training |
| WC | - | Western Cape Province |

Foreword

The year 2010 is the ninth year that Umalusi has successfully quality assured the assessments and examinations of the General Education and Training Certificate (GETC) for Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) at Level 1 on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).

This year saw the end of the old GETC: ABET qualification (SAQA ID no. 24153) and the introduction of the new GETC: ABET qualification (SAQA ID no. 71751).

This provided a final opportunity for candidates who failed, during June 2009 and November 2009, to rewrite the expired GETC: ABET NQF Level 1 qualification as there was an imminent change in the qualification.

We also had to contend with the many challenges that the 2010 FIFA Soccer World Cup brought. For the first time in the history of this qualification, the examination had to be written during May to accommodate the extended holiday period for public centres.

The introduction of the new qualification brought its own challenges. The extension of Umalusi's mandate as a Quality Council created opportunities for the council to play a leading role in the design and development of new qualifications for registration on its sub framework. While we are still a long way from achieving the ideal qualification for out-of-school youth and adult learners who have never had access to a general qualification, we need to push ahead to ensure that every South African learner who enrolls for the GETC: ABET NQF Level 1 receives the quality teaching, learning and assessment they deserve.

Umalusi has adopted the following quality assurance approach with regard to the GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination and assessment:

- moderating question papers;
- moderating internal assessment;
- monitoring the conduct of the examination;
- moderating marking; and
- standardising examination and internal assessment results.

The Assessment Standards Committee (ASC) met at Umalusi offices in Pretoria on Tuesday, 27 July 2010, and Wednesday, 29 December 2010, respectively. At the approval meetings, there was no report to suggest that the examination processes were compromised and the committee declared that the examinations were beyond reproach. The Executive Committee of Umalusi Council has concluded, from the reports submitted by all personnel involved in the quality assurance of examinations, that assessment in the GETC: ABET (NQF 1), examined by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) and the Independent Examinations Board (IEB), complied with policies and regulations governing the conduct of examinations.

The results are therefore found to be reliable, valid, fair and credible.

Dr S Mabizela
Chairperson

29 December 2010

Chapter 1

Introduction

1 BACKGROUND

The General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Amended Act (No 50 of 2008) and the recently enacted National Qualifications Framework Act (No 76 of 2008) assign the responsibility for quality assurance of general and further education and training in South Africa to Umalusi, the Quality Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training.

The Council executes this function through, inter alia:

- monitoring and reporting on the adequacy and suitability of qualifications and standards;
- quality assurance of all exit point assessments;
- certification of learner achievements; and
- accreditation of private providers.

This report focuses on the quality assurance of the General Education and Training Certificate for Adult Basic Education and Training (GETC: ABET) NQF 1 examination and assessments for the year 2010. Umalusi annually reports on the standard of the Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) assessment. In this regard, Umalusi reports on each of the quality assurance of assessment processes and procedures that, together, allow Umalusi to make an evaluative judgement on the credibility of the GETC: ABET assessments. These processes ensure that all aspects of the assessment are moderated and monitored against prescribed criteria, thus ensuring that standards are both maintained and improved.

Umalusi judges the quality and standard of the assessments by determining:

- the level of adherence to policy in implementing assessment-related processes;
- the efficiency and effectiveness of the systems, processes and procedures for monitoring the conduct of examinations, the quality of marking, and the quality and standard of internal assessment;
- the cognitive challenge of examination papers; and
- the quality of the presentation of examination papers.

2 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this document is to report on Umalusi's quality assurance of the May / June 2010 and October / November 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examinations, with respect to the following:

- the salient findings from the external moderators' and monitors' reports, which are analysed and used to make judgements on the standard of the ABET examinations;
- the quality and standard of the marking of the ABET assessments;
- the efficiency and effectiveness of the systems and processes for the conduct of the ABET assessments;
- areas for improvement of the assessment processes; and
- the moderation of marks during the standardisation process.

3 SCOPE OF THE REPORT

This document covers the May / June 2010 and October / November 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) national examinations and reports on the quality assurance of assessment processes used by Umalusi to ensure that the ABET assessments are of the required standard.

The report covers each of the processes in different chapters. Each chapter captures the prominent findings with respect to each of the processes, and highlights areas of good practice and areas for improvement:

- Chapter 1 outlines the purpose of the report and its scope, and briefly discusses the quality assurance processes used by Umalusi to ensure that the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination meets the required standards.
- The 2nd chapter reports on the findings of the moderation of question papers, as well as on the standard of the question papers.
- Chapter 3 outlines the findings from the moderation of internal assessment.
- The 4th chapter discusses the findings from Umalusi's monitoring of the conduct of the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examinations.
- Chapter 5 discusses in brief detail the moderation of marking.
- Chapter 6 reports on the standardisation of the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) results.
- The 7th and final chapter summarises the findings of the quality assurance of the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination, and makes recommendations for improvement.

Chapter 2

Moderation of question papers

1 INTRODUCTION

Umalusi moderates question papers to ensure that the standard is comparable across years and across assessment bodies. To maintain public confidence in the 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; and
- representative of relevant levels of cognitive challenge.

External moderators are required, on behalf of Umalusi, to moderate the question papers carefully, recommend improvements and, finally, approve the question papers.

2 SCOPE

Umalusi moderates question papers for the 23 learning areas examined by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), and the eight learning areas examined by the Independent Examinations Board (IEB): see tables 13 (a and b) and tables 14 (a and b).

It should be noted that the May / June cohort was the last to write question papers based on the previous GETC: ABET qualification (SAQA qualification ID no. 24153). The October / November cohort was the first to write the new GETC: ABET qualification (SAQA qualification ID no. 71751).

While there were significant changes to the rules of combination and the choice between Mathematical Literacy and Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences, the core “curriculum” has not changed significantly (see Umalusi Report, July 2009: Inspecting the foundations). Many of the new unit standards were incorporated into the Site-Based Assessment (SBA) tasks.

The newly developed Examination and Assessment Guidelines (EAGs) also made provision for expanding the assessment for both internal and external assessment. The EAGs were revised in 2010 for 23 of the 26 new learning areas.

The current qualification also has three new learning areas:

- Early Childhood Development
- Wholesale and Retail
- Information Communication Technology

There were no candidates enrolled for these learning areas for 2010.

3 APPROACH

Umalusi uses external moderators who are subject experts, experienced in the field of assessment, to moderate the question papers for every examination. The findings and recommendations are based on the reports received from the Umalusi moderators.

