



**Technical report on the Quality Assurance  
of the examination and assessment of  
General Education and Training Certificate for  
Adult Basic Education and  
Training (GETC:ABET) at Level 1 on the  
National Qualifications Framework (NQF)**

UMALUSI



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

# A TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE 2012 ADULT EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATION

---

PUBLISHED BY:



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

COPYRIGHT 2012 UMALUSI COUNCIL FOR QUALITY  
ASSURANCE IN GENERAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION  
AND TRAINING. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

*Whilst 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 SUMMARY .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	xiv
<b>CHAPTER 1: MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE .....	2
3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	4
3.1 New learning area examinations .....	4
3.2 Number of moderations required .....	4
3.3 Status of each question paper at final moderation .....	5
3.4 Summary per moderation instrument criterion .....	5
4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	7
5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....	8
6 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	9
7 CONCLUSION .....	9
<b>CHAPTER 2: MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	10
2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE .....	11
3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	16
3.1 Overview of provincial findings .....	16
3.2 Educators' portfolios of assessment .....	17
3.3 Learner evidence of assessment .....	20
4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	22
5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....	23
6 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	24
7 CONCLUSION .....	25
<b>CHAPTER 3: MONITORING .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>PART A: MONITORING OF THE WRITING PHASE OF THE EXAMINATION .....</b>	<b>26</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	26
2 MATERIAL AND SCOPE .....	27
3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	32
4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	34
5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....	34
6 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	36
7 CONCLUSION .....	36
<b>PART B: MONITORING OF MARKING CENTRES .....</b>	<b>37</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	37
2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE .....	37
3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	42
4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	45
5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....	45
6 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	46
7 CONCLUSION .....	46

<b>CHAPTER 4: MODERATION OF MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS</b> .....	<b>47</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	47
2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE .....	48
3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	51
3.1 Processes and procedures followed .....	51
3.2 Analysis of the role of the Umalusi moderator in memorandum discussions .....	52
4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	52
5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....	52
6 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	54
7 CONCLUSION .....	56
<b>CHAPTER 5: MODERATION OF MARKING</b> .....	<b>57</b>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	57
2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE .....	58
3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....	61
3.1 Summary of key criteria .....	61
3.2 Findings and suggestions .....	63
4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE .....	64
5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....	64
6 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	65
7 CONCLUSION .....	65
<b>CHAPTER 6: CERTIFICATION AND STANDARDISATION</b> .....	<b>66</b>
1 GETC: ABET STANDARDISATION OF RESULTS DECEMBER 2012 .....	66
1.1 Scope and approach .....	66
1.2 Decisions: DHET .....	66
1.3 Areas of good practice .....	67
1.4 Areas for improvement .....	67
1.5 Conclusion .....	68
2 THE STATUS OF CERTIFICATION OF THE GETC: ABET 2012 .....	68
2.1 Background .....	68
2.2 Current certification status: Department of Higher Education and Training .....	69
2.3 Current certification status: Independent Examination Board .....	71
<b>CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>72</b>
1 RECOMMENDATIONS .....	72
2 CONCLUSION .....	73

# Executive Summary

---

Umalusi quality assures the assessment for the General Education and Training Certificate for Adult Basic Education and Training (GETC: ABET) NQF1, conducted by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET).

Quality assurance of the assessment for the GETC requires an engagement with every process in the entire examination cycle. The intention of these quality assurance activities is to determine whether all assessments and all assessment processes in the examination cycle meet the required standards. These standards are judged against various criteria appropriate to the particular assessment or assessment process. The quality assurance processes are reported in the five chapters of the main report, while additional details of the findings are included in the addenda.

Umalusi is committed to the ongoing improvement, validity, reliability and fairness of assessment. The report therefore includes sections on “Areas for Improvement” and “Recommendations”, both of which are designed to offer feedback to all those involved in the processes of assessment. Umalusi believes that judicious consideration of the proposed Areas for Improvement and Recommendations can lead to improvement when assessment personnel, educators and officials consider them in relation to the context in which they operate.

Information on the moderation and monitoring processes has been tabulated and findings are presented in the main body of the report. Additional learning area-specific, as well as province-specific, information and findings can be found in the addenda included at the end of this report.

In Chapter 1, the reports on the final moderation of 32 question papers are presented. In some learning areas the question paper was approved after the first moderation; in other learning areas, the paper was approved at the second or third moderation. As these reports were on the final moderation, the reports indicated, as was to be expected, that all question papers were fair, valid and reliable and of an appropriate standard. In just over one-third of the reports, the external moderators were able to commend the examiners and internal moderators on setting good papers that were well above standard. Nevertheless, even at the final stage of moderation, many moderators had to give instructions for errors to be corrected.

Inadequate internal moderation is a serious concern. Internal moderators are not sufficiently vigilant or rigorous. They allow numerous errors to evade them. The marking memoranda generally did not meet the required standard at the first moderation, or even at the final moderation. Moderators frequently indicated that the memorandum was not fully compliant with all the standards. On the whole, however, examiners and internal moderators show the knowledge and skills to undertake the task. The challenge lies in attention to detail.

There are some excellent examiners. However, 66% of the question papers were not approved in the first moderation, which displays much room for improvement.

On the whole, the external moderators seem to provide invaluable guidance and assistance to internal moderators and examiners.

Two new learning area examinations were written in November 2012. Wholesale and Retail is a newly introduced learning area, as is Information Communication Technology. The external moderators for these two learning areas went to great lengths to assist the examiners and internal moderators of these question papers. They provided invaluable assistance in ensuring the successful first examination of these new learning areas.

Chapter 2 reports on Site-Based Assessment (SBA). SBA is assessment that takes place on site at the time of teaching and learning. The GETC: ABET NQF1 consists of two forms of assessment: Site-Based Assessment and formal examinations. The quality assurance of SBA is of importance for two reasons. Firstly, the marks awarded to candidates for SBA comprise 50% of the qualification results. Secondly, the process of conducting SBA provides insight into the standards of teaching, assessing, moderation and support at site, district and provincial levels, and should prepare candidates for success in the examinations. SBA forms an integral part of the teaching and learning process, especially for adults, but if SBA is not valid and reliable, the integrity of the examination is at risk.

External moderation of SBA is designed not only to view the work of the candidates, but also to confirm compliance with all the processes designed to guarantee the integrity of the system. For this reason, moderators review educators' portfolios to satisfy themselves that assessment has been correctly planned and prepared, and results recorded meticulously. A key role player in the quality assurance system is the internal moderator. The moderator therefore looks closely at the role played by the internal moderators in the sample SBA portfolios. Finally, the moderator evaluates the support provided by the district and the province.

Moderation of Site-Based Assessment took the form of provincial visits. Samples of educator portfolios and evidence of SBA by candidates were closely examined by eight Umalusi moderators who submitted reports on the moderation of Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, LLC English, Human and Social Sciences, Life Orientation, Mathematical Literacy, Natural Sciences, Technology and Travel and Tourism. SBA from all Provincial Education Departments (PEDs) was moderated in at least one learning area.

Although the analysis shows that there is fairly good adherence to policy in all respects, policy documents were not always filed in portfolios for ready reference. The most relevant aspect of this analysis is that compliance, or non-compliance, is largely province or district-dependent. In certain provinces all educators had the relevant documents in their files while in other provinces, very few educator portfolios contained policy documents. As not all the districts in a province were included in the moderation sample, it could be a district-related issue. There was a high degree of policy compliance in 50% of the provinces where SBA was moderated.

Nationally set SBA tasks meant that the instruments used to assess candidates for SBA

marks were of a good standard. The real cause for concern was the very poor standard of moderation in three provinces. This meant that marks were not of an acceptable standard and that educators did not receive support and guidance in their marking. Furthermore, candidates were receiving inappropriate feedback in respect of marks attained, and no support following the assessment process. Overall, there was little evidence of moderation at site level, but considering the situation at an AET site; the lack of capacity to moderate at that level can be understood. However, this makes thorough and effective moderation at circuit/district and provincial level absolutely critical. In 82% of the educator files, evidence was found of internal moderation, but the quality of moderation troubled most external moderators. In many cases, the internal moderation report was simply a check-list.

One of the obstacles lies in the lack of proof of authenticity of the assessment tasks in the learners' files. An inability to guarantee the authenticity of candidates' SBA marks undermines the integrity of the marks awarded. Moderators requested that Language teachers ensure that candidates be on call for the moderation of oral marks when their learning areas are being moderated. This would, at least, begin to deal with verifying the authenticity of oral marks.

Further training will solve some of the shortcomings. It is worth noting that one moderator remarked that training was non-existent in the province that he was in at the time. Training in the correct use of assessment instruments would improve assessment and lead to more accurate marking. This would also enable educators to provide appropriate guidance and support to their learners. Training in moderation at all levels would improve the quality of moderations. Training would also provide an opportunity for trainers to explain, in a practical way, the comprehensive and extensive purpose of assessment. It is strongly recommended that PEDs provide regular training to all key role-players and also ensure that the standard of training meets and exceeds all requirements.

Ultimately, the findings in relation to SBA indicate that learners, educators, as well as district and provincial moderators are largely quite conscientious about adhering to the requirements of Site-Based Assessment, but that mere adherence to the requirements of policy is not sufficient to guarantee quality moderation, or to support an improvement in learner performance. The findings of the SBA external moderation are reported on in Chapter 2, and specific details per learning area, per province are to be found in Addendum 2.

Chapter 3 addresses the issue of monitoring certain aspects of the assessment process. This chapter reports on the monitoring of a sample of writing centres and a sample of marking centres.

Part A of Chapter 3 covers the external monitoring of the writing phase of the examination. This monitoring is intended to quality assure the assessment processes and procedures during the writing and administration of the question papers. Umalusi deployed monitors to 50 sites in nine provinces to observe a range of processes, from

receipt to storage and return of question papers and answer scripts, preparation of examination venues, conduct of candidates, examination invigilation, and management of procedures such as irregularities.

On the whole, the Eastern Cape districts proved to be well aware of the challenges facing centres in the province and were supportive of AET centres. Several district offices store all question papers and examination material, and distribute daily. Either district officials deliver and collect examination material, or a vehicle takes the chief invigilators to the district office to collect and return the examination material – question papers, answer scripts and blank answer books. This eliminates the need for secure storage at centres to which there are no real roads, which do not have electricity and where candidates sit in desks made for Grade 1 and 2 learners. Certain districts in other provinces support their AET centres in a similar way.

In light of the inadequate facilities observed, it is recommended that DHET audits AET centres and gives consideration to de-registering centres that are unsuitable for the writing of examinations.

The most consistent problems found at examination centres were a lack of good management, poor procedures at the start of the examination and lack of a contingency plan. Another cause for disquiet is the poor quality of some of the invigilation. Across the sites monitored at least half a dozen chief invigilators were definitely not competent. This was particularly evident in the inadequate and inappropriate pre-writing preparations in the examination room. In other areas, training was neither adequate nor in-depth. As in so many other areas of the examination process, training remains the key to improvement of quality.

The high rate of absenteeism among the candidates registered for the examination remains a concern. An average of 32% of learners who registered for examinations during 2012 did not write the examination. This needs to be addressed, as it is inefficient to prepare for large numbers of candidates who do not write the examination.

It can be assumed that the three reported irregularities were not the only irregularities, probably because neither invigilators nor markers are alert to the possibility of irregularities. The Information Communication Technology external moderator picked up an incident of copying in one of the sets of sample scripts sent to him for external moderation after marking and moderation.

Despite the shortcomings mentioned by the monitors, the examination examination centres are generally well managed. All centres were said to be sufficiently well managed to ensure a credible examination. The excellent effort made by so many chief invigilators who show dedication and diligence must also be commended. At the point of writing, the integrity and success of the examination depends largely on the commitment and enthusiasm of people in the field.

Chapter 3 Part B analyses the external monitoring of the marking phase of the November 2012 Adult Education and Training examination. The purpose of external monitoring of the marking phase is to assess the integrity of the marking processes. The act of monitoring provides an opportunity for the identification of best practice, but also allows for the identification of challenges encountered in the marking of the examination for which there may be some solution, either based on the findings presented, or which may be addressed during standardisation.

Monitors visited a total of 12 marking centres during the marking sessions. A list of the sites and marking teams and a collated list of the evaluation of the marking centres are included in Chapter 3. Specific details on each marking centre are included in Addendum 3.

Good practice was observed in the thorough planning of marking centres. This is an administrative function which supports the process of marking and was the most highly rated area of the marking process. In addition, assessment officials exercised tight control over the dispatch of answer scripts to storage facilities, mark sheets to data capturers and reports to officials in the provincial office.

Internal moderators are expected to be present throughout the marking session at most marking centres, but not all internal moderators adhere to this requirement. The internal moderator moderates at least 10% of the marked scripts spread across the spectrum of marks.

Training of markers took place at each centre. However, in some cases training was fairly perfunctory and in other cases not highly effective. A mechanism other than the evidence of marking needs to be found to evaluate the effectiveness of marker training.

The monitors stated categorically that at no stage did they observe any action at a marking centre that could compromise the integrity of the marking.

Verification of marking involved two processes: firstly, verification of the marking guideline / memorandum discussions held after the writing of the question paper and prior to the commencement of marking; and, secondly, after marking, the verification of marked scripts. Chapter 4 contains an analysis of 17 reports on the marking memorandum discussions.

The external moderator for each learning area attends the marking guideline discussions to ensure that the approved question paper was the one that candidates wrote; to guide the interpretation of the questions and the required answers; to ensure standards are maintained; and to approve the final memorandum that will be used by all markers in that learning area.

The marking guideline / memorandum discussions were staggered, as each learning area meeting took place within a few days of the writing of the question paper. That is, the chief markers should have had the opportunity to pre-mark a few question papers and would be in a position to gauge the response of candidates to the question paper.

This report stresses the importance of attendance at the memorandum discussions. The nature of assessment is such that a marker has to know not only the answer that he or she is looking for, but also the processes by which one arrives at the answer. This is particularly important because candidates do not produce answers identical to those on the memoranda, and markers need to judge whether individual responses are valid.

Reports were submitted on 17 of the memorandum discussions. PEDs attend only the memorandum discussions of those learning areas written in their province. It is therefore not possible to provide exact statistics on the number of chief markers and internal moderators who did not participate. Suffice to say that the report shows that the expected 100% attendance did not take place. Learning area-specific details are contained in Addendum 4.

The role of the external moderator is determined, to some extent, by the competency of the chairperson and participants in the memorandum discussions. No external moderators were required to take the lead in the memorandum discussions as there was always a competent chairperson, usually a member of the examining panel, who could lead the discussions in each learning area.

Another good practice was the pre-marking of at least 20 scripts per person, which encouraged a keen understanding of the question paper and how candidates were responding. This knowledge led to genuine, informed participation in the memorandum discussions. Participants also analysed the results per question. This provided the discussion group with the knowledge of what worked in the memorandum and where adjustments were needed. The larger the number of scripts pre-marked and analysed, the better-prepared participants were, which, in turn, led to more valuable engagement with the question paper and memorandum.

Preparation was viewed as critical in light of the limited time available for a memorandum discussion. A major challenge in some memorandum discussions was that many chief markers and internal moderators were unable to or did not acquire question papers in time to prepare for the meeting.

Teaching of language structure and the writing of essays and transactional pieces is badly neglected in most languages. Candidates struggled to engage in extended pieces of writing, revealing a chasm between the standard expected and the work presented by the candidates. Answer scripts also provided clear evidence that many educators did not prepare their learners for the kind of questions they would face in the examination. The point made in the Language and Communication in Afrikaans meeting was that candidates simply do not have sufficient learning time to be fully prepared for the examinations.

The reports received on the memorandum discussions show that these meetings are professionally managed and the purpose of the meeting is fulfilled, to a large extent, in each learning area. Late arrival, early leaving and non-attendance by some chief markers and internal moderators proved problematic. Nevertheless, the memorandum discussions can be said to have served their intended purpose in every learning area for which a report was received.

Chapter 5 presents the analysis of the moderation of marking, a critical process in the quality assurance of an examination. It is not possible to have the same control over marking as one has over the setting of question papers and determining marking guidelines, where a limited number of people are involved. 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 that is marked is unique and a judgement has to be made for each in respect of its adherence to the memorandum.

The external moderation validates the process of marking and determines whether the marking has adhered to the marking guideline approved by the external moderator after memorandum discussions. External moderation also determines the standard of internal moderation and whether or not the internal moderators have fulfilled their duties appropriately. More detailed information would be required to make a judgement in this regard, but a comparison between the reports on the memorandum discussions and the moderation of marking shows a correlation in several instances.

An internal moderator who did not attend the memorandum discussions was found, in the moderation of the marked scripts, to be 'shadow-marking', or simply agreeing with all marks allocated by the markers. Three cases of poor marking of the sample scripts could be traced back to non-attendance at the memorandum discussions by the internal moderator.

The external moderation process determines whether correct judgements have been made and, if not, the shortcomings are identified for the standardisation committee. The reports on the moderating of 1373 scripts by 20 external moderators have been analysed and the findings reported in this chapter. A more detailed analysis of the moderators' reports is attached as Addendum 5.

In most cases the memorandum was adhered to by the markers. Changes effected at the memorandum discussions were taken into consideration by most markers. In the majority of learning areas, the allocation of marks was consistent and totals were accurate. Overall, marking was judged to be poor in two cases, average in six learning areas, good in 14 learning areas and, in four learning areas, the marking was deemed to be excellent. (Some moderators found the difference between provinces so great that they indicated more than one standard of marking.)

According to the learners' responses to 20 of the learning areas, candidates found the questions to be fair. There was such a wide range of responses to the Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises and Travel and Tourism question papers that the external moderators believed that different groups of candidates experienced the paper differently. For some candidates it was fair, others found it too easy, and a number found the paper very difficult.

The markers, moderators and examiners who have performed remarkably well must be congratulated on their commitment to the process. Marking was seen to be largely fair and valid. Training should see to it that in future the marking of every learning area by all markers will be fair, valid and well moderated.

Chapter 6 provides relevant information on the standardisation process. Chapter 7 sums up the report and the recommendations made.

The process of assessment for the GETC: ABET (NQF1) is far from perfect, but issues uncovered during moderation and monitoring of the quality assurance process showed that the problems that occur are isolated instances. Training, more effective support and streamlined administration would resolve most of the areas of weakness and forestall the potential risks.

In every report, the moderators and monitors indicated that the assessment process was sound and that nowhere did they observe any action that undermined the integrity of the examination.

# List of Tables

---

Table 1: Moderation reports received on DHET question papers.....	2
Table 2: Analysis of approval of question papers: DHET plus IEB.....	3
Table 3: Status of each question paper at final moderation.....	3
Table 4: Site-Based Assessment moderation reports per learning area per province.....	11
Table 5: Site-Based Assessment moderation reports.....	12
Table 6: SBA moderation.....	15
Table 7: Number of learning area moderations per province.....	15
Table 8: Overview of findings on SBA in provinces.....	15
Table 9: Evidence of policy documents in educators' portfolios.....	16
Table 10: Content of educators' file.....	17
Table 11: Assessment tasks in educator portfolios.....	18
Table 12: Findings of internal moderation in educator portfolios.....	19
Table 13: Findings in respect of recording and reporting in educator files.....	19
Table 14: Structure and content of learner evidence files.....	20
Table 15: Assessment tasks in learner files.....	21
Table 16: Internal moderation of learner files.....	21
Table 17: Examination centres monitored.....	27
Table 18: Monitoring of writing centres.....	30
Table 19: Rating descriptions for monitoring of writing centres.....	30
Table 20: Writing centre ratings per key monitoring area.....	30
Table 21: Writing centre ratings per key monitoring area as percentages.....	31
Table 22: Irregularities reported.....	31
Table 23: Marking venues monitored.....	37
Table 24: Marking centre monitoring.....	40
Table 25: Evaluation of the level of compliance of marking centres.....	40
Table 26: Average evaluation ratings of DHET marking centres.....	40
Table 27: Evaluation ratings per marking centre per province.....	41
Table 28: Marking memorandum discussion reports.....	48
Table 29: No of participants and scripts pre-marked.....	49
Table 30: Evaluation of marking memorandum discussions.....	50
Table 31: Role of the Umalusi moderator in marking memorandum discussions.....	51
Table 32: Reports on the external moderation of marking.....	58
Table 33: Collated evaluation of key areas of memo discussions.....	59
Table 34: Evaluation of the standard of marking.....	59
Table 35: Summary of GETC standardisation outcomes.....	67
Table 36: GETC: ABET Certification 2012.....	70

# List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

AET	Adult Education And Training
ABET	Adult Basic Education And Training
AS	Assessment Standards
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
GET	General Education and Training
GETC	General Education and Training Certificate
INCT	Information Communication Technology
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
SBA	Site-Based Assessment
US	Unit Standards

# CHAPTER 1:

---

## MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Umalusi quality assures the assessment for the General Education and Training Certificate for Adult Basic Education and Training (GETC: ABET) NQF1, conducted by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). Quality assurance of the assessment for the GETC requires an engagement with every process in the entire examination cycle. The intention of these quality assurance activities is to determine whether all assessments and all assessment processes in the examination cycle meet the required standards.

These standards are judged against various criteria, appropriate to the particular assessment or assessment process. The quality assurance processes are reported on in this and the following four chapters, while further details of the findings are included in the addenda.

Umalusi is committed to the ongoing improvement, validity, reliability and fairness of assessment. This report therefore includes sections on "Areas for Improvement" and "Recommendations", both of which are designed to offer feedback to all those involved in the processes of assessment. Umalusi believes that judicious consideration of the proposed areas for improvement and recommendations can lead to improvement when assessment personnel, educators and officials consider them in relation to the context in which they operate.

This chapter reports on the first step in the process of quality assurance, that is, the external moderation of question papers. Assessment bodies may not offer a question paper unless it has been approved by Umalusi. The external moderator is a specialist in the learning area and the assessment thereof, and is appointed by Umalusi to undertake this task.

The reports on the final moderation of 32 question papers are included in this report. In some learning areas, the question paper was approved after the first moderation, and in other learning areas, the paper was approved at the second or third moderation.

DHET sets two question papers at a time for each learning area. One is that printed for the candidates to write; the second is a back-up paper in case of an emergency. All

questions in the second paper must be different from those in the first, but both question papers must be of exactly the same standard.

## 2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE

Below is a list of the learning area question papers that was moderated in some learning areas, only one of the reports was submitted for inclusion in this analysis.

**Table 1: Moderation reports received on DHET question papers**

No	Subject	Set (Paper 1 or 2)	Moderation number	Approval rating
	Applied Agriculture & Agricultural Tech	1	1	A*
	Applied Agriculture & Agricultural Tech	2	1	CA*
	Economic and Management Sciences	1	2	A
	Economic and Management Sciences	2	2	A
	Human & Social Sciences	1	2	A
	Human and Social Sciences	2	2	A
	Information Communication Technology	1	1	A
	Information Communication Technology	2	1	A
	Life Orientation	1	1	A
	LLC Afrikaans	1	1	A
	LLC Afrikaans	2	1	A
	LLC isiNdebele	1	2	A
	LLC isiNdebele	2	2	A
	LLC isiXhosa	1	3	CA
	LLC Sepedi	2	1	CA – R*
	LC Sesotho	1	2	A
	LC Sesotho	2	2	A
	LC Setswana	2	3	A
	LC Tshivenda	1	3	A
	LC Tshivenda	2	3	A
	LC Xitsonga	1	3	A
	LC Xitsonga	2	3	A
	LC isiZulu	1	1	CA
	LC isiZulu	2	1	CA
	Natural Sciences	1	2	A
	Natural Sciences	2	2	A
	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	1	2	CA
	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	2	3	A
	Travel and Tourism	1	2	A

No	Subject	Set (Paper 1 or 2)	Moderation number	Approval rating
	Travel and Tourism	2	2	A
	Wholesale and Retail	1	1	A
	Wholesale and Retail	2	2	A

\*A = Approved

CA = conditionally approved

CA-R = conditionally approved but must be re-submitted

**Table 2: Analysis of approval of question papers: DHET**

ANALYSIS OF APPROVAL OF QUESTION PAPERS DHET					
Moderation	Approved	Conditionally approved: re- submit	Conditionally approved: no re- submission	Total	%
First moderation	7	1	3	11	34.38
Second moderation	13	0	1	14	43.75
Third moderation	6	0	1	7	21.87
Total	26	1	5	32	100

**Table 3: Status of each question paper at final moderation**

No.	Criteria	DHET	
		Fully compliant Frequency (out of 32)	Not fully compliant Frequency (out of 32)
	Analysis grid and assessment framework included	32	0
	Adherence to assessment policies & guidelines	32	0
	Content coverage	31	1
	Cognitive skills	32	0
	Language and bias	29	3
	Predictability	32	0
	Marking memo	18	14
	Technical criterion	22	10
	Internal moderation	20	12
	Overall impression of paper	30	2

### **3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

The summary of the results of the moderation of question papers reflects only the final external moderators' reports. The external moderators generally give little comment on criteria that have been successfully attained. However, key issues that have evidently been causing difficulties, and in some cases continue to cause difficulties, are discussed. Therefore the majority of comments below relate to issues that have not been resolved. A detailed analysis per question paper is included as an addendum.

#### **3.1 NEW LEARNING AREA EXAMINATIONS**

Two new learning area examinations were written in November 2012. Wholesale and Retail is a newly introduced learning area, as is Information Communication Technology. Although the DHET assessment guidelines guided the setting of the question papers, there were no past papers for reference. This made the examiners' tasks both easier and more difficult.

The external moderator of Information Communication Technology collaborated fully with the examiners and internal moderator of this learning area in the development of the first two question papers, as the papers demanded a completely different approach to the pen and paper question papers that are the norm for ABET examinations. In this learning area, Sections B and C were answered on a computer, and were both printed and saved electronically.

#### **3.2 NUMBER OF MODERATIONS REQUIRED**

There are several options that an Umalusi external moderator may exercise in respect of approving question papers. The moderator may approve the question paper; approve with amendments to be made without a re-submission of the question paper required; or approve with amendments to be made and re-submitted for final approval. In the worst case scenario, a question paper may be rejected and the examiners instructed to set a new question paper. Question papers may have to be re-submitted two or three times until the external moderator is convinced that the appropriate standard has been attained.

An analysis of the number of times that papers have to be submitted for moderation is relevant, both in respect of time and cost. It must be noted that question papers that needed a third moderation are on languages that do not have a long history as

examination languages, and some of the issues may relate to the use of the language itself.

It should also be noted that while certain external moderators approve a question paper even though errors have still to be rectified, others treat this as a conditional approval.

### **3.3 STATUS OF EACH QUESTION PAPER AT FINAL MODERATION**

Table 3 shows aspects of question papers that are not fully compliant, although the issues are not sufficiently serious to warrant a further moderation. The most significant area of default lies in the marking memoranda, which lack reference to the unit standards and assessment documents, or which contain errors. Technical criteria and internal moderation are also areas where errors may still be found. These three criteria suggest that while examiners may manage to get the content correct, neither they nor the internal moderators pay sufficient attention to the finer details that would result in a fully compliant question paper.

### **3.4 SUMMARY PER MODERATION INSTRUMENT CRITERION**

The summary of results is presented under the criteria described in the question paper instrument for external moderation.

#### **a. Is the analysis grid and assessment framework included?**

The analysis grid and assessment framework are important tools, both in setting and checking a question paper. The examiners and internal moderators are generally very good about completing and submitting the grid. However, in one case the grid was signed by the examiner only, the analysis was not submitted in one learning area, and the internal moderator had signed a blank analysis grid in both question papers of another learning area.

#### **b. Adherence to assessment policies and guideline documents**

This criterion was met, to a large extent, by virtually all examiners.

#### **c. Content coverage**

By the final moderation all content issues had been resolved, but moderators noted that the content generally allowed for creative responses. The DHET guidelines, however, raised some concerns. The Wholesale and Retail external moderator noted that the DHET guidelines must be amended to match the specific outcomes of the unit standards. The Economic and Management Sciences external moderator also noted an error in the

summative total in the DHET guidelines, and that the specific outcomes of the unit standards were not aligned in the guidelines.

#### **d. Cognitive skills**

A number of the examiners handled the cognitive skills criteria very well, as indicated in the following comment by a moderator: "The paper is challenging and allows creative responses and includes reasoning and expression of argument, communication and critical thinking, and includes translation from symbolic to verbal." It was evident that examiners were using the taxonomies of both Barrett and Bloom.

The external moderators for Wholesale and Retail, and Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises noted that the examiners had addressed the different cognitive levels, despite the fact that the DHET guideline does not clearly indicate the required spread.

Language and bias

A critical consideration under this criterion was that the language not be biased against non-mother tongue speakers of the language of the paper.

#### **e. Predictability**

No question papers were found to be predictable. The following comment indicates what moderators were looking for, and found, in these question papers: "The paper is original. There is no way that it can be predicted. There are questions that need innovation and creativity."

#### **f. Marking memorandum**

The moderators found that the marking memoranda were often not fully compliant with all the requirements.

Not all marking memoranda corresponded with the question paper and allowed for alternative answers. Another failing was a lack of correlation between the mark allocation in the question paper and that of the memorandum. Several moderators had to advise examiners to set the question paper and memorandum together to ensure correlation. Numbering errors, grammatical errors and mark allocation errors were frequently found in the marking guidelines.

Unit standards and assessment criteria have to be indicated in the memorandum. Many examiners did not do this.

### **g. Technical criterion**

The technical criterion requires attention to finer detail. Very few examiners were fully compliant with the technical criterion. Common problems were incorrect numbering and vague, inadequate or poorly worded instructions to candidates. The poor quality of photographs and diagrams was another hindrance to meeting the criteria. On a number of occasions the full history of the question paper was not included in the file, making it impossible for the examiner to check internal moderation and changes that had been made.

### **h. Internal moderation**

Moderators took issue with the absence of reports by internal moderators and reports that were not signed. In one learning area it was clear that internal moderation was not done and in another, the internal moderation was not of a very good quality. However, in several cases the moderator was able to compliment the internal moderator on a job well done.

### **i. Overall impression of the paper**

As these reports were on the final moderation, it was to be expected that all question papers would be fair, valid and reliable and of an appropriate standard. In one third of the reports, the external moderators were able to commend the examiners and internal moderators on setting good papers that were well above standard. However, even at the final stage of moderation, many moderators had to give instructions for errors to be corrected.

## **4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

The moderation reports show that examiners are mindful of the candidates that they will be examining. Passages are interesting and topics for extended writing are within the candidates' scope. Several examiners were complimented on using an appropriate register for ABET Level 4 candidates. Examiners are doing well in respect of using taxonomies to ensure that they test different cognitive levels and different abilities and skills, and most examiners had included a range of question forms appropriate for the candidates. All examiners set original question papers, some of them innovative, and no examiner was found to have used questions from previous papers.

## 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The main area of concern can be summed up in that fewer than 56% of the question papers from DHET reported on here were approved, or even conditionally approved, after the first moderation. In most cases, it seems that non-approval had less to do with the content of the question paper and more to do with errors made in the paper or in the submission of documents. Technical errors rank high among the problems experienced, and this includes simple things like page and question numbering, spelling, font (use) and other basic matters that simply require attention to detail.

In a number of cases the full histories of the question papers were not included in the file, as is required. This makes it impossible for the examiner to check internal moderation and changes made.

Inadequate internal moderation is a serious challenge. Internal moderators are not sufficiently vigilant or rigorous and allow numerous errors to evade them. The most serious concern lies in dealing with a moderator who signed a blank grid and report. This is not only unprofessional; it is unacceptable in this particular environment.

Errors and shortcomings in the DHET assessment guidelines are a challenge to examiners who are, as a result, not adequately guided by the document. The errors and shortcomings also make it difficult for external moderators to determine whether requirements and standards have been met.

A challenge of a very different nature is the confusion over cover page details on the instrument for external moderation, such as the date of the examination and the "Set" number. On some instruments it was stated that one question paper was the November question paper and the other was the "Back-up" paper. This is a decision that cannot be taken at this stage of the process, and it should not be common knowledge which of the two question papers is to be used in the examination. It is precisely a lack of knowledge around which paper is to be used that ensures both question papers are set to the same high standard. Incorrect completion of details such as these leads to confusion in identifying the reports on question papers.

On the whole there does not appear to be an inherent inability of examiners and moderators to undertake the task.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that there be a formal system introduced at DHET to deal with issues raised in moderators' reports. One issue that requires immediate attention is addressing external moderators' concerns about shortcomings in some DHET assessment guidelines. DHET needs to review the way in which question papers are prepared for external moderation.