Findings are reported against the following criteria:

- adherence to policy;
- content coverage;
- cognitive challenge;
- technical criteria;
- language and bias; and
- quality and standard of internal moderation.

4 FINDINGS

All question papers were approved by Umalusi prior to being written by candidates.

The table below represents the findings against the criteria used to moderate question papers.

Table 1: Moderation of question papers: DHET

| Criteria | Findings |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | DHET |
| Technical | There was an improvement in the technical quality of question papers. Most were generally compliant in respect of adherence to the format requirements. |
| Internal moderation | All external moderators confirmed that there was sufficient evidence that internal moderation took place. |

| Criteria | Findings |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | DHET |
| Content coverage | All moderator reports indicated that the question papers were found to be mostly compliant with all requirements of the EAGs. |
| Cognitive demand | Most moderated question papers covered the cognitive levels fairly well. However, some internal moderators' reports did not have a fully completed assessment framework, or analysis grid, for verification. Internal moderators should ensure that these assessment frameworks always accompany internal moderator reports, and that these agree with the EAGs. |
| Marking guideline | All marking guidelines (memoranda) were user-friendly and the marks, allocated per question, tallied in most cases. |
| Language and bias | No question paper was found to be biased in any way. |
| Adherence to policy | Generally, most question papers were compliant in all respects of the criteria for policy adherence. |
| Predictability | No question papers were found to be predictable in any way. |
| Overall impression of the paper | All question papers were found to be fair and of an appropriate standard. External moderator reports noted a general improvement in the quality of the question papers and internal moderation processes. |

Table 2: Moderation of question papers: IEB

| Criteria | Findings |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | IEB |
| Technical | The layout is learner-friendly and the instructions are clear. All papers complied with these criteria. |
| Internal moderation | All the external moderators confirmed that there was sufficient evidence that internal moderation took place. |
| Content coverage | Moderator reports showed compliance in most respects for this criterion. The question papers addressed the unit standards adequately. |
| Cognitive demand | Most of the question papers covered the cognitive levels fairly well. However, some internal moderators' reports did not have fully completed assessment frameworks or analysis grids for verification. Internal moderators should ensure that these assessment frameworks always accompany internal moderator reports, and that these agree with the user guides. |
| Marking guideline | Marking guidelines (memoranda) showed good correlation between mark allocations per question. |
| Language and bias | All moderated question papers were found to be learner-friendly, fair and pitched at the appropriate level. No question was found to be biased in any way. |
| Adherence to policy | All moderator reports indicated that all question papers were compliant in all respects of this criterion. |
| Predictability | The nature of most papers reduces the notion of predictability and there is no direct repetition of questions from past papers. |

| Criteria | Findings |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | IEB |
| Overall impression of the paper | Generally, all question papers were of a good standard and were found to be fair for ABET NQF Level 1 candidates. |

5 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

There is a marked improvement in the overall quality of the question papers. Layout and presentation quality are also acceptable. Question papers were learner-friendly, fair and pitched at the right level. The management, administration and security of question papers by the Department of Higher Education and Training and the Independent Examinations Board are appropriate.

6 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Incomplete assessment frameworks, or analysis grids in some learning areas, need to be closely monitored. Both the DHET and the IEB must ensure that all question papers and internal moderator reports are checked thoroughly prior to submission for external moderation.

Assessment bodies are encouraged to improve their internal quality control mechanisms continually, to ensure that their processes are not compromised.

7 CONCLUSION

While there is a marked improvement in the quality of internal moderation of question papers, assessment bodies should endeavour to submit question papers of an acceptable standard prior to external moderation, so that these can be approved at first moderation.

Chapter 3

Moderation of internal assessment

1 INTRODUCTION

Internal assessment [also referred to as Continuous Assessment (CASS), or Site-Based Assessment (SBA)], is assessment that takes place at the time of learning and, more importantly, it is integrated with teaching. In many cases, this has led to internal assessment components including an even wider range of specific outcomes than is traditionally assessed by an external examination.

The GETC: ABET (NQF 1) assessments consists of two components: internal and external assessment. Internal assessment, or SBA, constitutes 50% of the final examination mark. Since the internal assessment of the NQF 1 qualification is seen as equal in importance to the external assessment in contributing to the final mark, Umalusi quality assures internal assessment through the application of a rigorous moderation and verification process.

For the DHET, 2010 was the second year of implementation of five nationally set, common SBA tasks, which were externally moderated by Umalusi. This proved to be quite challenging.

Many provinces experienced implementation challenges because of the shortened second term as a result of the soccer world cup, and the prolonged public sector strike. However, in the main the process was well implemented. Nevertheless, the influence of these events on learner performance should not be underestimated.

SBA tasks are marked and graded at site level, which requires that assessment bodies and provincial education departments (PEDs) have effective monitoring and moderation systems in place. Major capacity challenges seem to hamper improvement in this area of the quality assurance process. Furthermore, ensuring reliable internal assessment in a system with vast differences in available resources remains a major challenge.

The main objective of the moderation of internal assessment is to:

- ascertain the appropriateness and standard of the assessment tasks;
- ensure that evidence is collected and documented effectively;
- assure that sufficient tasks of different types have been administered;

- ensure that assessment across different sites of delivery is consistent and that standards are maintained; and
- assure that the quality assurance of the internal assessment component of the GETC: ABET is effectively managed.

2 SCOPE

The moderation of internal assessment was conducted in a sample of learning areas across the nine PEDs and the IEB.

The table below indicates the selected learning areas where moderation of SBAs was conducted.

Table 3: Learning areas included in SBA moderation sample

| Learning Area | Eastern Cape | Free State | Gauteng | | KwaZulu-Natal | Limpopo | | Mpumalanga | North West | Northern Cape | Western Cape | IEB | TOTAL | | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|------------|------------|---------------|--------------|-----|-------|---------|----------|
| | | | June | October | | June | October | | | | | | June | October | |
| Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Arts and Culture | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Economic and Management Science | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Human and Social Science | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | * | | 3 | 3 |
| Life Orientation | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Mathematical Literacy | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Mathematics and Mathematical Science | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Natural Science | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 4 | 4 |
| Small Medium and Micro Enterprises | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 4 |
| Technology | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 4 | 4 |
| Travel and Tourism | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| LLC – Afrikaans | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 3 |
| LLC – English | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 4 | 4 |
| LLC – Sesotho | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 3 |

| Learning Area | Eastern Cape | Free State | Gauteng | | KwaZulu-Natal | Limpopo | | Mpumalanga | North West | Northern Cape | Western Cape | IEB | TOTAL | | TOTAL |
|----------------|--------------|------------|----------|----------|---------------|----------|----------|------------|------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | June | October | | June | October | | | | | | June | October | |
| LLC – Sepedi | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| LLC – Setswana | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| LLC – Xhosa | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | 3 | 3 |
| LLC – Xitsonga | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 3 | 3 |
| LLC – Zulu | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 8 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 63 | 66 |

* Moderator unavailable

Umalusi's decision to moderate the internal assessment of these learning areas was motivated, firstly, by the fact that a new qualification had been introduced; and secondly, because of the continued poor performance of learners in some of these learning areas.

The decision to moderate a larger sample was based on a long-term strategy towards moderating all learning areas, over a period and to provide Umalusi with a benchmark of practices within all learning areas it is responsible for quality assuring.

3 APPROACH

For the May / June 2010 examination, Umalusi deployed two moderators to moderate internal assessment at two PEDs. On-site moderation was undertaken in three stages in each province:

- a pre-moderation session;
- moderation of portfolios; and
- a post-moderation session.

For the October / November 2010 examination, moderation of internal assessment was conducted for 19 learning areas across nine PEDs and four learning areas for the IEB. Centralised moderation was undertaken in two stages at Umalusi:

- the moderation of portfolios; and
- a post-moderation session.

3.1 PRE-MODERATION

For the May / June 2010 examination, sessions were held with assessment body officials who were involved with managing the implementation of internal assessment.

Issues discussed included:

- sampling of portfolios;
- compliance with policy;
- educator training;
- quality of site-based assessment;
- internal moderation; and
- monitoring and evaluation.

3.2 MODERATION OF EDUCATOR AND LEARNER PORTFOLIOS

A rigorous process was followed to moderate both educator and learner portfolios. The moderators evaluated, moderated (re-marked) and reported on the standard of assessment within the moderated learning areas. The following criteria were considered:

- policies (provincial policy, learning area guidelines);
- quality of internal moderation at all levels;
- quality and standard of assessment across PEDs; and
- recording and reporting.

3.3 POST-MODERATION

In May / June 2010, at the end of the moderation session assessment body officials and moderators had an opportunity to interact with external moderators, during a post-moderation meeting. The external moderators, where possible, gave verbal feedback on the strengths and weaknesses identified during the moderation. This was followed by recommendations.

For the October / November 2010 sample, Umalusi will provide formal feedback to the assessment bodies to encourage intervention strategies that ensure implementation of all recommendations made during the moderation of internal assessment of this examination cycle.

4 FINDINGS

It should be noted that our findings are based on the sample of learning areas moderated as indicated in table 3. The standard of the SBAs varied from assessment body to assessment body, from province to province, from district to district and from centre to centre.

An overview of the findings for the 2010 SBA moderation process for the DHET and the IEB is presented in the tables below.

Table 4: Moderation of internal assessment – DHET

| Criteria | Findings |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Compliance with national guidelines and national policy on the implementation of SBA in GETC: ABET</p> | <p>Provincial internal assessment policies are generally available for verification. However, not all PEDs have updated policies in place. Most of the PEDs have met the minimum requirements for internal assessment and moderation.</p> <p>There remains a vast gap between policy and practice. The lack of monitoring and support, by provincial and district officials in most cases, needs to be addressed.</p> |
| <p>Quality of internal moderation at all levels</p> | <p>Generally, internal moderation has taken place. However, in many cases moderation took the form of audits and mainly checklists, which were completed as evidence of moderation. These audits did not focus on the quality and standard of assessment and moderation of the tasks.</p> <p>The timing of internal moderation throughout the academic year is not evenly spread within different provinces. Many PEDs conduct centre- and district-level moderations too late in the year.</p> <p>Most PEDs still do not use feedback effectively. Internal moderation reports do not provide sufficient qualitative input and thus there is no effective contribution to the improvement of teaching and learning. PEDs are still finding it difficult to re-mark all tasks. There are still major inconsistencies between marks at the different levels. Internal moderation is inconsistently implemented in most PEDs.</p> |
| <p>Quality and standard of the assessment tasks</p> | <p>Most of the PEDs used the nationally set SBA tasks, which were externally moderated by Umalusi and they are of an acceptable standard. Different forms of assessment, and assessment tools, were used. It was evident from the verification process that many facilitators struggled with the use of rubrics as an assessment tool. This resulted in inconsistent marking by different facilitators.</p> <p>The nationally set SBA tasks brought about an improvement, compared to</p> |

| Criteria | Findings |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | previous years, in the quality of internally assessed tasks in all learning areas. |
| Recording and reporting | <p>In general, the record of marks in the educator portfolio tallied with the learners' portfolio marks. Most PEDs used the five nationally set SBA tasks for compiling the final SBA mark, while some included a sixth task, which was internally set and moderated. Most moderators' reports were generated in an audit form and contained qualitative feedback that was limited in its ability to enhance the teaching and learning process.</p> <p>In some provinces it was evident that there is no standardised mark sheet in place. The majority of PEDs have included computerised mark sheets. However, some failed to do so and this made it extremely difficult to verify marks allocated to learners.</p> |

Table 5: Moderation of internal assessment – IEB

| Criteria | Findings |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Compliance with national guidelines and national policy on the implementation of SBA in GETC: ABET | There was no assessment body policy on internal assessment available for verification. However, the assessment body generally complied with national policy requirements. |
| Quality of internal moderation at all levels | <p>The quality of internal moderation is of an acceptable level but moderation occurs only at assessment body level.</p> <p>There is no evidence of qualitative reports for other levels of moderation.</p> |
| Quality and standard of the assessment tasks | Three standardised assessment tasks developed and internally moderated by the assessment body were used in all learning areas. These tasks are of a good quality. |
| Recording and reporting | No assessment body mark sheets were enclosed for verification. External moderators had to rely on the marks captured in portfolios. |

5 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

Generally, portfolios were neat and presentable. It is heart-warming to see that in some provinces there was evidence of re-marking at various levels of the moderation process. Some provinces make a considerable effort to ensure that portfolios meet the minimum requirements. There is evidence of pockets of excellence across the assessment bodies and PEDs. This is commendable.