One of the more basic challenges can be fairly easily resolved, and should be, because a lack of key documents makes it impossible for Umalusi moderators to perform their task effectively. DHET should provide a cover page for each of the key documents to be submitted and some detail as to key factors to be remembered when preparing the document, such as a checklist to remind examiners to include the specific outcomes and assessment standards. A clerk would also have to complete the checklist before it is sent to Umalusi. Missing documents could be retrieved from the internal moderator before the file is sent to Umalusi.

The matter of the internal moderator who signed a blank analytical grid and a blank report form needs to be addressed. This is a practice that cannot be accepted in a process of quality and integrity.

## 7 CONCLUSION

The external moderators' reports on the final moderation exercise were analysed and the findings have been presented. While there are some excellent examiners, the question papers of 66% were not approved in the first moderation, indicating much room for improvement. On the whole, the external moderators seem to provide invaluable guidance and assistance to internal moderators and examiners. The external moderators have to be commended on the input they give and the quality of the reports presented.

Perhaps it is worth singling out the external moderators for the two new learning areas, Wholesale and Retail and, especially, Information Communication Technology. These external moderators went far beyond the call of duty to assist the examiners and internal moderators of the question papers. They provided invaluable assistance in ensuring the success of the first examinations of the new learning areas.

# CHAPTER 2:

---

## MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Site-Based Assessment (SBA) is assessment that takes place on site at the time of teaching and learning, and should be integrated with teaching and learning. The GETC: ABET NQF1 consists of two forms of assessment: Site-Based Assessment, and formal examinations. The quality assurance of SBA is of importance for two reasons. Firstly, the marks awarded to candidates for SBA form 50% of the qualification results and, secondly, the process according to which SBA is conducted provides insight into the standards of teaching, assessing, moderation and support at site, district and provincial levels.

SBA forms an integral part of the teaching and learning process, especially for adults, but if SBA is not valid and reliable, the integrity of the examination is at risk. The school management teams, educators and district officials manage SBA according to the guidelines provided by the relevant assessment body. It is expected that the assessment bodies will manage the monitoring and moderation of SBA to ensure that the assessment that takes place is fair and valid; that the assessment tasks are correctly marked; and that feedback from this process enhances teaching and learning and prepares candidates for the examination.

External moderation of SBA is designed not only to view the work of the candidates, but also to confirm compliance with all the processes designed to guarantee the integrity of the system. For this reason, moderators review educators' portfolios to satisfy themselves that assessment has been correctly planned and prepared and results recorded meticulously. A key role player in the quality assurance of the SBA is the internal moderator. The external moderator therefore looks closely at the role played by the internal moderators in the sample SBA portfolios.

Moderation of SBA took the form of provincial visits that examined, particularly, policy and compliance, control measures and the efficacy of internal moderation. Samples of educator portfolios and evidence of SBA by candidates were closely examined by eight Umalusi moderators.

They submitted reports on the moderation of Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, LLC English, Human and Social Sciences, Life Orientation, Mathematical

Literacy, Natural Sciences, Technology, and Travel and Tourism. Site-Based Assessments from all Provincial Education Departments (PEDs) were moderated in at least one learning area.

The findings of this external moderation are reported on below, and specific details per learning area per province are to be found in Addendum 2.

## 2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE

Table 4 below summarises the learning areas and the provinces that were subjected to SBA moderation.

**Table 4: Site-Based Assessment moderation reports per learning area per province**

Learning Area	Provincial Education Department
Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	Limpopo
	Mpumalanga
	Western Cape
Human and Social Sciences	Northern Cape
Life Orientation	Eastern Cape
	Gauteng
	North West
LLC English	Eastern Cape
	Gauteng
	KwaZulu-Natal
Mathematical Literacy	Mpumalanga
	Free State
	KwaZulu-Natal
	Gauteng
Natural Sciences	Eastern Cape
	North West
	Northern Cape
Technology	Free State
	KwaZulu-Natal
Travel and Tourism	Limpopo
	Mpumalanga
	Free State

External moderation of SBA was conducted in the provinces, districts and sites as illustrated in Table 5. The moderation included the portfolios of educators and evidence of the work of candidates. The number of candidates' files of evidence moderated per site is also indicated.

**Table 5: Site-Based Assessment moderation reports**

Learning area	Date 2012	PED	District / site of moderation	Sites moderated	Educators	No of candidates
Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	25–26 October	Limpopo	Vhembe	Tswinga	0	1
				Hlawulekani	1	1
				Mbokta	1	1
			Mopani	Wamungololo	1	1
				Save SAI BN	1	1
				Nyoko	1	1
			Waterberg-Capricorn	Mosha	0	1
				Settlers	1	1
				Helene Frans	1	1
	09–10 October	Mpumalanga	Gert Sibanda	Intando Yeningi	1	3
			Nkangala	Vaalbank	1	3
			Ehlanzeni	Vukutakhe	1	3
14–17 October	Western Cape	Overberg	Riviersonderend	1	6	
		Metro East	Share	1	3	
Human and Social Sciences	25–26 October	Northern Cape (8)	Namaqua	Bergsig	1	2
			Siyananda	Refentse	1	3
			Pixley ka Seme	De Aar Correctional centre	1	3
Life Orientation	9 September	Gauteng	Zonderwater Medium "B"			2
			Tswinyane Adult Centre			1
			Daveyton Adult Centre			1
			Mamelodi Adult Centre			1
			Sharpeville AET			1
			Kagiso AC			1
			Wattville AC			1
			Orange Farm			1
	26 October	Eastern Cape	Kirkwood			1
			Qibira Mngqaba			1

Learning area	Date 2012	PED	District / site of moderation	Sites moderated	Educators	No of candidates
				Lady Frere		1
				Hlamandana		2
				Buffalo City		1
				Majola		1
				Kango's		1
				Khowa PALC		1
	13 October	North West		Tshepisoong		3
				Koketso		3
				Pica Pau		3
LLC: English	9 October	Gauteng (7)	Alberton  (site of moderation)	City Deep	1	1
				Fourways Adult Centre	1	1
				Chief Albert Luthuli		1
				Mohlakeng AET	1	1
				Kagiso AET		2
				Lekoa (Khutlo-Tharo)	1	1
	29 October	KwaZulu-Natal (8)	A M Moola Special School  (site of moderation)	Qalakabusha AET	1	1
				Mafukuzela	1	1
				Ntuthuko	1	1
				Enduduzweni	1	1
				Ffuku	1	1
				Bhekuzulu	1	1
				Ncumuse	1	1
				Manaye	1	1
	27 October	Eastern Cape (8)	Garden Court  (site of moderation)	Khanyisa Heatherbank	1	1
				Mbulukweza	1	1
				Sinethemba	1	1
				Nqeleni	1	1
				Mfundisweni	1	1
				Lady Frere	1	1
				Adelaide	1	1
Nompumelelo				1	1	
Mathematical Literacy	24–25 October	Mpumalanga		Buthelelani AET	1	2
				Masibekela B	1	2
				Ndimande	1	1
				Thulani AET	1	1

Learning area	Date 2012	PED	District / site of moderation	Sites moderated	Educators	No of candidates
	20–21 October	Free State	Fichardt Park, Bloemfontein  (site of moderation)	Vaalbank AET	1	2
				Bodibeng PALC	1	3
				Tia Keni Adult	1	2
				Ipatlele Lesedi	1	2
	7–9 December	Kwazulu-Natal		Hawa Farm	1	
	7–9 December	Gauteng			Diepkloof AC	1
Thutomfundo						4
Technology	15 November	Free State	Durban  (site of moderation)	Aganang AC	1	3
				Tiakeni AC	1	3
	29–30 October	KwaZulu-Natal	eThekweni	Siyakhanyisa	1	1
				Isulabasha	1	2
				Enduduzweni	1	2
				Usizuzulu	1	1
				School of industries	1	2
				Siphimfundo	1	2
				Masifunde PALC	1	2
				Nsiligwane AET	1	1
	Intiwe AET	1	2			
Travel and Tourism	20–21 October	Free State	Bloemfontein  (site of moderation)	QwaQwa	1	3
				Kutlwano Siyavana	1	3
				Rammolotsi Adult Centre	1	3
	26–27 October	Limpopo	Waterberg  Vhembe	Sondela	1	1
				Nanodoni	1	4
				Thonda Lushaka		
				Redeeming		
Matashe						
		Mopani	Mogoboya	1	1	

Learning area	Date 2012	PED	District / site of moderation	Sites moderated	Educators	No of candidates
			Kone Kwen	Mdauma		1
			Capricorn	Soka Leholo		2
				Moleke AC		
	23–24 October	Mpumalanga		Embhuleni	1	3
				Thulamahashe		1
				Saselani	1	2
				Eamogetswe	1	3

**Table 6: SBA moderation**

No of Learning Areas moderated	No of PEDs moderated	Total no of moderations across LAs and PEDs	No of centres moderated	No of educator files moderated	No of learner files moderated
8	9	23	93	73	142

**Table 7: Number of learning area moderations per province**

Eastern Cape	Free State	Gauteng	KwaZulu-Natal	Limpopo	Mpumalanga	North West	Northern Cape	Western Cape	Total
3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	23

### 3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This section provides a summary of the findings during the SBA external moderation.

#### 3.1 OVERVIEW OF PROVINCIAL FINDINGS:

Table 8: Overview of findings on SBA in provinces

OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS ON SBA IN PROVINCES		
Summary of findings	Frequency of criteria fully met (out of 23)	Frequency of criteria not, or not fully, met (out of 23)
Compliance with policy	18	5
Acceptable quality of moderation at all levels	10	13
Acceptable quality and standard of the assessment task	19	4
Recording and reporting	17	6

Although policy is generally complied with, the relevant policy documents were not always at hand in the portfolios of the educators. Furthermore, candidates were not aware of the appeal procedures. However, the real cause for concern was the very poor standard of internal SBA moderation, especially in cases where moderation meant no more than the completion of a checklist, with no feedback whatsoever.

On at least one occasion an educator's file was signed as moderated but there was no evidence whatsoever of any internal moderation. The lack of quality internal moderation meant that marks were not of an acceptable standard and that educators did not receive support and guidance in their marking. The knock-on effect of this was that learners did not receive feedback.

Overall there was little evidence of internal moderation at site level. This can be attributed to the lack of capacity to moderate at that level. However, this makes thorough and effective moderation at circuit / district and provincial level absolutely critical in the quality assurance process.

The quality and standard of the assessment tasks were acceptable because the tasks, developed by DHET, are provided to educators together with the marking memoranda. In cases where the tasks were not acceptable, the educator had not, or had not correctly, utilised the tasks provided. Where educators had not fully engaged with the tasks they were unable to provide developmental tasks prior to the formal task.

## 3.2 EDUCATORS' PORTFOLIOS OF ASSESSMENT

Moderators received 73 reports on educators' files.

**Table 9: Evidence of policy documents in educators' portfolios**

EVIDENCE OF POLICY DOCUMENTS IN EDUCATORS' PORTFOLIOS		
Summary of findings	Evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Evidence not in educator file Frequency (out of 73)
1. Internal assessment policy	28	45
2. Appeal procedure	27	46
3. Learning area-specific guideline	28	45
4. Exemplars of various forms of assessment in guidelines	25	48

In respect of evidence of policy documents contained in educators' portfolios, only 38% of the educators had a copy of the internal assessment policy in their files. Only 37% of the educators had copies of the appeal procedure.

Of real concern is the fact that only 38% of the educators' portfolios had learning area-specific guidelines and even fewer had exemplars of the assessment that should be used in the teaching environment. A fair number of educators had copies of the unit standards (outdated in a number of cases), but unit standards are very different from an assessment guideline. Unit standards will not enable an educator to prepare him or herself, or the candidates, for assessment.

Without this connection to policy and exemplars, educators cannot understand and develop their own assessment tasks. They can do no more than apply the assessment tasks given to them. It is highly probable that they have no understanding of the construction and specific purpose of an assessment task. If this is so, educators are assessing without a real understanding of the process.

The most relevant aspect of this analysis is that compliance, or non-compliance, is largely province or district-dependent. In certain provinces all educators had the relevant documents in their file, while in others very few educator portfolios contained policy documents. There was a high degree of compliance in 50% of the provinces where SBA was moderated.

**Table 10: Content of educators' files**

CONTENT OF EDUCATORS' FILES			
Summary of findings	Evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Evidence not in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Partial evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)
Daily/weekly/year plan indicating progression, time allocation and assessment opportunities	35	26	12
2. Copies of moderators' reports	42	14	27
3. Well-structured portfolio	45	22	6

Only 48% of the educators' portfolios met the criteria in respect of daily, weekly and year plans. These indicate a plan for progression, time allocation and assessment opportunities for the educator and candidates. The majority of educator portfolios either had no planning documents or these were incomplete. Portfolios contained mainly details of the five compulsory SBA tasks. In three cases the moderator indicated that the documents were there, but they were incomplete or unsatisfactory.

An examination of the assessment tasks in educator portfolios determines adherence to policy and provides an opportunity for moderators to examine the quality and appropriateness of the set tasks. Where tasks are set nationally, the latter aspect becomes redundant.

**Table 11: Assessment tasks in educator portfolios**

ASSESSMENT TASKS IN EDUCATOR PORTFOLIOS		
Summary of findings	Evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Evidence not in educator file Frequency (out of 73)
1. List the forms of assessment	73	0
2. Types of assessment used	72	1
3. Appropriateness of the task for the assessment outcome and unit standard	73	0
4. Instructions for each of the assessment tasks	73	0
5. Cognitive level of individual tasks	73	0
6. Inclusion of mark sheets, mark grids, rubrics and criteria for assessment, marking memoranda	73	0
7. Detailed analysis of the suitability and quality of rubrics and the memorandum	67	6

The evidence shows that PEDs, district officials and / or educators are meticulous in ensuring that each educator has details of all SBA tasks in his or her portfolio. However,

the details of the tasks are not really relevant, in that these assessment tasks are not set at site level. Assessors and internal moderators need to focus on the application of the set tasks and the marking memorandum.

Internal moderation of educator files is a mechanism that allows for both quality assurance of SBA and for guidance and support of educators.

**Table 12: Findings of internal moderation in educator portfolios**

FINDINGS OF EVIDENCE OF INTERNAL MODERATION OF EDUCATOR PORTFOLIOS			
Summary of findings	Evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Evidence not in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Partial evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)
Evidence of internal moderation	49	9	15
Evidence of re-marking	48	11	14
Evidence of moderation of internal assessment	60	9	2

In two-thirds of the educator files, evidence was found of internal moderation. However, the quality of moderation is what troubled most external moderators. In 20% of the cases, moderators found the evidence of internal moderation so poor that they could not commit to an affirmation on internal moderation and could only acknowledge that some attempts had been made to moderate the educator files. In most cases, the internal moderation report was simply a checklist. The issue is not that there is no internal moderation; it is the quality of moderation that is in question.

Re-marking had taken place in 66% of the educator files. However, it was found, especially in LLC English, that where the marks were inflated, internal moderators simply accepted inflated marks. In cases where questions had been incorrectly marked as correct, the internal moderators also marked the questions as correct.

In the worst case scenario an official had signed an educator's portfolio as moderated but, on external moderation, it was absolutely clear that no moderation had been done.

**Table 13: Findings in respect of recording and reporting in educator files**

RECORDING AND REPORTING OF SBA TASKS IN EDUCATOR FILES		
Summary of findings	Evidence in educator file Frequency (out of 73)	Evidence not in educator file Frequency (out of 73)
Records of learner progress	67	6
Records indicating the learners' developmental progress	42	31
Inclusion of assessment body mark sheets	50	23
Correct transference of marks to mark sheets	49	24
Internal assessment contributed to learner achievement	44	29

The validity of SBA marks depends on the correct recording of marks in the educator's file, while a proper record of marks will also show the progress of the learner and, therefore, the support that was given to the candidate.

There are few errors in the transference of marks, mainly because the final mark sheets are merely photocopies. This is the explanation provided by the provincial education departments for the lack of records indicating the developmental progress of learners in 50% of the files. The point was made by more than one external moderator that moderation took place only once all the work had been completed. It therefore could not contribute to learner achievement.

### 3.3 LEARNER EVIDENCE OF ASSESSMENT

One aspect of the moderation exercise was moderation of learner files of evidence. The intention in moderating learner files is to validate the process as well as the quality of the assessment tasks learners have carried out as part of the assessment process. A total of 142 reports on learner evidence of assessment were received and analysed in respect of the given criteria. The positive / negative dichotomy is far simpler than the moderators' reports, but it attempts to give some idea of what the issues are. Moderators have different understandings of certain values, and certain learning areas have different expectations of learner evidence of work.