The quality and the standard of the IEB's SBA tasks are also commendable. Nevertheless, we need to investigate the possibility of submitting all tasks for external moderation to ensure comparability across assessment bodies.

6 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The specific areas of concern are listed in the above tables and should be scrutinised for more detailed information.

Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET)

Implementation

The lack of uniformity in sequencing of tasks within provinces and districts needs closer monitoring as this defeats the notion of common, national, standardised tasks.

There seems to be an over-reliance on SBA tasks by facilitators and officials. The formative purpose is totally lost in many cases, as teachers use SBA tasks primarily to prepare learners for the examination, which is unacceptable. The officials, on the other hand, use them as monitoring tools to check whether educators have “taught” or “done their work”. As a result, they are used as “assessment for accountability”.

Training

The training of ABET facilitators is critical to the development and improvement of learner performance in all learning areas. Training for internal moderation and in the use of assessment tools are two of the most important areas identified by the external moderators.

Recording and reporting

Not all working and computerised mark sheets were available to verify the recording of results during external moderation. Standardised working mark sheets should be developed to ensure uniform capturing of marks by educators. The conversion of marks should be streamlined for all provincial education departments. Final computerised mark sheets should be available at all times for external moderation so verification of the marks can be done.

It is therefore imperative that the national Department of Higher Education and Training develops standardised, national, working mark sheets, for educators to capture learners' marks to track learner performance.

Feedback

The timing and frequency of internal moderation needs serious consideration as it is evident that the reports from the moderation process do not lead to effective feedback to learners and educators. Internal moderation should provide qualitative developmental feedback that can enhance educator and learner performance. Educators should use previous, externally moderated SBA tasks as scaffolding tasks to address the problem that exists with incorrect pitching of assessment activities, inappropriate language and format, and inadequate preparation for final SBA tasks. Facilitators must ensure that correct unit standards are used in preparing for internal and external assessment.

Independent Examinations Board (IEB)

Implementation

Close monitoring of implementation by service providers is necessary if the IEB wants to see an improvement in learner performance. While it is evident that the IEB is confronted with different challenges within the sector, it is imperative that solutions be found to address these challenges.

Recording and reporting

No computerised mark sheets were available for verification during external moderation. Final computerised mark sheets should be available at all times for external moderation so that verification of the marks can be done.

Feedback

The timing and frequency of internal moderation needs serious attention. The lack of moderation at other levels of the system, e.g. the learning site, also needs to be addressed.

Internal moderation should provide qualitative developmental feedback that can enhance educator and learner performance. Reports to this effect should be available during external moderation.

7 CONCLUSION

The use of standardised SBA tasks by both the DHET and the IEB sets a clear benchmark for internal assessment of expected learner performance within these two assessment bodies.

It is clear that the effective implementation of internal assessment still poses some challenges to the assessment bodies and PEDs. Of major concern are the variable assessment practices within assessment bodies, provinces and districts or regions. There are still major discrepancies between policy and practice.

Internal assessment in the PEDs and the IEB is problematic, as are the reliability and validity of the SBA marks. For this reason, Umalusi applies its statistical moderation model to reduce such variations.

Chapter 4

Monitoring of the examination

1 INTRODUCTION

Umalusi monitors the conduct of the examination to ensure adherence to regulatory policy for the administration and conduct of adult examinations.

The following phases of the GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examinations were monitored:

- the design phase, which focuses on the 'state of readiness' of the assessment bodies to administer the examinations;
- the conduct of examinations phase, which includes the writing and marking of papers; and
- the capturing of marks and processing of results.

2 SCOPE

The examination is monitored by both the PEDs and the DHET. The IEB monitored examination centres under its control.

Umalusi's monitoring exercise extended across the nine PEDs and the IEB.

The table below represents the number of visits conducted by Umalusi monitors for the 2010 examination period.

Table 6: Monitoring of different phases of the examination

| Province or assessment body | Phase of examination monitored | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-------|-----|----------|
| | Design | | Writing | | Marking | | Total | | |
| | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | |
| EC | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| FS | 0 | 0 | 3* | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| GP | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| KZN | 0 | 0 | 3* | 3 | 1 | # | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| LP | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |

| Province or assessment body | Phase of examination monitored | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Design | | Writing | | Marking | | Total | | |
| | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | |
| MP | 0 | 0 | 3* | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| NW | 0 | 0 | 3* | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| NC | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| WC | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| IEB | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 10 | 9 | 40 | 39 | 79 |

Monitor was unavailable

* IEB sites monitored in various provinces

3 APPROACH

Umalusi's approach to monitoring the GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination comprised of the following:

- the assessment body completed a state of readiness questionnaire and submitted a report. The Umalusi convening monitor followed up with an evaluation visit to establish the validity of the assessment body's report;
- Umalusi received daily irregularity reports from the assessment bodies;
- monitors deployed to the examination centres submitted reports to Umalusi;
- Umalusi monitors made random, unannounced visits to the examination centres; and,
- Umalusi staff shadowed monitors and made random, unannounced visits to examination centres.

4 FINDINGS

Umalusi's evaluative report on monitoring the GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination seeks to determine the relative credibility of the examination and establish whether any factors compromised the credibility of the examination.

The findings are presented in line with the phases of monitoring. They highlight only the key aspects underpinning the credibility of the examination.