The structure and content of learner files is an indicator of attentiveness to SBA. A presentable appearance and orderly filing facilitates the learning process. The table below shows that the files are generally well presented. The problem lies in the lack of proof of authenticity of the assessment tasks. It is the task of the educator to ensure that every learner vouches for his or her work.

**Table 14: Structure and content of learner evidence files**

Structure and content of learner evidence files		
Summary of findings	Evidence in learner file Frequency (out of 142)	Evidence not in learner file Frequency (out of 142)
Presentable appearance of portfolio	141	1
Proof of authenticity	114	28
Orderly filing of tasks	108	34
Record of achievement/mark sheets	94	48

The correct filing of tasks in the files needs attention and several moderators found it difficult to find the tasks for moderation. Thirty-four percent of candidates did not have a record of the marks that they had achieved over the course of the year.

The moderation of assessment tasks in the files looks at the quantity of tasks performed, the quality of the tasks given to learners and their ability to respond to the tasks. There was evidence of inappropriate marking, but this was in only 9% of the files moderated.

**Table 15: Assessment tasks in learner files**

ASSESSMENT TASKS IN LEARNER FILES		
Summary of findings	Evidence in learner file Frequency (out of 142)	Evidence not in learner file Frequency (out of 142)
Prescribed no of tasks included	129	13
Different forms of assessment used	142	0
Tasks assessed according to agreed criteria	129	13
Scoring/marking appropriate	135	7
Variations in cognitive levels	142*	0
Learner ability to respond	140	2
Proven authenticity of portfolios	129	13

\*Moderators found the correct variations in cognitive levels, but commented that these were all externally set tasks.

Internal moderation is a necessary quality assurance process. Internal moderation allows for confirmation that SBA tasks have been performed, and that the quality of marking is appropriate. A key factor in the assessment process is the feedback to both educators and learners following the marking of the assessments.

**Table 16: Internal moderation of learner files**

INTERNAL MODERATION OF LEARNER FILES		
Summary of findings	Evidence in learner file Frequency (out of 143)	Evidence not in learner file Frequency (out of 143)
Evidence of internal assessment at different levels	103	14
Evidence that internal moderation enhanced the development of the learner	0	142

Although external moderators found that more than 90% of the portfolios had been moderated, not many portfolios had been moderated at all levels. Almost half the portfolios had only one level of moderation, while 25% had been moderated at two levels. There was virtually no moderation at site level.

External moderators were unable to find evidence of a single instance in which they could say with confidence that learners had actually benefited from the internal moderation.

This correlates with the finding that moderation was largely in the form of checklists and therefore lacked quality. Furthermore, the point was made by the moderators that internal moderation took place only once all the tasks had been completed. There could be no evidence, therefore, that internal moderation enhanced the development of learners.

## 4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

The external moderators agreed that there had been a decided improvement in the quality of the educator and learner portfolios. However, they could identify few examples of particularly good practice. An analysis of the evidence found in educator portfolios was that many educators and / or district officials were meticulous in ensuring that all educator portfolios contained all details relating to SBA tasks in the portfolio. Both educator and learner files were well presented and well ordered, and most files were complete in most respects.

## 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The external moderators expressed concern that internal moderation was at district and provincial level but not at centre level and, even then, some districts and provinces moderated the five tests only. Generally, the quality of moderation was considered superficial and lacking in substance and guidance. A shortage of AET curriculum advisors may explain why moderation was hurried and superficial; and why there was insufficient evidence of ongoing monitoring by PEDs.

Internal moderators tended to concur with the educator rather than take a position in respect of the required standard. This practice of concurring with the marking of each educator leads to a lack of consistency across a province and prevents the moderator from providing the required support to educators. It was also observed in the external moderation of LLC English that educators were struggling with the use of the marking rubric for extended pieces of writing, resulting in a generous allocation of marks that were not justified. This was not rectified during the moderation process.

Although external moderators found that nearly 90% of the portfolios had been moderated, not many portfolios had been moderated at all levels. External moderators were unable to find evidence of a single instance in which learners benefited from the moderation. This correlated with the finding that moderation was largely in the form of checklists and therefore lacked quality. This shocking finding suggests a lack of understanding of the purpose of Site-Based Assessment.

A number of centres have innovative mark sheets for tracking learner progress, whereas other centres simply use the summative mark sheet. This is clear evidence that they do not track the development and progress of their learners. Neither educators nor internal moderators provide significant feedback that supports the learners and leads to an improvement in learner performance.

One of the challenges in the learner files lies in the lack of proof of authenticity of the assessment tasks. It is the task of the educator to ensure that every learner vouches for his or her work. An inability to guarantee the authenticity of the SBA marks of the candidates undermines the integrity of the marks awarded for SBA. Handwriting is often considered evidence of authenticity, but a moderator cannot determine whether the handwriting is that of the candidate.

The external moderator for LLC English expressed serious concern about the leniency of marking in the learning area, particularly as a result of the inability of educators to apply the marking matrix correctly, and is of the opinion that all portfolios could be marked

down by 10% to 15%. The external moderator for Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology (AAAT) expressed concern that there were so few AAAT learners in some provinces, despite the agricultural nature of those provinces.

An inadequate number of AET professional staff in some of the provinces has been identified as a reason why teachers are not adequately supported, and why moderation is so superficial.

The shortage of provincial officials is probably one of the reasons that AET educators have not been properly guided in respect of current policy. Considering the environment and context, it is not surprising that most AET educators / facilitators are assessing in a policy vacuum. Nevertheless, such a situation can very easily be to the disadvantage of candidates. DHET has developed an assessment guideline, which should be invaluable to AET educators who receive little support from officials. Unfortunately, many educators do not have subject and/or assessment guidelines in their subject files and are therefore not engaging with, and benefiting from, the guidelines.

Further training will solve some of the above shortcomings. One of the external moderators remarked that training was non-existent in the province that he was in at the time. Training in the correct use of assessment instruments would improve assessment and lead to more accurate marking. This should also enable educators to provide guidance and support to their learners.

Training in moderation at all levels would improve the quality of moderation. This training will provide an opportunity for the trainers to convey, in a practical way, the comprehensive and extensive purpose of assessment.

## **6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that each province develops a comprehensive plan of monitoring, evaluation and support for AET centres, and that the plan be provided to external moderators of SBA. Training in moderation at every level of the system, i.e. centre, district and provincial levels, is strongly recommended. It is also important that officials work through particular sections of relevant policy documents, as well as the assessment guidelines, to acquire a full understanding of the benefits of working with the guidelines within a policy framework. A process should also be put in place to ensure that all learners are advised of the appeal process, so that they may exercise their right to appeal should the need arise.

All AET educators should be trained in all aspects of planning for teaching and assessment, prior to the commencement of the academic year, so that they can work developmentally and pace both themselves and the learners. This is particularly important given the short period of teaching time in which AET learners must complete the curriculum and prepare for examinations.

Provinces, or DHET, should develop a standard mark sheet that all centres could use to record and track the developmental progress of learners.

The LLC English external moderator highly recommends training educators and subject advisors in the language learning areas in the use of marking grids. Language teachers need to ensure that candidates are on call for the moderation of oral marks during external moderation of their learning areas. This would begin to address the authenticity of oral marks. Both educators and learners need to be fully informed of the significance of providing proof of authenticity of one's work and of recording one's achievements in the file. Educators must ensure that learners understand the filing system they are using and file tasks correctly. Not all adult learners will have an understanding of filing, and learning to file correctly should enhance their learning experience.

## **7 CONCLUSION**

The moderation instruments have been judiciously developed to interrogate the process of SBA. The findings indicate that learners, educators, and district and provincial moderators are, largely quite conscientious about adhering to the use of the national instruments and the requirements of SBA, as far as they understand these requirements.

However, correct practice and adherence to the requirements of policy have not resulted in quality moderation; nor can they be said to have supported an improvement in learner performance. Moderation must not be a formality in which the moderators simply concur with educators. Moderation must seek to improve the standard of marking, as well as teaching and learning. The findings suggest that the quality of assessment and moderation has improved, but it is particularly revealing that most external moderators recommend downward adjustments of the SBA marks.

# CHAPTER 3:

---

## MONITORING

### **PART A: MONITORING OF THE WRITING PHASE OF THE EXAMINATION**

#### **1 INTRODUCTION**

Chapter 3, Part A, covers the external monitoring of the writing phase of the examination, which is intended to quality assure the assessment processes and procedures during the writing and administration of the question papers.

The act of monitoring allows for the observation of administrative practices and invigilation of examinations to ensure that all policy, regulations and Umalusi directives are adhered to. Centre managers, chief invigilators, invigilators, officials and candidates are involved in this phase of the examination cycle, and their actions are carefully monitored.

Monitoring of examination writing centres also provides an opportunity for the monitor to check that irregularities, should they occur, are handled correctly.

Umalusi deployed monitors to 54 sites in nine provinces to observe all processes, from the receipt, storage and return of question papers and answer scripts, to preparation of examination venues, conduct of candidates, invigilation of the examination and management of procedures, such as in the case of an irregularity occurring.

The monitors are provided with a set of criteria against which they evaluate the standard of these processes at each site. However, the monitors can evaluate and report only on processes that they observe during their visits. A report will therefore not include information on a criterion that he or she does not, or cannot, observe during the monitoring visit.

The report below contains the main findings arising from the monitoring. Additional details not contained in the report below have been included in Addendum 3.

## 2 MATERIAL AND SCOPE

### 2.1 EXAMINATION CENTRES

The following are reports on the monitoring of examination writing centres:

Table 17: Examination centres monitored

EXAMINATION CENTRES MONITORED						
Province	Examining Body	Date	Region/ District	Venue	Learning Area	No of candidates writing
Eastern Cape	DHET	19/11	Mthatha	Ntekelelo JSS	Economic & Management Sciences	Registered 26 Present 13
		14/11	Mthatha	Dalubuhle ABET Centre	Travel and Tourism	Registered 36 Present 12
		16/11	Uitenhage	Jeffreys Bay AET	Human & Social Sciences	21
		13/11	Port Elizabeth	Algoa Cluster for ABET Centres	Small, Medium & Micro Enterprises	466
Free State	DHET	14/11	Thabo Mofutsanyana	Horebe PALC	Travel & Tourism	32
		02/11	Thabo Mofutsanyana	Thahasellang	Life Orientation	Registered 41 Present 30
		12/11	Thabo Mofutsanyana	Bosele Adult Centre	Mathematical Literacy	Registered 50 Present 34
		02/11	Thabo Mofutsanyana	Centre 3194011	Mathematical Literacy	31
		13/11	Lejweleputsoa	Mamahabane	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	26
		08/11	Lejweleputsoa	Meloding AET Centre	Technology	74
		07/11	Motheo	Grootvlei Prison ABET	English LLC	15
Gauteng	DHET	2012	Johannesburg JN	Peter Lengene ABET	Mathematical Literacy	171
		12/11	Johannesburg	Herbert Mdingi ABET	Natural Science	154
		15/11	Johannesburg Alexander	Alexander Adult Centre	English LLC	103
		07/11	Johannesburg D9	Leeuwkop Maximum Adult Centre	Small, Medium & Micro Enterprises	49

EXAMINATION CENTRES MONITORED						
Province	Examining Body	Date	Region/ District	Venue	Learning Area	No of candidates writing
		12/11	Tshwane South	Reneilwe AET	Mathematical Literacy	359
		15/11	Johannesburg North	Diepkloof Adult Centre	Natural Science	44
KwaZulu-Natal	DHET	21/11	Amajuba	Inhloso AET Centre	Ancillary Health Care	Registered 17 Present 8
		07/11	Amajuba	Thanda AET Centre	LLC English	Registered 12 Present 11
		15/11	Amajuba	Siyakhula PALC	Natural Science	16
		21/11	Amajuba	Asifunde PALC	Ancillary Health Care	76
Limpopo	DHET	19/11	Mopani	Burgersdorp ABET Centre	Economic and Management Sciences	85
		07/11	Waterberg	Tshukudu Aet	LLC English	Not provided
		19/11	Sekhukhune	Tompi Seleka ABET Centre	Economic and Management Sciences	55
		7/11	Vhembe	Sendedza ABET Centre	LLC English	57
		16/11	Vhembe	Litshovhu AET Centre	Human and Social Sciences	6
		19/11	Bohlabela	Buyisonto AET Centre	Economic Management Sciences	37
		12/11	Bohlabela	Kennen ABET Centre	Mathematical Literacy	?
		15/11	Nkangala	Lynnville ABET Centre	Natural Science	34
		07/11	Gert Sibande	KwaZanele AET Centre	LLC English	76
		30/10	Bohlabela	Kadishe AET Centre	LLC Sepedi HL	29
Mpumalanga	DHET	12/11	Gert Sibande	Hloma State Centre Adult Education	Mathematics & Maths Science/ Mathematical Literacy	31 71
North West	DHET	07/11	Bojanala	Mogale AET Centre	LLC English	37
		02/11	Dr RS Mompoti	Lemogang AET Centre	Life Orientation	38
		12/11	Dr RS Mompoti	Utlwanang ABET Centre	Mathematical Literacy	21
		13/11	Ngaka Modiri	Tlhoahalo ABET L4	Small, Medium	15

EXAMINATION CENTRES MONITORED						
Province	Examining Body	Date	Region/ District	Venue	Learning Area	No of candidates writing
			Molema	Centre	and Micro Enterprises	
		07/11	Ngaka Modiri Molema	Rutanang ABET L4 Centre	LLC English	20
Northern Cape	DHET	21/11	Siyanda	Paballelo High School/Masakhane ABET Centre	No examination	0
		16/11	Namaqua	Bergsig Public Centre	Human and Social Sciences	17
		12/11	Namaqua	Nababeep Public Centre	Mathematical Literacy and Mathematical Sciences	8
		02/11	Siyanda	Learn for Life Public Centre	Life Orientation	Registered 31 Present 17
		21/11	Pixley ka Seme	Schmidtsdrift Batlhaping Intermediate School	Ancillary Health Care	Registered 13 Present 5
		02/11	Pixley ka Seme	Ikhwezi Lomso Adult Centre	Life Orientation	Registered 12 Present 4
		Western Cape	DHET	09/11	Winelands	Worcester CLC
21/11	Metropole North			Atlantis Adult Education Centre	Ancillary Health Care	Registered 34 Present 30
06/11	West Coast			Malmesbury CLC	Arts & Culture	33
09/11	Central Metropole			Maryland Literacy Project Centre	LLC Afrikaans	17
21/11	Winelands			Matie Community Services	Ancillary Health Care	35
12/11	Eden and Central Karoo			George CLC	Mathematical Literacy	Not provided
21/11	Eden and Central Karoo			Oudtshoorn CLC	Ancillary Health Care	47

**Table 18: Monitoring of writing centres**

Total no of writing centres monitored	Period of monitoring
50	30 October – 21 November 2012

Each of the monitors rated seven key monitoring areas at the writing centres, according to the rating descriptions below. The rating was arrived at by observation and by asking specific questions of the chief invigilators and invigilators at the centre.

**Table 19: Rating descriptions for monitoring of writing centres**

LEVEL	RATING	RATING DESCRIPTION / LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1	Poor / unacceptable	School / examination centre does not meet the minimum requirements / standards and requires urgent intervention, development, support and follow up monitoring.
2	Fair / partially meets requirements / standards	School / examination centre partially meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires intervention, support and follow up monitoring.
3	Good / meets requirements / standards	School / examination centre meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and cyclic monitoring.
4	Very good / exceeds requirements / standards	School / examination centre exceeds the minimum requirements / standards and has shown evidence of good practice and requires limited monitoring.

**Table 20: Writing centre ratings per key monitoring area**

Key Monitoring Areas	Centres obtaining rating of 1	Centres obtaining rating of 2	Centres obtaining rating of 3	Centres obtaining rating of 4	Total no of centres
General management of the examination	2	14	26	8	50
The examination room – general	0	13	34	3	50
The examination room – seating of candidates	1	13	26	9	49
Before the commencement of the examination	1	14	29	5	49
The writing of the examination	2	3	37	7	49
Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	0	2	39	9	50
Monitoring	3	19	23	4	49
Instances per rating	9	78	214	45	

NB: The total equals 49 in all instances where the monitor was unable to give a rating at a centre at which no examinations were taking place.

**Table 21: Writing centre ratings per key monitoring area as percentages**

	Key Monitoring Areas	% of centres rated as 1	% of centres rated as 2	% of centres rated as 3	% of centres rated as 4
	General management of the examination	4	28	52	16
	The examination room – general	0	26	68	6
	The examination room – seating of candidates	2	26.5	53	18.5
	Before the commencement of the examination	2	28.6	59.2	10.2
	The writing of the examination	4.1	6.1	75.5	14.3
	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	0	4	78	18
	Monitoring	6.1	38.8	46.9	8.2
	Overall percentages	2.6	22.6	61.8	13

**Table 22: Irregularities reported**

Irregularity	Learning Area	Reported by
Copying of work	Information Communication Technology	Moderator
Lack of question papers	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	Limpopo Education Department
Impersonation	Mathematical Literacy	Eastern Cape Education Department
Impersonation	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	Eastern Cape Education Department
Answer script missing	Travel and Tourism	Eastern Cape Education Department

### 3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Below is a summary of the key result areas that monitors considered when visiting examination centres during the examinations.

### 3.1 GENERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE EXAMINATION

The examination writing centres were generally well managed. Overall, all centres could be said to be sufficiently well managed to ensure a credible examination, although there were issues that need attention. From the figures above, it is clear that the examination was conducted in such a way that three-quarters of the centres met the requirements, and more. The great majority of centres (more than 95%) did a very good job of packaging and transmitting scripts. The management of the examination centre seemed to be the greatest weakness in the system, with one-third of the centres not fully meeting the requirements for good management. Correctly conducting procedures immediately prior to the commencement of the examination was another area of concern. Thirty percent of the centres did not meet the requirements in this area, as invigilators did not check question papers for missing pages and other errors; reading time was incorrectly managed; and a number of centres simply started these processes too late to conduct them properly.

The third area of weakness lies in seating candidates according to examination seating plans timeously and efficiently. The lack of a seating plan, or not seating candidates according to a seating plan, creates disorder prior to the examination and would cause difficulties if there were an irregularity.

Two centres indicated that they would turn away any candidate as a latecomer if he or she arrived more than 30 minutes late. One chief invigilator was adamant that an educator would not invigilate his or her own learning area, yet he was unable to name the educator of the learning area being examined on that day. He could not, therefore, guarantee that the invigilator was not the learning area educator.

A consistent problem found by monitors was a lack of a contingency plan. One centre indicated that they would call the security guards to assist if there were an emergency, although no one had considered what the security guards would be able to do. It was, however, noted that quite a number of chief invigilators had contact numbers for emergency services. Furthermore, most chief invigilators did not have a satisfactory plan for invigilators to summon the chief invigilator to the examination room.

At several centres chief invigilators had not received training for a number of years. Other centres did not receive adequate or in-depth training.

On the whole, the Eastern Cape districts proved to be well aware of the challenges facing centres in the province and were supportive of AET centres. The district offices stored all question papers and examination material, and distributed these daily. Either district

officials delivered and collected examination material, or a vehicle collected the chief invigilators and took them to the district office to collect and deliver the examination material – question papers, answer scripts and blank answer books. This eliminates the need for secure storage at centres that do not even have electricity. Mpumalanga districts support their AET centres in a similar way.

Concern about security was raised in a province that delivers question papers on a weekly basis. The monitor noted that one centre stored the question papers for the week in a steel cabinet in an ordinary room; another stored the papers on a shelf in the strong-room of a school. The school principal had the key because he used the safe during the day. Several centres across the country were unable to produce a record or inventory of examination material.

## 3.2 IRREGULARITIES

Monitors make it a point to determine whether each chief invigilator is familiar with irregularity procedures. In addition, assessment bodies are requested to send a report to Umalusi after each examination, either informing Umalusi of any irregularity that occurred during the examination or reporting that no irregularities occurred. Three irregularities were indicated in the irregularities reports in the file, but there may well have been additional unobserved or unreported irregularities. The Information Communication Technology external moderator picked up an incident of copying in one of the sets of sample scripts sent for external moderation, after marking and internal moderation.

The Free State Department of Education was meticulous in sending a report after each examination. The Limpopo Department of Education reported an incident at Maandamahulu AET Centre, in the Vhembe district, where two candidates did not receive question papers for Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences on the afternoon of 12 November 2012. The situation was quickly resolved when question papers were collected from another AET centre in the circuit. Candidates were accorded the full time allowed for the examination from the time they received the question papers.

The Eastern Cape Department of Education reported two incidents of irregularity on 12 November 2012. At centre no 210099, two people wrote the examinations on behalf of registered candidates. One wrote the Mathematical Literacy examination on behalf of a candidate, and another the Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences question paper on behalf of a candidate. The matter is under investigation.

Another irregularity was reported by the Eastern Cape Department of Education, following the Travel and Tourism examination on 14 November 2012. The completed answer script

of one candidate went missing at a Port Elizabeth examination centre and could not be traced. The matter is under investigation.

## **4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

A number of examples of good practice were found. The great majority of centres do a very good job of packaging and transmitting scripts. Conduct, or writing, of the examination is done in such a way that it meets the requirements and more, in 90% of the centres.

Question papers were generally secured, even under difficult circumstances. The safekeeping of question papers by district offices where centres did not have the facilities to store examination material was seen to be an excellent practice, although it meant that district officials had to arrange for the distribution of question papers and the collection of answer scripts. In many cases district officials themselves undertook this task. District offices in deep rural areas must be congratulated on delivering question papers, on time, in areas with poor, and often inadequate, infrastructure.

At one centre where hundreds of candidates write, the chief invigilator and invigilators had developed a set of stringent control measures to manage the candidates in an orderly manner. The arrival and seating at this large centre was quicker, quieter and more efficient than many much smaller centres.

The excellent effort made by so many chief invigilators and invigilators who show dedication and diligence must also be commended. At the point of writing, the integrity and success of the examination greatly depends on the commitment and enthusiasm of people in the field.

## **5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Poor infrastructure made monitoring hazardous in some rural areas where roads were treacherous and there were no sign posts, making it difficult to find and monitor the centres. This situation puts the examination (and teaching and learning) at risk on a daily basis. In addition, some candidates were writing examinations in centres with no electricity, while others wrote examinations at desks made for Grade 1 and 2 learners.

Of concern was the poor quality of some of the invigilation in a few centres. The chief invigilators showed no understanding of the policy on identification of candidates, while procedures to prepare candidates for writing the question paper were poorly implemented. This may have disadvantaged many candidates.

At least half a dozen chief invigilators were not performing their duties appropriately. In one centre the invigilators were using their cell phones in the examination room. At another centre the invigilators were incompetent, despite training and years of experience. Alcohol could be smelt on one invigilator. Although he did not appear drunk at the time, this was unacceptable. Several centres could not supply a seating plan or were not seating the candidates according to the seating plan.

Inadequate security is a concern raised in several reports. At least one chief invigilator collected question papers and returned answer scripts using public transport. The security of stored question papers could be improved in areas where there is not a daily delivery of question papers.

The high rate of absenteeism among candidates registered for the examination remains a concern for all.

Every centre must develop a crisis and contingency plan, and make it available to invigilators. Centres must address the late arrival by many candidates for examinations. All candidates must produce identification and invigilators must check identity documents and admission letters before candidates enter the examination room. Candidates must place their identification document and letter of admission on their desks.

All registers required according to regulations must be in place and updated daily, and a register of visits by monitors must be kept. Centres should invest in functional clocks that can be displayed in each examination room. The chief invigilator and the deputy, or substitute, must be appointed in writing. Every centre must appoint sufficient invigilators, as per policy, to invigilate the examination.

An information session for all candidates before the examinations commence would be helpful in preparing candidates and advising them of the necessity for punctuality and other issues.

Monitoring is essential to improve the management and conduct of the examinations. It is therefore disconcerting to note that at 22 centres, monitoring was unacceptable, or inadequate. Some of the worst-performing centres receive the least monitoring.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The areas of weakness all point towards the need to provide regular and thorough training. There should be compulsory induction training for new invigilators and chief invigilators. Assessment bodies should also present a short but fresh, innovative and effective refresher course every year for all other chief invigilators. This should be cascaded to invigilators using case studies, role playing and even quizzes. Innovative training sessions should be developed and a mechanism found to evaluate the effectiveness and usefulness of the training. PEDs should investigate issues of security around the storage of question papers.

AET centres should be audited. Consideration should be given to de-registering centres that are unsuitable for writing examinations. The issue of the high rate of absenteeism of registered candidates needs to be addressed.

## 7 CONCLUSION

Despite the areas of concern and the need for improvement, the examinations were generally well managed and credible at all examination centres. The majority of centres were evaluated as having met the requirements and standards, or exceeding these requirements. Nevertheless, attention must be paid not only to centres that are weak, but also to those particular criteria where centres do not meet requirements. Assessment bodies should monitor AET centres in a way similar to the monitoring of NSC centres. More support should be provided to AET chief invigilators.

## PART B: MONITORING OF MARKING CENTRES

### 1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the chapter covers the external monitoring of the marking phase of the November 2012 Adult Education and Training examination. The purpose of external monitoring of the marking phase of the examination is to assess the integrity of the marking processes. The act of monitoring provides an opportunity for the identification of best practices. It also allows for the identification of challenges encountered in the marking of the examination. There may be solutions based on the findings presented, or which may be addressed during standardisation.

Monitors visited 13 marking centres where a total of 58 marking teams were working. A list of the sites and marking teams, and a collated list of the evaluation of the marking centres, can be found below. Specific details on each marking centre are included in Addendum 3.

### 2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE

Table 23: Marking venues monitored

Date of monitoring	PED	Venue	Learning Areas	No of scripts
07/12/ 2012	Eastern Cape	Adelaide Gymnasium School	LLC English	63506
			Information Communication Technology	243
Hoërskool Aliwal Noord		LLC Afrikaans	133	
		Technology	368	
		Wholesale and Retail	124	
05/12/2012		Queenstown Girls High School	Human and Social Science	969
	Early Childhood Development		1026	
	LLC Sesotho Home Language		150	
05/12/2012	Free State	AJC Jooste High School	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	247
			Ancillary Health Care	3228
			Arts and Culture	245

Date of monitoring	PED	Venue	Learning Areas	No of scripts
			Early Childhood Development	307
			Economic Management Sciences	1608
			Human and Social Science	984
			Information Communication Technology	75
			LLC Afrikaans	49
			LLC English	4303
			LLC Sesotho	770
			LLC Setswana	10
			LLC isiXhosa	25
			LLC isiZulu	9
			Life Orientation	4254
			Mathematical Literacy	3751
			Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	670
			Natural Sciences	338
			Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	979
Technology	452			
Travel and Tourism	2399			
06/12/2012	Gauteng	Hoërskool President	LLC English	10307
			Economic Management Sciences	4422
			Ancillary Health Care	5524
			Mathematical Literacy	10308
01/12/2012	KwaZulu-Natal	Arthur Blaxall	Technology	1549
			Natural Sciences	5263
			Arts and Culture	2486
			Human and Social Sciences	3166
			Ancillary Health Care	6270
			Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	1251
			Economic Management Sciences	4898
			Travel and Tourism	2746
04/12/2012	KwaZulu-Natal	Suid-Natal High School	LLC English	12228
			Life Orientation	12056
			Mathematical Literacy	12411
			Afrikaans	44
			isiXhosa	152
			Information Communication Technology	10
			Early Childhood Development	299
			Sesotho	01
			Tshivenda	01
			Mathematics and Mathematical Science	406
			Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	2558
4/12/2012	Limpopo	Northern Academy	Mathematical Literacy	23509

Date of monitoring	PED	Venue	Learning Areas	No of scripts
			All other ABET learning areas – no details provided	
06/12/2012	Mpumalanga	Dr CN Mahlangu FET College	Ancillary Health Care	6084
			Applied Agriculture	4872
			Arts and Culture	2827
			Economic Management Sciences	3131
			LC English	13595
			Human and Social Sciences	2706
			isiZulu	2703
			Life Orientation	13559
			Technology	758
			Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	3581
03/12/ 2012	North West	Ferdinand Postma HS	Life Orientation	5697
29/11/2012 30/11/2012 01/12/2012	Northern Cape	Vuyouwethu High School	LC Afrikaans	198
			Arts and Culture	75
			Ancillary Health Care	881
			Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	15
			Economic Management Sciences	338
			Human and Social Sciences	610
			LC English	1173
			Life Orientation	1157
			Maths Literacy	1443
			Natural Sciences	69
			Setswana	240
			Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	91
			Travel and Tourism	495
			Technology	24
LC isiXhosa	39			
27/11/2012	Western Cape	CPUT Bellville	All learning areas	Not provided
24/11/2012	Independent Examination Body	St John's College	Mathematical Literacy	370
			Natural Science	115
			Communication in English Levels 1,2, 3,4	240, 374, 402, 486
			Technology	61
			Numeracy L1	257
			Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	155

**Table 24: Marking centre monitoring**

No of PEDs monitored	No of marking centres monitored	No of marking teams monitored	No of scripts
9	12	56	2798505

**Table 25: Evaluation of the level of compliance of marking centres**

LEVEL	RATING	RATING DESCRIPTION/LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1	Poor / unacceptable	Marking centre does not meet the minimum requirements / standards and requires urgent intervention, development, support and follow up monitoring.
2	Fair / partially meets requirements / standards	Marking centre partially meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires intervention, development, support and follow up monitoring.
3	Good / meets requirements / standards	Marking centre meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and cyclic monitoring.
4	Very good / exceeds requirements / standards	Marking centre exceeds the minimum requirements / standards and has shown evidence of good practice and requires limited monitoring.

**Table 26: Average evaluation ratings of DHET marking centres**

Average evaluation ratings of DHET marking centres		
	Key Monitoring Areas	Evaluation
1.	Planning for marking	3.4
2.	Marking centre	3.4
3.	Security	3.3
4.	Appointments	3.2
5.	Training of markers	3.1
6.	Marking procedure	3.0
7.	Internal moderation	3.3
8.	Selection of scripts for external moderation	3.3
9.	Monitoring of marking	3.1
10.	Handling of irregularities	3.2
11.	Quality assurance procedures	3.4
12.	Reports	3.3
13.	Electronic capturing of marks	3.3
14.	Packing and transmission of documentation	3.5
Overall Judgment		3.3

**Table 27: Evaluation ratings per marking centre per province**

No.	Key Monitoring Areas	Eastern Cape			Free State	Gauteng	KwaZulu-Natal		Limpopo	Mpumalanga	North West	Northern Cape	Western Cape
		Adelaide	Aliwal North	Queenstown	Hoërskool AJC Jooste	Hoërskool President	Blaxall	Natal-Suid	Northern College	Dr Mahlangu FET College	Ferdinand Postma High	Vuyouweithu High School	CPUT Bellville
1.	Planning for marking	3	4	4	3	4	4	2	3	4	3	4	3
2.	Marking centre	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	3
3.	Security	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	3	4	4	3
4.	Appointments	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
5.	Training	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4
6.	Marking procedure	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
7.	Internal moderation	3	-	4	3	3	2	4	4	-	3	4	3
8.	Scripts for external mod	3	-	-	3	4	-	-	4	2	4	3	3
9.	Monitoring of marking	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	3
10.	Handling of irregularities	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3
11.	QA procedures	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3
12.	Reports	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3
13.	Electronic mark capturing	3	4	4	3	3	-	-	4	3	3	-	3
14.	Packing and transmission	3	4	-	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3
	Overall Judgement	3	4	4	3	3.5	3.25	3.1	3.4	2.9	3	3.76	3

The overall judgement per marking centre ranges from 2.9 to 4.0, with an average evaluation of 3.3. Not all key monitoring areas were evaluated at all centres. The selection of scripts for external monitoring generally did not take place at the time of monitoring and so was rarely evaluated.

The detailed evaluation per marking centre is included in Addendum 3.

### **3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

The following is a summary of the findings in each of the key areas monitored during the marking process.

#### **a. Planning for marking**

Marking is planned well in advance by most provinces. This was the strongest area in respect of marking. Officials in North West commented that arrangements for marking were made late, resulting in hasty preparations at the marking centre.

The model for marking is, generally, one provincial level marking centre that provides for marking space, catering, security and access control, and a management and control centre. Overnight accommodation is available where needed. KwaZulu-Natal caters for numbers and distance by arranging three marking centres, but each question paper is marked at a single centre. The exception to this rule (of a minimal number of marking centres) is Mpumalanga, which has 18 marking centres scattered across three of the four districts.

#### **b. Marking centres**

Marking takes place in centres amenable to the activity of marking. Various venues in the centres are used to provide a quiet room or area for each team. Meals were deemed to be satisfactory, although beds in school and college hostels were not always sufficiently comfortable for adults.

Most centres operated from 08:00 to 17:00, but the centre manager at one marking centre indicated that they would work until 22:00 if time became tight.