Table 7: Monitoring of the examination: DHET

| Criteria | Findings |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Monitoring of the Writing phase | |
| Security, storage and dispatch of examination material | <p>All PEDs have adequate security measures in place to ensure safe storage and dispatch of examination material.</p> <p>Officials were responsible for the storage and distribution of examination material. Some PEDs made use of courier companies to transport the examination material to centres.</p> <p>Most PEDs have measures in place for collection and return of the question papers and scripts.</p> |
| Management of examination centres | <p>In general, the examinations centres were managed well.</p> <p>All question papers were sealed on arrival; these were opened in the presence of the learners and the invigilators. After the learners had completed writing, scripts were counted, checked and packed by the chief invigilators. A recording register to dispatch the scripts was completed in some PEDs. Scripts were packed in either numerical order or according to the attendance register. Scripts were then taken to the district or circuit offices before dispatch to marking centres.</p> <p>In most provinces the centre managers were appointed as the chief invigilators. Not all examination rooms were clearly indicated, but most of the centres were conducive to the writing of the examinations. Rooms were, in general, clean, with adequate lighting and ventilation.</p> <p>It was evident that regular monitoring was done by the PEDs.</p> |
| Invigilation of the examination | <p>The examinations were generally managed well. Most invigilators understood the task at hand and conducted the examinations, and themselves, professionally. A few cases of late arrival and late starting were reported. Some centres did not have invigilator attendance registers available. All chief invigilators received training from the provincial office and they, in turn, trained the other invigilators.</p> |
| Management of irregularities | <p>Chief invigilators were tasked with reporting all irregularities to the district offices; district offices to provincial offices; and provincial offices, in turn, to the DHET and Umalusi. No serious irregularities were reported to Umalusi during the writing phase of the examination.</p> |
| Monitoring of marking phase | |
| Monitoring of marking | <p>Umalusi monitors were deployed to all PEDs to monitor the marking phase of the examination. Most provincial marking centres were well organised and the necessary systems and processes were in place to ensure effective control over scripts and marking.</p> <p>Generally, the training of markers entailed discussion of the memorandum, as well as administration and logistical issues around the marking. In most</p> |

| Criteria | Findings |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>cases, examination assistants were appointed to assist the markers, checking their additions and transferring marks. This was monitored by the internal moderator. The internal moderators were present at the marking centres throughout the marking period. There were no irregularities reported.</p> <p>Umalusi officials monitored marking centres to ensure that the training given to markers was adequate. It was evident from the oversight monitoring visits that good practices applied at marking centres should be transferred to classrooms, to ensure better marking of internal assessment tasks.</p> |

Table 8: Monitoring of the examination: IEB

| Criteria | Findings |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Monitoring of the Writing phase | |
| Security, storage and dispatch of examination material | <p>The assessment body has adequate security in place for the storage and dispatch of examination material. Generally, the situation at site level is not as secure, as there are no secure storage facilities in place. Question papers are mainly kept in lockable offices.</p> <p>All question papers were sealed on arrival and opened in the presence of the learners and the invigilators. It was reported that after the learners had completed writing, scripts were counted and packed by the chief invigilators. Scripts were packed in either numerical order or according to the attendance register.</p> |
| Management of examination centres | <p>In general, the examinations were conducted well and in a professional manner. Most centres are at the learners' place of employment. Most prescribed standards were met. Not all rooms were clearly indicated, but most of the centres were conducive to the writing of the examinations.</p> |
| Invigilation of the examination | <p>Invigilators have a fair understanding of their responsibilities. The examination centres were generally well managed. Some centres did not have invigilator, attendance or irregularity registers.</p> |
| Management of irregularities | <p>No irregularities were reported to Umalusi during the writing phase of the examination.</p> |
| Monitoring of marking phase | |
| Monitoring of marking | <p>An Umalusi monitor was deployed to monitor the marking phase of the examination at the assessment body's marking centre.</p> <p>The marking centre was well organised and the necessary systems and processes were in place to ensure effective control over scripts and marking.</p> <p>The training of markers entailed discussion about the memorandum, and administration and logistical issues around the marking.</p> |

| Criteria | Findings |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>In most cases examination assistants were appointed to assist markers, to check their additions and transfer marks, a process monitored by the internal moderator.</p> <p>The internal moderators were present at the marking centre throughout the marking period. There were no irregularities reported.</p> |

5 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

The examinations were generally well managed within all the PEDs and the IEB.

Most examination centres were conducive to writing the examination. Monitoring of the centres by the PEDs and the IEB during the examination is encouraging.

6 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

For the May / June 2010 examination:

- The versioning or translation of memoranda was mentioned by Western Cape chief markers as problematic, as there were discrepancies between English and Afrikaans memoranda.
- National (assessment body), provincial and district monitoring plans should be made available to Umalusi timeously to ensure effective and efficient planning,
- A high absenteeism rate among candidates needs to be investigated as the monitoring and verification of examination centres is a costly process. Absenteeism might indicate a lack of preparedness to write the examination. Assessment bodies should endeavour to implement measures to reduce absenteeism.
- Centres should be checked prior to examinations to establish their condition and appropriateness to host examinations for adults.
- The lack of monitoring reports from DHET, as well as the IEB, needs urgent intervention.
- A lack of monitoring of the conduct of the examination, including the marking of scripts, by the Northern Cape Department of Education needs to be investigated by DHET.

For the October / November 2010 examination:

- Some provinces, and the IEB, failed to submit daily irregularity reports, which is a great concern. Evidence of the appointment of examination officials was not always easily verifiable as some invigilators were "appointed" by virtue of their positions on assessment bodies.
- It was found that in some IEB examination centres no seating plans had been drafted. This might create problems in the event of an investigation into irregularities.

7 CONCLUSION

All the PEDs and the IEB have appropriate systems in place to ensure the effective conduct of the examinations. All irregularities reported were handled in a satisfactory manner by the Irregularity Committees operating in the assessment bodies. It can be concluded that the 2010 examination was managed in a credible manner.

Chapter 5

Moderation of marking

1 INTRODUCTION

The moderation of marking is a critical process in assessment. It largely determines the standard and quality of marking, thus ensuring that marking is conducted in accordance with established practices and standards and that learner performance is not compromised.

2 SCOPE

For the May / June 2010 examination, Umalusi conducted on-site moderation of marking. The focus was on three learning areas that show continued under-performance, and learning areas that have shown consistent improvement over a number of years.

For the October / November 2010 examination, Umalusi used 19 external moderators to conduct off-site moderation of marking. The table below reflects the sample of learning areas that were part of the moderation of marking cycle for 2010.

Table 9: Learning areas included in moderation of marking sample

| Learning area | Province / Assessment body | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|----------|
| | EC | FS | GP | | KZN | LP | MP | NW | NC | WC | IEB | | Total | | |
| | Oct | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | |
| AAAT | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| ARTC | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| EMSC | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| HSSC | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | * | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| LIFO | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| MLMS | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| MMSC | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| NATS | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | # | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| SMME | | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| TECH | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| TRVT | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| LCAF | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 0 | 3 | 3 |

| Learning area | Province / Assessment body | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | EC | FS | GP | | KZN | LP | MP | NW | NC | WC | IEB | | Total | | | |
| | Oct | Oct | Jun | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Jun | Oct | Jun | Oct | | |
| LCEN | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | |
| LCSO | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| LCSP | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 4 | 5 | |
| LCTS | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| LCXH | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| LCXI | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 3 | 3 | |
| LCZU | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | |
| Total | 8 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 62 | 65 |

Examiner conducted off-site marking

* Moderator was unavailable

3 APPROACH

The purpose of this exercise was to validate, and ensure, that all markers in all assessment bodies adhered to the approved marking guidelines as agreed during marking guideline approval (memorandum discussion) meetings. It also serves to establish the standard of internal moderation.