#### **c. Security**

All centres had security guards, although access at the entrances to venues was often lax. However, access to marking rooms was tightly controlled. Scripts were kept secure at all

times and remained in locked marking rooms at night. Movement of scripts from one room to another in the marking centre was recorded on control sheets.

#### **d. Appointment of markers and administrative / examination assistants**

Markers are appointed according to the PAM criteria and informed via letter well in advance of marking. Examination assistants are appointed shortly before the commencement of marking, when assessment bodies are able to ascertain the exact number of candidates who wrote. Competency tests were not set by any of the assessment bodies for markers of the AET examinations.

#### **e. Training of markers**

All markers are trained in marking procedures and by means of dummy script marking. Chief markers are trained by provincial officials, separately from markers. Training of markers is conducted by chief markers and usually takes at least five hours and, in some cases, most of the first day, at the marking centre. However, this was either insufficient or the quality of training was poor, as many of the language markers had not fully grasped how to apply the marking grid for extended writing. Only one province specifically required markers to pre-mark the question paper at home but even then, many markers arrived without having tried to answer the question paper.

#### **f. Marking procedures**

The marking procedure was the weakest area monitored. One issue that lowered the evaluation score was that of minute-taking, which rarely took place at the memorandum discussions in the marking centres. There was one reported instance where the marking team decided to correct an incorrect answer on a memorandum. They then informed the DHET which, in turn, informed the moderator, after the decision had been taken.

Memoranda were discussed in detail and markers were encouraged to contribute to the discussion. Two assessment bodies indicated that the markers may make additions to the memorandum. However, memoranda were generally not changed. Marks were allocated as per the marking memorandum.

There was no uniformity with regard to “per question” marking versus “whole script” marking. The approach to marking was fairly evenly divided between those who marked question-by-question, and those who did whole script marking. In some instances, a provincial Department of Education had determined the approach, in other cases the chief marker and the marking team decided which approach to favour. Monitors found both approaches a single marking centre. The same learning area was marked differently in different marking centres. In a few cases, it was decided at the memorandum discussion to use a particular approach for the learning area.

All markers either attached a signature to the marked script, or used codes provided, to identify themselves as the marker of a script. In all cases, the chief marker had to check and record the scripts on day one, and record all scripts that left the marking room.

**g. Internal moderation**

Internal moderators are expected to be present throughout the marking session at most marking centre, but not all internal moderators adhered to this requirement. The internal moderator moderates at least 10% of the marked scripts, spread across the spectrum of marks, but at two centres the internal moderator was required to moderate only 20 scripts. The key function of the internal moderator is to quality assure the marking. However, in learning areas with small candidate numbers, some internal moderators also marked scripts.

**h. External moderation**

Not all marking venues were at the point of selecting scripts for moderation when the monitor was in attendance, but where they were engaged in the process, 20 scripts were selected as samples for external moderation, according to Umalusi requirements. These scripts were sent to the provincial offices for forwarding to Umalusi.

**i. Monitoring of marking**

All markers are monitored for accuracy and adherence to the memorandum as well as consistency in mark allocations. Markers who do not meet the standard are given support and guidance but if this does not improve the quality of marking, they are removed from the marking team. Not all assessment bodies take recommendations from previous years into account when markers are appointed.

**j. Handling of irregularities**

Markers were well trained and handled irregularities professionally. Only in one instance was a case of serious irregularities observed by a monitor. At all other centres, either no irregularities, or technical irregularities only, were observed during monitoring.

**k. Quality assurance procedures**

Senior markers, chief markers and, finally, examination assistants, check scripts to ensure that no errors have been made. The marking centres do not close until every script and every mark sheet has been accounted for. Most centres keep copies of mark sheets.

## **I. Reports**

Chief markers assisted by the internal moderator, present a comprehensive report at the end of a marking session. These reports are used to provide feedback to educators and subject specialists. They also produce the report required by Umalusi.

### **m. Electronic capturing of marks**

Mark sheets become the responsibility of the provincial examination officials once the marking and checking process is complete. The mark sheets are carefully controlled, from the marking room through all stages to the data capture room, to ensure none are lost or mislaid. Mark sheets are generally submitted for capture at least once a day. When monitors did report on the actual capture of marks, they indicated that the blind double capture method was used.

### **n. Packing and transmission of documentation**

Assessment bodies exercised tight control over the dispatch of answer scripts to storage facilities, mark sheets to data capturers and reports to officials in the provincial office. As with writing centres, packing and transmission of documentation proved to be the strongest of the key monitoring areas.

## **4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

Good practice was observed in thorough planning for conducting marking centres. This administrative function stood the process of marking in good stead. Security within marking centres was tight. Chief markers and internal moderators worked well as a team, which enhanced the quality of marking. Packing and transmission of documentation were handled well.

## **5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Training of markers took place at each centre. However, in some cases it was fairly perfunctory and in other cases not highly effective. Security was always visible but not always highly effective.

Internal moderators need to be at the marking centre from the commencement of marking. Security officers at the access points to marking centres need to be more vigilant. Final memoranda must be sent to marking centres timeously. Markers must work through the question paper before arriving at the marking centre.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Attention must be paid to security personnel at marking centre access points. Final memoranda must be sent to the assessment bodies timeously. Educators must be informed in their letters of appointment that they are required to go through the question paper and prepare a marking memorandum before arriving at the marking centre. Learning areas with large numbers of candidates should not be examined in the last week of the examination, as markers struggle to complete marking when there are delays in the receipt of memoranda after the memorandum discussion meetings.

A mechanism other than the evidence of marking needs to be found to evaluate the effectiveness of training provided.

## 7 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be stated with confidence that at no stage did any of the monitors observe any action at a marking centre that could compromise the integrity of the marking. Only on eight occasions did the evaluation of a marking centre process dip below the level of meeting the standard and, on each of those occasions, the standard was partially achieved. Not one of the key evaluation areas at a marking centre was found to be unacceptable. Marking centres are well planned and managed according to the relevant policy and guidelines, and provide the appropriate environment for quality marking.

# CHAPTER 4:

---

## MODERATION OF MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Verification of marking involves two processes: firstly, the verification of the marking guideline / memorandum discussions held after the writing of the question paper and prior to the commencement of marking; and, secondly, the verification of marked scripts after marking.

The external moderator for each learning area attends the marking guideline discussions to ensure that the approved question paper was the one presented to candidates, to guide the interpretation of the questions and the required answers, and to approve the final memorandum that will be used by all markers in that learning area.

The marking guideline / memorandum discussions were staggered, as each learning area meeting took place within a few days of the writing of the question paper, after the chief markers should have had the opportunity to pre-mark a few question papers and be in a position to gauge the response of candidates to the question paper.

This report stresses the importance of attendance at the memorandum discussions. The nature of assessment is such that a marker has to know not only the answer that he or she is looking for, but must also understand the question fully and the processes by which one arrives at the answer. This is particularly important because candidates do not produce answers identical to those on the memoranda. Markers are required to make a judgement as to whether individual responses are valid.

Reports were submitted on 17 of the memorandum discussions. However, this did not allow for precise identification of chief marker(s) and internal moderator(s) who did not attend. Suffice to say, the report shows that the expected 100% attendance did not happen.

The report below contains the main findings of the moderation process. Learning area-specific details are contained in Addendum 4.

## 2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE

Marking guideline discussions were held for the following learning areas:

**Table 28: Marking memorandum discussion reports**

No	Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	26 November
2	Economic and Management Sciences	Not indicated
3	Information Communication Technology	8 November
4	LC English	13 November
5	LLC Zulu	12 November
6	LLC Tshivenda	12 November
7	LLC Sesotho	12 November
8	LLC isiNdebele	8 November
9	LLC isiXhosa	9 November
10	LLC Setswana	9 November
11	LLC Afrikaans	13 November
12	LLC Xitsonga	9 November
13	Mathematical Literacy	15–16 November
14	Small, Medium & Micro Enterprises	16 November
15	Technology	8 November
16	Travel and Tourism	20 December
17	Wholesale and Retail	28 November

**Table 29: No of participants and scripts pre-marked**

	Learning Area	Participants in memo discussions (excluding Umalusi moderator)*	Number of scripts pre-marked
1.	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	16	267
2.	Economic and Management Sciences	17	205
3.	Information Communication Technology	1	36
4.	LLC isiZulu	10	120
5.	LLC Tshivenda	5	55
6.	LLC Sesotho	7	?
7.	LLC isiXhosa	12	123
8.	LLC Xitsonga	8	63
9.	LLC English	21	?
10.	LLC Setswana	9	65
11.	LLC isiNdebele	5	5
12.	LLC Afrikaans	12	116
13.	Mathematical Literacy	21	372
14.	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	14	145
15.	Technology	16	231
16.	Travel and Tourism	17	363
17.	Wholesale and Retail	7	77

\*The minutes have not yet been confirmed so there may be additional participants. \*The number of participants is also dependent on the number of provinces writing a particular paper – the expected number of participants should be compared to the actual number of participants.

Below is a table indicating the evaluation of marking memorandum discussions in terms of the frequency of adherence to the criteria against which the external moderators judged the success of the meetings. These discussions were held to finalise marking memoranda after the writing of the examination and when examination and marking officials should have had insight into the responses of candidates to the question papers.

The marking guidelines, drawn up when the question papers were set, are revised following input by all the chief markers and internal moderators who, at that point, have had access to the question paper and to candidate responses to the question paper.

**Table 30: Evaluation of marking memorandum discussions**

EVALUATION OF MARKING MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS			
	Findings by external moderators	Frequency/ 17	%
	Does the examination paper and memorandum represent the final approved version?	17	100
	Were the changes recommended by you amended in the marking memorandum?	13	76.5
	Did the chief markers from the PEDs mark a sample of scripts?	17	100
	Was the chief marker's report of the previous examination discussed at the memorandum session?	3/15*	20
	Did all chief markers, examiners and internal moderators attend?	10	58.8
	Did all attendees come prepared, with each having worked out or prepared possible answers?	13	76.4
	Did each attendee receive a sample of scripts from the PED?	11	64.7
	Were any changes and / or additions made to the memorandum during the memorandum discussion?	17	100
	Did the Umalusi moderator approve the changes / additions?	17	100
	Did the changes / additions have an impact on the cognitive level of the answer / response required?	1	5.9

Two learning areas do not have previous chief markers' reports, i.e. Information Communication Technology, and Wholesale and Retail.

**Table 31: Role of the Umalusi moderator in marking memorandum discussions**

ROLE OF THE UMALUSI MODERATOR IN MARKING MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS			
	Findings by external moderators	Frequency/17	%
	Led the discussion	0	0
	Provided input / participated fully	5	29.4
	Undertook the role of an observer	4	23.5
	Provided support and advice	6	35.3
	Ensured that quality and standards were not compromised	10	58.8
	Provided clarity on content	8	47.0
	Ensured all participants could apply the memorandum correctly	6	35.3
	Ensured alternative answers were included	6	35.3
	Acted as adjudicator when there was no consensus	8	47.0
	Approved final changes to the memorandum	6	35.3

### 3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

#### 3.1 PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOLLOWED

The findings above show a serious weakness in the system in that in a significant number of the learning areas, not all examiners, internal moderators and chief markers attended the memorandum discussion. In several learning areas only one person representing a province attended, but there were several cases where there were no provincial representatives present.

The findings indicate that in almost one-quarter of the learning areas, attendees arrived at the memorandum discussion unprepared for the task at hand. These participants would not have been able to participate meaningfully in the memorandum discussions.

Furthermore, in only two-thirds of the learning areas were all participants able to contribute towards an understanding of how candidates had responded to the question paper.

The only question paper in which the cognitive level was affected by changes to the memorandum was where a question had been incorrectly printed and the marks had to be adjusted.

## **3.2 ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE UMALUSI MODERATOR IN MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS**

The role of the external moderator is determined, to some extent, by the competency of the chairperson and participants in the memorandum discussions. The fact that none of the external moderators had to take the lead in the memorandum discussions shows that in each learning area, there was a competent chairperson who could lead the discussions. In nearly 60% of the learning area discussions, external moderators were able to focus fully on their key role of safeguarding quality and standards. Umalusi moderators were frequently called upon to make a decision when consensus among participants could not be reached. The decisions taken by external moderators were informed by the standards they were appointed to uphold.

## **4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

There was unanimous agreement that the marking of dummy scripts at the memorandum discussion was an excellent practice that quickly revealed different understandings of the memorandum. This allowed, in some learning areas, for additional changes to be made to the memorandum to make it more user friendly. The underlining of key words was found to be most helpful in making it easier to apply the memorandum accurately.

Another good practice was pre-marking at least 20 scripts per person. This encouraged a keen understanding of the question paper and how candidates were responding, leading to genuine, informed participation in the memorandum discussions. The analysis of the results, per question, set a framework for the meeting as the group knew what worked in the memorandum and where adjustments were needed. The larger the number of scripts marked and analysed, the better-prepared participants were. This, in turn, led to more valuable engagement with the question paper and memorandum. Preparation was viewed as critical in light of the limited time available for a memorandum discussion.

## **5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

A number of challenges arose at the memoranda discussions. These had different origins but time seemed a recurrent issue in one way or another.

Inadequate teaching at AET centres led to many challenges, including questions that candidates simply could not manage, or were unable to answer as the work had not

been taught. Teaching of language structure, essay writing and transactional writing seem to be badly neglected in most languages. In most learning areas, candidates struggled to engage with extended pieces of writing. This revealed a chasm between the standard expected and the work presented by the candidates. Answer scripts also provided clear evidence that many educators did not prepare their learners for the kinds of questions they would face in the examination.

The point made in the Language and Communication in Afrikaans meeting was that candidates simply did not have sufficient teaching time to prepare fully for the examination. An hour a week for AET learners, compared to the four and a half hours contact time that school learners enjoy, makes the point. Even a very good educator would be hard-pressed to prepare candidates in all aspects of a language learning area in the time available.

A major challenge in some memorandum discussions was that many chief markers and internal moderators were unable to get hold of question papers timeously. They were therefore not fully prepared for the meeting. Usually it was a case of time and / or distances that departments had to cope with in collecting and delivering answer scripts to chief markers and internal moderators. Often the memorandum discussion was held so soon after the writing of the question papers that there was insufficient time for marking and analysis of at least 20 scripts.

Time was a considerable challenge in memorandum discussions where participants arrived late. In addition, participants were booked on flights that left before the discussion was complete, so participants left the meeting without a complete understanding of how marking was to proceed. Others left before the dummy marking was complete and were therefore unaware of problems that arose in the process of marking and how they were resolved. The point was made that the process of marking and the process of resolving issues with the memorandum are as important as the words on the memorandum itself.

The greatest challenge occurred in those learning areas where one or both provincial representatives did not attend the memorandum discussion. In at least four learning areas, both representatives of one or more provinces did not attend the discussion. In addition, in at least three learning areas members of the examining panel were absent from the meeting. The presence of examining panel members is vital as they need to explain the intention of the questions in the examination paper. They also need to expound on the expected responses. Fortunately, each learning area was chaired by a member of the examining panel.

The absence of the chief marker and the internal moderator from the provincial departments was even more alarming. While a copy of the final marking memorandum

will provide the answers, assessment is not an exact science and those who do not attend memoranda discussions do not acquire the nuances of a memorandum, nor do they have insight into the processes that lead to the required standard. If a chief marker does not attend, that chief marker is not in a position to train the markers and to set appropriate standards in the marking of scripts. Internal moderators cannot support the chief marker, or critique the standard set by the chief marker, if he or she is not part of the discussions on standards and what makes an answer acceptable. Not many solutions were offered to the problems that arose, although several recommendations were made.

Several learning areas determined that the underlining of key words in a memorandum helped to keep markers focused on the responses sought and assisted with the accuracy of marking. Most participants believed that marking dummy scripts had solved a great deal of the problems that had previously arisen only when chief markers began marking in the provinces.

Agreement should be reached by all parties on the most suitable dates for memorandum discussions, bearing in mind all the requirements that have to be fulfilled and the need for full participation by well-prepared participants.

It would be very helpful if the attendance registers signed at the marking memorandum discussions were completed correctly and with all information requested. Where a province is not represented, the attendance register should reflect whether that province was absent, or whether there were no candidates in the province who wrote that question paper.

## **6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Learning area-specific recommendations were put forward by the Travel and Tourism and Information Communication Technology discussion groups. Other recommendations were more generic and were made in some form or another by a number of learning areas. The Travel and Tourism chief markers and moderators recommended that questions not be stored and selected at random for an examination. A learning area like Travel and Tourism has topical questions that lose their meaning over time. They pointed to questions on the World Cup Soccer tournament that would not have the same relevance in later years. The strong recommendation was that question papers be used in the year that they are set, or in the following year.

The external moderator for Information Communication Technology strongly recommended that the memorandum discussion for the learning area be held in a computer room so that all participants at the meeting had access to a computer.

The most common recommendation was that curriculum officials train and support AET educators so that they are able to teach all sections of the curriculum and are able to prepare candidates for the types of questions they will encounter in the examination. In order to solve the problem of using an incorrect version of a memorandum, it was recommended that chief markers be permitted to take a copy of the final memorandum with them, so that they can confirm the one issued by the provincial officials is indeed the correct and final version.

It was recommended that measures be put in place to ensure that all chief markers and internal moderators from all provinces attend the memorandum discussion. Where a province does not send the chief marker and internal moderator, the province should not be authorised to mark the question paper. The province should have to make alternative arrangements, such as employing and accommodating a member of the examining panel for the duration of the marking session.

The external moderators suggested that measures be put in place to ensure that every participant marks and analyses at least 20 scripts. It was recommended that a copy of the analysis be sent to the head of examinations in the province so that shortcomings could be taken up by the relevant authority.

The external moderators recommended that sufficient time be allowed for participants to obtain and mark scripts before the memorandum discussion is held. The value of the exercise is greatly enhanced if participants are well prepared.

Everyone should have the benefit of attending a full memorandum discussion. Umalusi should impress upon the heads of examinations the need for all chief markers and internal moderators to attend the meetings in full. It was recommended that all flights be booked so that participants arrive in time for the start of the meeting. Return flights should be booked for a time after the conclusion of the memorandum discussion. Officials who book flights must make allowance for the time required to drive to the airport and for the necessary check-in before the flight.

## 7 CONCLUSION

The reports received on the memorandum discussions show that these meetings are professionally managed and the purpose of the meeting is fulfilled to a large extent in each learning area. Late arrivals, early leaving and non-attendance by some chief markers and internal moderators are unacceptable as it impacts negatively on the integrity of the marking, particularly in the affected provinces, and it certainly impacts the candidates in that province. The memorandum discussions can be said to have served their intended purpose in every learning area for which a report was received.

# CHAPTER 5:

---

## MODERATION OF MARKING

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Moderation of marking is a critical process in the quality assurance of an examination. It is not possible to have the same control over marking as one has over the setting of question papers and determining marking guidelines, where a limited number of examiners are involved.

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 has to be made for each in respect of its adherence to the memorandum.

External moderation validates the process of marking and determines whether marking has adhered to the marking guideline approved by the external moderator after the memorandum discussions. External moderation also determines the standard of internal moderation and whether or not internal moderators have fulfilled their duties appropriately. More detailed information would be required to make a judgement in this regard, but a comparison between the reports on the memorandum discussions and the moderation of marking shows a correlation in several instances. One internal moderator who did not attend the memorandum discussions was found, in the moderation of the marked scripts, to be shadow marking, or simply agreeing with all marks allocated by the markers. Three cases of poor marking could be traced back to the internal moderator not having attended memorandum discussions.

The external moderation process determines whether correct judgements have been made and, if not, shortcomings are identified for the standardisation committee. The reports on the moderating of 1373 scripts by 20 external moderators were analysed and the findings are reported in this chapter. A number of provinces did not submit sample packs of scripts. In certain learning areas it was unclear whether candidates in a province had written the question paper.

A more detailed analysis of the moderators' reports on the marking of each of the learning areas, as well as the results obtained by those candidates whose scripts were submitted as samples, is attached as Addendum 5.

## 2 MATERIALS AND SCOPE

Reports were supplied on the external moderation of the marking of 20 learning areas. Included in this sample were the two new learning areas of Wholesale and Retail and Information Communication Technology. This was the first examination written by candidates in these learning areas.

**Table 32: Reports on the external moderation of marking**

No	Learning area	No of scripts moderated
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	171
2	Human and Social Sciences	80
3	Information Communication Technology	30
4	Life Orientation	80
5	LLC Afrikaans	72
6	LLC English	45
7	LLC isiNdebele	24
8	LLC isiXhosa	50
9	LLC isiZulu	40
10	LLC Sepedi	60
11	LLC Setswana	99
12	LLC siSwati	20
13	LLC Tshivenda	32
14	LLC Xitsonga	40
15	Mathematical Literacy	160
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	127
17	Small Medium and Micro Enterprises	120
18	Technology	180
19	Travel and Tourism	83
20	Wholesale and Retail	40
Total number of scripts received for moderation		1373

Below is a summary of the most important findings in the verification process.

**Table 33: Collated evaluation of key areas of marking moderation**

COLLATED EVALUATION OF KEY AREAS OF MARKING MODERATION				
Criterion			Yes	No
Adherence to the memorandum			198	2
The memorandum made provision for alternative responses			19	1
The allocation of marks was consistent and totals were correct			16	4
Changes to the marking memorandum were effected at the marking centre			0	20
Internal moderation took place			18	2
Unfair questions were asked			1	19
Standard of marking	Poor	Ave.	Good	Excellent
	2	6	14	4
Comment on the candidates' performance		Fair	Easy	Difficult
		20	2	2

\* A total of 20 reports were received but in some cases, moderators felt it necessary to mark both "yes" and "no", or indicate more than one level of competency.

The standard of marking is the key area of evaluation that requires further investigation. Forty percent of the moderators suggested that markers were either "Poor" or simply "Average". It is expected that markers who are selected to mark an external examination would be, at the very least, good markers.

**Table 34: Evaluation of the standard of marking**

Subject	Standard of marking				Remarks
	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
Applied Agriculture & AT			√		The markers improved in marking compared with last year. However, there is room for improvement in counting marks and allocating marks.
Human & Social Sciences			√		Good adherence to the memorandum and no carelessness noted.
Information Communication Technology			√		The standard of marking was relatively consistent. Owing to the easy nature of the INTC4 question paper (introductory level), the markers were able to adequately interpret all questions and give credit for correct answers.
LLC Afrikaans		√			Some markers cannot determine whether an answer is relevant or not. Markers cannot interpret rubrics. Markers do not carry out

Subject	Standard of marking				Remarks
	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
					instructions.
LLC English			√		Very few, and insignificant, discrepancies between the markers and the external moderation.
LLC isiNdebele		√			Markers were not able to use the marking rubric properly to score creative writing. Markers' comments showed a distinct isiZulu influence.
LLC isiXhosa			√		Markers adhered to the memorandum and showed a good grasp of how to use the matrix.
LLC isiZulu		√			The difference in mark allocations was evident in Section C, where markers were unable to use the marking matrix correctly.
LLC Sepedi			√		
LLC Setswana			√		The markers' performance was on par as there were only minor differences.
LLC siSwati				√	All questions were well marked. Answers of the same value were given the same marks. Compositions and the invitation were particularly well marked.
LLC Tshivenda			√		Markers were vigilant and marks awarded to candidates were authentic.
LLC Xitsonga			√		Panel marking is consistent. Ticks indicated marks.
Life Orientation				√	The whole process was carried out in a very professional manner.
Mathematical Literacy		√	√	√	Some provinces were merely average and others good but marking was excellent in the Free State.
Mathematics and Maths Sciences			√		Generally the markers attempted to apply the memorandum consistently, recognised alternative answers and awarded marks correctly.
Small, Medium & Micro Enterprises	√	√	√	√	Free State markers were excellent. Other provinces ranged from good to poor: too many ticks, inconsistent mark allocation, scratching out of marks, etc.
Technology			√		Mark allocation was on target. Alternative answers were accepted. A few addition errors should have been picked up by the checkers.
Travel and Tourism	√	√			Markers and IMs ignored gross errors in spelling place names. The standard of marking was poor in one PED, with spelling errors and keywords marked correct, in spite of the sentence (usage) being incorrect.
Wholesale and Retail			√		Generally marking was consistent and fair and candidates were given credit for correct answers. Only two calculation errors were identified.

## **3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

### **3.1 SUMMARY OF KEY CRITERIA**

#### **3.1.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum**

In most cases the memorandum was adhered to by the markers. Changes effected at the memorandum discussions were taken into consideration by most markers. The Mathematical Literacy external moderator was of the opinion that one province simply did not meet the requirements for marking correctly. In Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises, the external moderator distinguished between those marking centres that adhered to the marking memorandum, those that partially adhered to the memorandum and one that "marked any vaguely relevant answer" correct and did not adhere to the memorandum.

The Wholesale and Retail external moderator found that markers adhered to the memorandum in most cases, giving credit to candidates for correct answers even when they were not worded exactly as in the memorandum. Unfortunately, the same moderator discovered frequent non-adherence to the memorandum in the question which assessed calculations, and suspected that a lack of competency led to marking errors.

#### **3.1.2 The memorandum made provision for alternate responses**

During the memorandum discussions, alternative answers had been added and these alternative answers were given credit in most cases. Some memoranda simply added a codicil that "any relevant response" could be accepted. It was pointed out by one external moderator that not all markers had the capacity to make these decisions. In another learning area, the memorandum instructed the markers to consult with the chief marker should they believe that a given answer was an acceptable alternative to answers in the memorandum.

#### **3.1.3 Consistency and accuracy**

In the majority of learning areas, the allocation of marks was consistent and totals were accurate. The mark allocation was not consistently distributed in LLC isiNdebele owing to the poor marking of Section C, the extended writing section. The external moderator for

Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises worked out an error rating for each province or examining body that sent a sample of scripts. Of the nine sets of sample scripts he received, only one province had an error rating of less than 50%.

### **3.1.4 Changes to the marking memorandum at the marking centre**

The external moderators were pleased to report that none of the provinces had made an unauthorised change to the marking memorandum.

### **3.1.5 Standard of marking**

Three external moderators found a range of differences in the marking of the various sets of scripts received from the provinces and the Independent Examination Board. One moderator indicated that marking ranged from poor in some cases to average in others. The Mathematical Literacy moderator found that marking ranged from excellent in one province to good and average in the other provinces. Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises posed the most challenges with marking, with performance ranging from poor to average to good, although, in two cases, the marking standard was excellent. Overall, marking was judged to be poor in two cases, average in six learning areas and good in 14 learning areas. In four learning areas, the marking was judged to be excellent.

### **3.1.6 Internal moderation**

Moderation took place in the majority of learning areas. In some provinces there were several layers of moderation to quality-assure the marking. The external moderators of LLC isiNdebele and LLC isiXhosa found sets of sample scripts that had not been internally moderated.

### **3.1.7 Unfair questions**

In 19 of the learning areas, there were no questions that were unfairly presented, outside the syllabus or beyond the level of AET learners. The internal moderator of Wholesale and Retail was concerned about one question that required candidates to draw an organogram and respond to it in ways that were beyond the expectations of the unit standards. It was a choice question and very few candidates chose it.

### **3.1.8 Candidates' performance**

According to the candidates' responses, more than 80% of candidates must have found the questions fair. There was such a wide range of responses to the Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises and Travel and Tourism question papers that the external moderators believed candidates experienced the paper differently. Some found the papers fair, others too easy and a number found these papers very difficult.

## **3.2 FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS**

### **3.2.1 For internal moderators**

Findings in respect of internal moderators indicated that there are many highly competent and committed internal moderators. Internal moderators were reminded that it was essential to submit a report as well as the final mark sheet and, in the case of Information Communication Technology candidates, the electronic copy of the answer script, together with the sample scripts. It was suggested that internal moderators could spend more time training markers on how to record marks on scripts. Language moderators are strongly advised to spend more time training markers to use the matrix to mark extended pieces of writing. Some internal moderators need to be reminded to moderate all questions in a script. They need to re-mark the script and not shadow mark, or just confirm whatever marks the marker has awarded.

### **3.2.2 For examiners**

Marks allocated to questions must be clear and self-evident for candidates. Examiners are setting questions with appealing visuals, but there should be a balance in terms of appropriate cognitive levels, using Barrett and Bloom's taxonomies.

### **3.2.3 For chief markers and markers**

Marks should be neatly recorded on the scripts. Chief markers and markers must be vigilant against failure to adhere to the memorandum. Markers should refer to the marking guideline frequently. As far as markers of the Language learning areas are concerned, the matrix must be clearly understood and properly applied to avoid giving undeserved marks. Some of the marking was deemed sterling. The good marking is acknowledged and every effort must be made to continue the development of markers and to maintain a level of good practice.

## 4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

The reports indicated that there are exceptional markers and moderators in the field, but in several of the learning areas there are markers and moderators who do not adhere to good practice. In most cases, markers adhered to the memorandum, and the value of adding alternative answers during the memorandum discussion was evident. In the majority of learning areas, the allocation of marks was consistent and totals were accurate. It was pleasing to see that chief markers and internal moderators must surely have participated fully in the memorandum discussions because not one of the chief markers or internal moderators allowed any unauthorised changes to the final, approved memorandum.

## 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The quality of marking and internal moderation is a challenge in many instances. The poor quality of marking and moderation is learning area-specific, not province-specific. For example, one particular province was deemed to have the best marked and moderated scripts in one learning area; while in another learning area the exact opposite was true of scripts marked.

Poor moderation where scripts are not re-marked but simply shadow marked remains a problem. In the worst case, an internal moderator was deemed to be raising marks. In another learning area neither the marker nor internal moderator picked up a fairly obvious case of copying. The latter two were, fortunately, isolated incidents.

Because challenges and bad practice were not widespread, only the internal moderators who are not making the grade need specific training. Likewise, where marking is poor, the chief marker needs training. One instance where training is vital is in the use of the marking rubric in Languages. From the reports it was clear that some markers are marking extremely well using the rubric, so the rubric is not the source of the difficulties. Where marking shows poor application of the rubric, the chief marker must be trained and that training cascaded to the markers. Provinces should allow time for additional training before the next marking session for these marking teams.

Attendance by all chief markers and internal moderators at the marking memorandum discussions must be an imperative. Provinces that do not submit samples of marked scripts to Umalusi timeously need to be informed that this, too, is an imperative.

Where a province does not send a sample set of scripts, the composite analysis should reflect whether that province did not submit scripts; or whether no candidates in the province wrote that question paper.

## **6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that training be instituted where marking standards are not being met and that attendance at memorandum meetings be enforced so internal moderators and chief markers are in a position to guide and support their markers. The timeous submission of sets of marked scripts should be an imperative as the moderation of scripts is a critical mechanism for ensuring that the marking memorandum has indeed been appropriately applied.

## **7 CONCLUSION**

The markers, moderators and examiners who have performed remarkably well must be congratulated on their commitment to the process. Marking was seen to be largely fair and valid. Training should see to it that in future, marking of every learning area by all markers will be fair, valid and well moderated. The external moderators are to be complimented on excellent reports on the verification process.

# CHAPTER 6:

---

## CERTIFICATION AND STANDARDISATION

### 1 GETC: ABET STANDARDISATION OF RESULTS DECEMBER 2012

#### 1.1 SCOPE AND APPROACH

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 sites of learning. The pre-standardisation and standardisation meetings took place on Thursday, 13 December 2012 for the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET).

#### 1.2 DECISIONS: DHET

**Raw marks were accepted for the following 19 learning areas:**

- Language, Literacy and Communication: Afrikaans
- Ancillary Health Care
- Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology
- Early Childhood Development
- Economic and Management Sciences
- Information Communication Technology
- Language, Literacy and Communication: English
- Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiNdebele
- Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiXhosa
- Language, Literacy and Communication: IsiZulu
- Life Orientation
- Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences
- Natural Sciences
- Language, Literacy and Communication: Sepedi
- Language, Literacy and Communication: siSwati
- Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises
- Technology

- Language, Literacy and Communication: Tshivenda
- Human and Social Science
- Upward moderations were accepted for the following five learning areas:
- Arts and Culture
- Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises
- Language, Literacy and Communication: Tshivenda
- Language, Literacy and Communication: Sesotho
- Travel and Tourism

**Downward moderations were accepted for the following two learning areas:**

- Language, Literacy and Communication: Xitsonga
- Mathematical Literacy

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

**Table 35: Summary of GETC standardisation outcomes**

Description	Number for October 2012 DHET
Number of learning areas presented for standardisation	26
Number of learning areas where raw marks were accepted	19
Number of learning areas for which marks were adjusted upwards	5
Number of learning areas for which marks were adjusted downwards	2
Number of learning areas standardised	26

### 1.3 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) has fairly reliable systems for the administration, conduct and management of the examination, assessment and resulting processes in place.