4 FINDINGS

All marking guidelines or memoranda were approved and signed off before implementation at marking centres.

All PEDs and the IEB submitted the requested answer scripts for moderation of marking. For the October session, three provinces submitted their scripts late.

The tables below reflect the findings against the criteria used for moderation.

Table 10: Moderation of marking: DHET

| Criteria | Findings |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Training of markers, chief markers and internal moderators | <p>Most markers were appointed in October 2009 for the May/June marking session. Appointments are generally based on qualification and ABET teaching and / or learning area expertise.</p> <p>Training was mostly informal, based on the national marking guideline approval meetings (memorandum discussion meetings). General administration and rules regarding the marking processes and logistics were also discussed.</p> |
| Memorandum discussions | <p>These discussions took place at national level. All chief markers and / or internal moderators are expected to attend the meetings. They are also expected to pre-mark a sample of 20 scripts by candidates from a variety of performance ranges. This allows chief markers to critically evaluate the marking guideline, gauge candidates' performance and make meaningful contributions to the marking guideline approval meeting.</p> <p>Some chief markers expressed concerns about receiving the pre-marking sample timeously. PEDs have their own provincial memorandum discussions in which the minutes of the national memorandum discussion meetings are discussed and shared with markers.</p> <p>The absenteeism of some PED chief markers and internal moderators was noted and the DHET was duly informed. It is evident that some provinces do not send additional officials if the examiner or internal moderator is from the respective province. This practice does not add value to the process, as these officials have a dual role to play.</p> <p>The approved marking guideline was not distributed at this meeting but was couriered to marking centres at a later date.</p> |
| Marking procedure | <p>Most PEDs have training manuals on the marking procedure in place covering, for example, the transfer of marks, internal moderation and marking approach, among others.</p> <p>Some learning areas had question-by-question marking, while others preferred section-by-section or whole script marking.</p> |
| Adherence to marking memoranda and consistency of marking | <p>Most markers adhered to the marking memoranda. There were some errors detected in the tallying of marks. PEDs should ensure that marks are checked thoroughly after the marks have been transferred by the examination assistant and verified by the internal moderators.</p> |
| Changes to marking memorandum | <p>No changes were made to the nationally approved marking guidelines.</p> |
| Quality and standard of marking | <p>Generally, the quality of marking ranged from average to good. While the marking standard is acceptable, more can be done to improve marking techniques.</p> <p>Some areas of marking, e.g. essay marking, also need further training.</p> |

| Criteria | Findings |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Internal moderation | The sample provided sufficient evidence of internal moderation. |
| Unfair questions | External moderators did not report any unfair questions. However, they reported that some questions might have been misunderstood as a result of some candidates' limited language ability. |
| Candidates performance | Performance across certain learning areas was generally good. Most learners found the papers to be fair. There were some improvements in learner performance in some learning areas. |
| Irregularities | No serious irregularities were reported. |
| Adjustment of marks | In most instances it was proposed by the external moderators that the raw marks be accepted, since these provided a true reflection of candidates' performance. |

Table 11: Moderation of marking: IEB

| Criteria | Findings |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Appointment of markers, chief markers and internal moderators | <p>The appointments are generally based on qualification and ABET teaching and / or learning area expertise. All markers were appointed in mid-May, 2010.</p> <p>Mainly experienced examiners / markers were used for marking and internal moderation of scripts.</p> |
| Training of markers, chief markers and internal moderators | <p>No actual training of markers takes place because of geographical constraints. However, informal training takes place on the first day of marking.</p> <p>Markers are expected to mark an exemplar script to ensure consistent and correct marking across the board.</p> |
| Memorandum discussions | <p>These discussions took place at assessment body level. Markers are required to go through the question paper and compile their own memorandum for discussion on the first day of marking.</p> <p>Once this is completed, the markers exchange their memoranda for peer-marking. This is followed by a memorandum discussion in which the marking guideline is finalised and approved. Markers are then required to mark an exemplar script, which the examiner checks before actual marking commences.</p> |
| Marking procedure | Pre-marking is done only by examiners/chief markers and internal moderators. |
| Adherence to marking memoranda and consistency of marking | All markers adhered to the marking memoranda. There were few errors detected in terms of the tallying of marks. |
| Changes to marking memorandum | It was reported that no changes were made to the approved marking guidelines. |
| Quality and standard of marking | The marking standard is generally acceptable. |
| Internal moderation | The sample provided sufficient evidence of internal moderation. |
| Unfair questions | No questions were found to be unfair in any way. |

| Criteria | Findings |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Candidates' performance | Performance across learning areas was generally between 40% and 80%, with the exception of a few candidates. Most candidates found the papers to be fair. |
| Irregularities | No serious irregularities were reported. |
| Adjustment of marks | It was proposed by the external moderator that the raw marks be accepted as these provide a true reflection of candidates' performance. |

Chief markers' reports

The IEB did not include chief markers' reports with the requested sample of scripts for moderation of marking, for May / June and October / November 2010. Only some PEDs included their chief marker's reports with the scripts for verification.

PEDs and the IEB should submit these reports as soon as the internal moderation processes are completed as delayed submission has adverse consequences on the external moderation of marking processes.

5 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

Most chief markers conducted pre-marking prior to the marking guideline approval (memorandum discussion) meetings. This contributed significantly to an overall improvement in the quality of marking and internal moderation within PEDs.

The development by the IEB of an independent memorandum prior to actual marking is commendable as it allows markers to critically analyse their responses to the learners' responses. The IEB's marking of an exemplar script ensures consistency of marking and allows the internal moderator to easily pick up discrepancies.

All chief markers are encouraged to do a thorough item analysis of learner performance to make more qualitative inputs during these meetings.

6 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The timely submission of scripts, reports and computerised mark sheets is critical to the external moderation of marking processes. Assessment bodies must ensure that these quality assurance processes are not compromised.

Assessment bodies should ensure that appropriate internal moderation control systems are in place to eliminate any marker interventions, e.g. markers should not inflate marks.

Marking training should be given to all assessors and facilitators in the field to ensure that good practices are implemented when internal assessment takes place.

The marking standard is generally acceptable, but more can be done to train markers and internal moderators to improve marking techniques.

There is a marked improvement in the qualitative feedback provided in reports by chief markers and internal moderators. In most cases the prescribed report format was used, but some PEDs and the IEB failed to submit the required reports.

7 CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the marking process as a whole was reported to be of an acceptable standard. The standard of the GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination was in no way compromised. However, to maintain a credible marking standard the DHET, PEDs and the IEB must ensure that areas suggested for improvement are effectively addressed.

Chapter 6

Standardisation of results

1 INTRODUCTION

Moderation of marks is conducted to address the variation in the standard of the question papers, internal assessment and the standard of marking that may occur from examination to examination and between assessment bodies.

2 SCOPE

All the GETC: ABET (NQF 1) results of the May / June 2010 and October / November 2010 examinations were standardised for both the DHET and the IEB.

The general principles that applied in the standardisation of the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination results were:

- No adjustments should exceed 10%, and
- In the case of the individual candidate, the adjustment effected should not exceed 50% of the mark obtained by the candidate.

The pre-standardisation and standardisation meetings took place on Tuesday, 27 July 2010, and Friday, 17 December 2010, respectively.

The table below indicates a summary of the decisions taken at the standardisation meetings.

Table 12: Summary of standardisation outcomes

| Description | 27 July 2010 | | 17 December 2010 | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | Number of learning areas | | | |
| | DHET | IEB | DHET | IEB |
| Number of learning areas presented for standardisation | 23 | 8 | 23 | 8 |
| Number of learning areas where no decisions were taken due to insufficient data | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of learning areas that could not be standardised because less than 80% of the results were available. (*standardised on condition that, after capturing the marks, it | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Description | 27 July 2010 | | 17 December 2010 | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | Number of learning areas | | | |
| | DHET | IEB | DHET | IEB |
| would not be significantly different from the current marks) | | | | |
| Number of learning areas where all the candidates who wrote the learning area failed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of learning areas where Umalusi requested a revision of the proposed decision of the DHET or IEB | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Number of learning areas where raw marks were accepted | 14 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| Number of learning areas for which marks were adjusted upward | 8 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Number of learning areas for which marks were adjusted downward. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of learning areas standardised | 23 | 8 | 23 | 8 |

3 APPROACH

The model for the statistical moderation of the examination marks for the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examinations remained unchanged. This consisted of comparisons between the current mark distributions and the historical average of mark distribution of the years since 2001.

Comparisons between the current mark distribution and the historical average were made in both examination sessions. Pairs analyses were also used in these processes. The Pairs analysis compares the mean marks in two learning areas taken by the same group of candidates. These analyses are based on the principle that, as a group, the performances of the same candidates in two related learning areas (taken at the same level) should show close correspondence. On the basis of all these comparisons, together with qualitative reports from chief markers, internal and external moderators, raw marks are accepted or adjusted over defined mark ranges.

4 FINDINGS

The improvement in Mathematical Literacy for the May / June 2010 examination is encouraging. However, continued under-performance in Mathematical Literacy, Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences, Natural Sciences, English and Agriculture and Applied Agricultural Technology remains a concern for the Assessment Standards Committee (ASC).

The performance of candidates in the African language learning areas has consistently produced good results over a number of examinations for the DHET. Candidates again produced good results for this examination in these learning areas.

5 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

The absence of a common curriculum still poses major challenges. The under-performing learning areas need urgent attention. The continued high failure rates are of concern to Umalusi. The DHET, PEDs and the IEB need to develop intervention programmes to improve learner performance.

Assessment bodies should endeavour to strengthen their assessment systems and processes.

6 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

May / June 2010 examination:

Department of Higher Education and Training

- The continued under-performance of many learning areas is still a major concern for the ASC as there is little evidence to suggest that intervention strategies and improvement plans are bearing any fruit. While the cohort is seen to be weaker than those sitting for the October examination, there is a need for further investigation into the reasons for this continued poor performance.
- The 80% capturing rate for Sesotho was noted and the DHET was requested to resolve this matter. However, the results for the learning area were tentatively standardised, with the understanding that this would be resolved through internal processes.
- The lack of qualitative reports from DHET and PEDs on the monitoring of quality assurance of assessment processes needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. These reports are a valuable source of information. They also assist the ASC to judge, as a whole, the credibility of the examination and assessment processes.
- There is a notable increase in enrolment in many learning areas; however, high absenteeism rates in some learning areas needs investigation and urgent attention.
- The following should be noted with regards to the statistical booklets:
 - The incorrect pass rate reflected by the graphs should be corrected before the next examination.
 - The DHET is requested to add a distribution table below the Pairs analysis table before the next pre-standardisation meeting.

Independent Examinations Board

- Candidate performance was generally poor in most learning areas. Special attention should be given to learning areas such as English and Mathematical Literacy. These are fundamental learning areas which have shown consistent under-performance over a number of years.
- The lack of qualitative reports from the IEB on the various monitoring and moderation of quality assurance of assessment processes needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. These reports are a valuable source of information, and they assist the ASC to judge the credibility of the examination and assessment processes as a whole.
- The IEB should submit reports on the performance of candidates, per centre, to allow Umalusi to investigate accredited ABET providers that continually produce weak learner performance.
- The following should be noted with regards to the statistical booklets:
 - There is a need for further discussion on the representation of data in the booklets. Committee members felt it would be more meaningful to represent data in the same format as is that in the National Senior Certificate (NSC).

October / November 2010 examination:

Department of Higher Education and Training

- Low pass rates in most learning areas remain a major concern for Umalusi and need urgent attention.
- Intervention by markers is strongly discouraged and DHET must put internal control measures in place to prevent this.

Independent Examinations Board

- The low pass rates in most learning areas are still a major concern for Umalusi and need urgent attention.

Both assessment bodies should endeavour to strengthen their assessment systems and processes.

7 CONCLUSION

It is recommended that these areas for improvement be addressed by the DHET, PEDs and the IEB. A report from DHET, PEDs and the IEB, indicating the improvement plans, must be submitted to the ASC by 31 March 2011 to show how the areas of concern raised in this report will be addressed.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

It is evident that the ABET system is maturing.

The ASC expressed concern with the continued high failure rates of both DHET and IEB candidates in some learning areas.

It is apparent that the effective implementation of internal assessment still poses some challenges to the assessment bodies and PEDs. A major concern is the variation in assessment practices within provinces, districts and assessment bodies. There remain major inconsistencies between policy and practice. There needs to be a closer alignment between the SBA and the examination.

Internal assessment in the PEDs and the IEB is still problematic and Umalusi applies its statistical moderation model to reduce such variations.

The quality of question papers has improved, with fewer errors.

All the PEDs and the IEB have appropriate systems in place to ensure the effective conduct of the examinations. All irregularities reported were handled in a satisfactory manner by the Irregularity Committees of the assessment bodies. It can be concluded that the 2010 examination was managed in a credible manner.

It is the collective responsibility of all stakeholders and partners in education to ensure that adult learners are provided with access to high quality education. The increase in uptake in some learning areas is encouraging.

The approval meetings were conducted on Tuesday, 27 July 2010, and Wednesday, 29 December 2010 respectively. It was concluded, on the basis of the evidence presented, that the May / June 2010 as well as the October / November 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examinations were administered in terms of policy requirements. There is currently no report of any irregularities that could jeopardise the credibility of the examinations.

The Executive Committee of Umalusi's Council ratified the Assessment Standards Committee decision, and the release of the results was approved.

ANNEXURES

Table 13 (a): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Content Learning Areas offered by DHET

| LA No | CONTENT: LEARNING AREAS | LA CODE |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology | AAAT4 |
| 2 | Arts and Culture | ARTC4 |
| 3 | Ancillary Health Care | ANHC4 |
| 4 | Economic and Management Sciences | EMSC4 |
| 5 | Human and Social Sciences | HSSC4 |
| 6 | Life Orientation | LIFO4 |
| 7 | Mathematical Literacy | MLMS4 |
| 8 | Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences | MMSC4 |
| 9 | Natural Sciences | NATS4 |
| 10 | Small Medium and Micro Enterprises | SMME4 |
| 11 | Technology | TECH4 |
| 12 | Travel and Tourism | TRVT4 |

Table 13 (b): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Language, Literacy and Communication Learning Areas offered by DHET

| LA No | LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND COMMUNICATION: LEARNING AREAS | LA CODE |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 13 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Afrikaans | LCAF4 |
| 14 | Language, Literacy and Communication: English | LCEN4 |
| 15 | Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiNdebele | LCND4 |
| 16 | Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiXhosa | LCXH4 |
| 17 | Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiZulu | LCZU4 |
| 18 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Sepedi | LCSP4 |
| 19 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Sesotho | LCSO4 |
| 20 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Setswana | LCTS4 |
| 21 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Siswati | LCSW4 |
| 22 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Tshivenda | LCVE4 |
| 23 | Language, Literacy and Communication: Xitsonga | LCXI4 |

Table 14 (a): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Content Learning Areas offered by IEB

| LA No | CONTENT: LEARNING AREAS | LA CODE |
|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Human and Social Sciences | A4HSSC |
| 2 | Life Orientation | A4LIFO |
| 3 | Mathematical Literacy | A4MATH |
| 4 | Economic and Management Sciences | A4EMSC |
| 5 | Natural Sciences | A4NATS |
| 6 | Technology | A4TECH |
| 7 | Small Medium and Micro Enterprises | A4SMME |

Table 14 (b): GETC: ABET (NQF 1) Language, Literacy and Communication Learning Area offered by IEB

| LA No | LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND COMMUNICATION: LEARNING AREA | LA CODE |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 8 | Communication in English | A4CENG |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of many people's hard work and inputs. This report is written by Mr John April who acknowledges the assistance of numerous Umalusi staff, especially that of Mr Eardley Twigg, Mr Vijayen Naidoo, Dr Ronel Blom, Ms Sheila Phora and Ms Mmarona Letsholo as well as Ms Kathy Waddington, the external editor, and Ms Annelize Jansen van Rensburg, for the typesetting of the report.

The moderation of question papers and the verification of internal assessment were conducted by the following external moderators:

Mr Jack Ngobeni, Ms Titi Shokane, Ms Joyce Mokoena, Mr Donald Hanneman, Dr Marimuty Govender, Dr Reginald Monyai, Ms Phillipine Pila, Mr Sylvester Sibanyoni, Mr Malese Mokoko, Ms Grace Makobane, Ms Matlhodi Mathibela, Mr Absalom Fakude, Ms Precious Molepo, Mr Jotham Mahlangu, Ms Pumla Cutalele, Mr Edward Mukwevho, Ms Louisa Ndobela-Mononyane, Mr Roger Mackay, Mr Rajendran Govender, Mr Ishmael Kungwane, Ms Didri Spingies and Mr Jayprakash Chhana.

The monitoring and evaluation of provincial education departments and the IEB examination centres were conducted by the following external monitors:

Mr HE Franzsen, Prof CZ Gebeda, Mr GZ Sonkwala, Ms B Bekiswa, Mr PJ Venter, Mr LJ Moloi, Mr MJ Dhlamini, Mr SS Tinte, Mr JJ Mabotja, Mr A Seckle, Ms JN Mophiring, Mr S Pillay, Mr LJ Khathi, Mrs NG Jafta, Mrs AT Zuma, Mr C Maakal, Mr MT Khosa, Mr SM Mafora, Mr SJ Masola, Mr MT Magadze, Mr SJ Hlatshwayo, Mr IS Mnguni, Mrs M van Venrooy, Ms TV Dlhamini, Mr MRC Setshogoe, Mrs MC Motlhabane, Mr IK Motsilanyane, Mrs MA Venter, Mr KP Spies, Mr DR Shepherd, Mr MS Nduna and Mrs T Yawa.

The Assessment Standard Committee (ASC) would also like to express their sincere gratitude and thanks to all who, in various ways, have contributed to the success and integrity of the 2010 GETC: ABET (NQF 1) examination and assessment.

A special word of thanks to the examining panels (examiners and internal moderators), departmental officials at national level and in the provinces and districts, SITA, IEB staff and Umalusi staff (external moderators and monitors), parents or guardians or spouses, and in particular to the learners themselves, for the contributions and effort they have collectively made.

Stakeholders are encouraged to continue to work tirelessly to ensure that the needs of adult learners are met.

It is only by working together that a real difference can be made in the lives of our adult learners.