### 1.4 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The delay in bringing the GETC computer system in line with the NSC system resulted in Umalusi verifying standardisation data at the last minute and the DHET submitting standardisation booklets late, because serious errors were discovered in the booklets. This

also meant that the statistical moderation process had to be verified on live data, with no previous tests being conducted by Umalusi.

The continued underperformance of candidates of the DHET needs further investigation and action.

It is heartening to see the increase in the number of candidates enrolling for this examination. This is, however, offset by the high absentee rate.

Interventions by markers who tend to increase the number of candidates at the pass mark of 40% are strongly discouraged. The DHET is requested to intervene and to put measures in place to prevent this from happening in future.

## **1.5 CONCLUSION**

Based on the results and the reports of the quality assurance processes undertaken by the team of external moderators and monitors, as well as the deliberations and conclusions of Umalusi Council's Assessment Standards Committee, the Executive Committee of Council concluded that the GETC: ABET L1 examinations were generally conducted in a professional, fair and reliable manner and that the results could be regarded as credible.

## **2 THE STATUS OF CERTIFICATION OF THE GETC: ABET 2012**

### **2.1 BACKGROUND**

It is evident that certification is perceived by many people as the simple action of printing a certificate. This is far removed from the reality and actual processes that lead to the issuing of a credible certificate. Certification, as the formal recognition of a full qualification, or of a subject or subjects achieved by a candidate, requires many layers of complex processes.

Umalusi, through its Act, is responsible for certification of learner achievements in South Africa for the qualifications registered on the General and Further Education and Training Sub-framework of Qualifications. This means that Umalusi is responsible for ensuring, through rigorous quality assurance processes, that the certificates it issues meet the minimum requirements for the qualification. In respect of this responsibility, Umalusi has

published directives for certification that must be adhered to by all assessment bodies that submit candidate data for certification. Umalusi also ensures adherence to policies and regulations promulgated by the Minister of Higher Education and Training in respect of the GETC: ABET.

To give further effect to this mandate, Umalusi must ensure that certification data is valid and reliable and that it is submitted by public and private assessment bodies in a format prescribed by the Council.

Assessment bodies must ensure that all records for candidates who registered for an examination in a specific examination cycle are submitted to Umalusi. The data set must also include the records of candidates who do not qualify for a certificate, such as the records of candidates who withdrew from the examination after registration was completed, or candidates who failed all subjects.

The closing of the examination cycle is confirmed by the issuing of a certificate, subject statement, or a confirmation that the candidate does not qualify for any type of certificate, which would be the case when all subjects were failed or the candidate was absent for the examination.

## **2.2 CURRENT CERTIFICATION STATUS: DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

The GETC: ABET provides an opportunity for candidates to accumulate credits towards the qualification across a number of examinations. Therefore in reporting on the status of certification for the GETC: ABET in 2012, it is important to examine the status of certification of the 2011 GETC: ABET cohort.

The Department of Higher Education and Training, through the nine Provincial Education Departments (PEDs), submitted all the records for the 2011 cohort of candidates who wrote the GETC: ABET (Level 4). However, the PEDs could not account for the discrepancy between the number of candidates entered for the examination and the number certified.

The dilemma as explained above has been created because PEDs are not finalising the examination cycle by completing records and requesting all certificates immediately after the resulting process; PEDs do not adhere to timeframes for the submission of certification data, determined as three months after the release of the results; nor do they re-submit rejected records within the required timeframe.

The two certification issues as listed below is and remains a concern:

- The certification system for the combination of results for candidates who wrote some subjects under the expired GETC and other subjects under the revised GETC is long overdue; and
- The absence, since 2003, of a certification function to assist candidates who have lost a certificate and wish to have it replaced, is a great disservice to adult learners.
- Finally, there is an urgent need for training of PED and DHET officials on the certification module of the GETC: ABET, to improve the effectiveness of the GETC: ABET certification system.

Below is a statement regarding the status of GETC: ABET certification 2011 / 2012:

**Table 36: GETC: ABET Certification 2012**

	Jun12		Oct12	
	LAC	GETC	LAC	GETC
GAUTENG	806	18	5468	2399
KWAZULU-NATAL	1901	82	8755	2747
W/CAPE	2	0	1741	437
MPUMALANGA	0	0	4908	1495
LIMPOPO	7339	39	12003	3309
N/WEST	747	0	3632	1059
N/CAPE	301	0	869	124
E/CAPE	912	0	6833	1576
FREE STATE	757	30	2155	750
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12765</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>46364</b>	<b>13896</b>
<b>Total Learning Area Certificates (including IEB) 2009/06 -2011/10</b>			<b>181383</b>	
<b>Total GETC Certificates (2009/06 -2011/10)</b>			<b>24323</b>	

NOTE: LAC = Learning Area Certificate

It is noted that there is an improvement in the number of candidates who achieved the GETC under the revised GETC, with the pass requirement of 40% in five subjects, versus the three different options under which the expired GETC was achieved, with a minimum of eight learning areas that needed to be passed.

## **2.3 CURRENT CERTIFICATION STATUS: INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION BOARD**

In November 2011 a group of candidates was certified against the expired GETC programme. This resulted in the need for re-certification of candidates on the current GETC programme. It is essential that the assessment body develop and test its IT program used in the administration of examination data and certification, prior to the commencement of the examination, so that errors of this nature are avoided in future.

Certification of the GETC: ABET (Level 4) for the 2011 cohort of candidates has been completed.

# CHAPTER 7:

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 1 RECOMMENDATIONS

An analysis of the entire history of the question papers would result in a much more extensive report that is not within the scope or the time limitations of this report. This analysis was limited to the final moderation reports as presented for analysis. However, the analysis of the final moderation reports suggests that each question paper is unique, carefully developed and thoroughly quality assured. The resolution of many of the technical faults noted in numerous question papers lies squarely on the shoulders of examiners and internal moderators who should be more attentive to these requirements. There are individuals whose work can be queried, but the system is solid. In addition, DHET can be supportive by investigating the issues raised regarding the assessment guidelines. Most recommendations in Chapter 1 are intended to enhance the system, not to remedy a weak or inefficient system.

Site-Based Assessment remains a difficult issue. The fact that so many candidates have not authenticated the work in their SBA files is an indicator that candidates, educators and support officials do not understand the importance of the SBA file of evidence. Poor moderation of SBA tasks suggests not only of a lack of competency but also a lack of deep understanding of the purpose and process of assessment. The key recommendation in this area is training of educators and internal moderators, both in conceptual understanding and in the skills to assess, to moderate and to provide feedback for teaching and learning.

Monitoring of the examination writing centres and the marking centres showed that there are no crises in these areas. More work has to be done to improve the quality of invigilation and marking, but there are many sites where the invigilation of examinations and the marking centres are extremely well managed. Recommendations relate again to training, and regular training of personnel, and support for the minority not currently competent to execute the functions they are called upon to perform.

Clearly, the majority of moderators and chief markers are fully aware of the importance and value of the memorandum discussion sessions. Attendance is, on the whole, good, but preparation for the memorandum meeting is not at an appropriate level. Although the responsibility for adequate preparation lies squarely on the shoulders of the chief

markers and internal moderators, arrangements for memorandum discussions must be such that sufficient time is available for receiving and pre-marking scripts. Arrangements must also be such that each and every chief marker and internal moderator attends the entire marking memorandum discussion.

The introduction of Information Communication Technology requires a new approach to marking memorandum discussions. These memorandum sessions should take place in a suitable facility in which chief markers and internal moderators have access to computers. In both SBA and examination marking, it was evident that many educators and / or markers had not grasped the use of the marking matrix for extended pieces of writing. Here, again, the recommendation is for DHET to focus on quality training for all internal moderators and role-players in the assessment process.

In general the incidents of non-compliance are very low as the system is sound. Individuals who are not competent for the tasks they must perform should receive focused and appropriate training interventions to ensure adherence to the quality assurance mechanisms in the system.

## 2 CONCLUSION

**Chapter 1:** The external moderators' findings on the final moderation of 32 question papers have been captured and analysed. The analyses, per learning area, have been captured in Addendum 1. Examiners are mindful of the candidates that they will be examining. The set passages in question papers are interesting to adults and the topics for extended pieces of writing are within the candidates' scope and interest. Examiners also understand the importance of using an appropriate register for the candidates who write the examinations. Nevertheless, the fact that only 35% of the question papers from DHET were approved after the first moderation serves as a reminder that there is much work still to be done to offer question papers of a high standard in an efficient manner.

**Chapter 2:** The moderation of Site-Based Assessment is critical. If the SBA results are not valid, the integrity of the entire qualification is at risk. It was therefore disconcerting to report on the large number of candidates' evidence which was not authenticated as the candidates' original work. Learner evidence and educator portfolios were well presented, but there was still little substance to the assessment process. Excellent tasks were prepared for the educators by DHET, but marking of the tasks, moderation and feedback to learners remains problematic. SBA cannot yet be validated, except when measured against the written examination. It is vital to ensure that candidates, educators and

support officials place an appropriate value on SBA that is equivalent to the value they place on the examinations. This is quite evidently not yet the case.

**Chapter 3:** Monitoring of the writing centres resulted in consensus by all monitors that the examination was conducted with integrity. This is not to say that the monitors did not note many challenges, some as a result of the context in which candidates write, but others the result of incompetence by those charged with ensuring that the writing of examinations is properly administered. Here again, the system is sound and the responsible officials need to address the shortcomings of the minority of people who put the examinations at risk by not adhering to the regulations that ensure well-managed examinations. Provincial officials need to be generous with support and training for AET chief invigilators and invigilators.

Monitors found that marking centres were particularly well managed. This is testament to the efficiency and dedication of examination officials who take particular care to adhere to rules and regulations. The monitors were pleased to report that they did not observe any action at a marking centre that could compromise the integrity of the marking.

**Chapter 4:** The reports on the memorandum discussions show that these meetings are professionally managed and the purpose of the meeting fulfilled, to a large extent, in each learning area. Late arrivals, early leaving and non-attendance by some chief markers and internal moderators are problems that must be addressed, but there can be no doubt as to the efficacy of marking memorandum discussions.

**Chapter 5:** Marking was seen to be largely fair and valid. This is not to say that the quality of marking and internal moderation was a challenge in many instances. However, it must be noted that the poor quality of marking and moderation was specific to particular marking teams in particular learning areas. It was not province-specific.

The commitment and dedication of external moderators and monitors who put in long hours to thoroughly moderate the question papers and answer scripts, to travel long distances to moderate SBA, and to monitor the writing centres and the marking centres, is to be commended. The analysis of the various reports reveals the important role that this final layer of quality assurance plays in the success and integrity of the ABET examination. The Department of Higher Education and Training must be commended on the efforts made to conduct a quality ABET examination.

A TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE  
QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE 2012  
ADULT EDUCATION AND TRAINING  
ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATION

---

ADDENDA

PUBLISHED BY:



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

# Table of Contents

---

ADDENDA .....	i
<b>ADDENDUM 1</b> .....	1
<b>1. MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS</b> .....	1
1.1 APPLIED AGRICULTURE & AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY .....	1
1.2 WHOLESALE AND RETAIL .....	3
1.3 INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY .....	5
1.4 ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES .....	7
1.5 HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES .....	9
1.6 LLC AFRIKAANS .....	11
1.7 LLC ENGLISH .....	13
1.8 LLC ISINDEBELE .....	15
1.9 LLC SEPEDI .....	17
1.10 LLC SESOTHO .....	18
1.11 LLC SETSWANA .....	20
1.12 TSHIVENDA .....	21
1.13 LLC ISIXHOSA .....	23
1.14 LLC XITSONGA .....	24
1.15 LLC ISIZULU .....	26
1.16 LIFE ORIENTATION .....	28
1.17 NATURAL SCIENCES .....	29
1.18 SMALL, MEDIUM AND MICRO ENTERPRISES .....	31
1.19 TRAVEL AND TOURISM .....	33
<b>ADDENDUM 2</b> .....	35
<b>1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF EXTERNAL MODERATION OF SBA TASKS</b> .....	35
1.1 LEARNING AREA: APPLIED AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY .....	35
1.2 LEARNING AREA: HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES .....	39
1.3 LEARNING AREA: LIFE ORIENTATION .....	40
1.4 LEARNING AREA: LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION ENGLISH .....	41
1.5 LEARNING AREA: MATHEMATICAL LITERACY .....	43
1.6 LEARNING AREA: NATURAL SCIENCES .....	48
1.7 LEARNING AREA: TECHNOLOGY .....	49
1.8 LEARNING AREA: TRAVEL AND TOURISM .....	50
<b>ADDENDUM 3</b> .....	51
<b>PART A MONITORING OF EXAMINATION CENTRES</b> .....	51
<b>1 MONITORING OF WRITING PHASE</b> .....	51
1.1 EASTERN CAPE .....	51
1.1.1 NTEKELELO JSS .....	51
1.1.2 DALUBUHLE ABET CENTRE .....	52
1.1.3 JEFFREYS BAY AET .....	53
1.1.4 ALGOA CLUSTER FOR ABET CENTRES .....	54
1.2 FREE STATE .....	55
1.2.1 MAMAHABANE ABET CENTRE .....	55
1.2.2 MELODING ABET CENTRE .....	56

1.2.3	GROOTVLEI PRISON ABET.....	57
1.2.4	HOREBE PALC.....	58
1.2.5	THAHASELLANG.....	58
1.2.6	BOSELE ADULT CENTRE.....	59
1.2.7	CENTRE 3194011*.....	60
1.3	GAUTENG.....	61
1.3.1	PETER LENGENE ABET.....	61
1.3.2	HERBERT MDINGI ABET.....	62
1.3.3	ALEXANDER ADULT CENTRE.....	62
1.3.4	LEEUEWKOP MAXIMUM ADULT CENTRE.....	64
1.3.5	RENEILWE AET.....	65
1.3.6	DIEPKLOOF ADULT CENTRE.....	65
1.4	KWA-ZULU NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	66
1.4.1	INHLOSO AET CENTRE.....	66
1.4.2	THANDA AET CENTRE.....	67
1.4.3	ASIFUNDE PALC.....	68
1.4.4	SIYAKULA PALC.....	69
1.5	LIMPOPO EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	69
1.5.1	BURGERSDORP ABET CENTRE.....	69
1.5.2	TSHUKUDU AET CENTRE.....	70
1.5.3	TOMPI SELEKA ABET CENTRE.....	71
1.5.4	SENDEDZA ABET CENTRE.....	72
1.5.5	LITSHOVHU AET CENTRE.....	73
1.6	MPUMALANGA EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	74
1.6.1	KADISHI AET CENTRE.....	74
1.6.2	BUYISONTO AET CENTRE.....	75
1.6.3	KENNEN ABET CENTRE.....	76
1.6.4	KWAZANELE ADULT CENTRE.....	77
1.6.5	HLOMA STATE AET CENTRE.....	78
1.6.6	LYNNVILLE ABET CENTRE.....	79
1.7	NORTH WEST EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	80
1.7.1	MOGALE AET CENTRE.....	80
1.7.2	LEMOGANG AET CENTRE.....	91
1.7.3	TLHOHALO ABET CENTRE.....	92
1.7.4	RUTANANG ABET L4 CENTRE.....	83
1.7.5	UTLWANANG ABET CENTRE.....	84
1.8	NORTHERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	85
1.8.1	PABALLELO HIGH SCHOOL / MASAKHANE ABET CENTRE.....	85
1.8.2	SCHMIDTSDRIFT BATLHAPING INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL.....	86
1.8.3	IKHWEZI LOMSO ADULT CENTRE.....	87
1.8.4	BERGSIG PUBLIC CENTRE.....	87
1.8.5	NABABEEP PUBLIC CENTRE.....	88
1.8.6	LEARN FOR LIFE PUBLIC CENTRE.....	89
1.9	WESTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	90
1.9.1	WORCESTER CLC.....	90

1.9.2	ATLANTIS ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.....	91
1.9.3	MALMESBURY CLC.....	92
1.9.4	GEORGE CLC.....	93
1.9.5	MATIE COMMUNITY SERVICES.....	94
1.9.6	OUDTSHOORN CLC.....	94
1.9.7	MARYLAND LITERACY PROJECT CENTRE.....	95
2	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF THE MONITORING OF WRITING CENTRES.....	96
2.1	Key issues raised by monitors.....	96
2.2	Performance of centres.....	97
	Lynnville ABET Centre	
	George CLC	
	Atlantis Adult Education Centre	
	Bosele Adult Centre	
	Diepkloof Adult Centre	
	NababEEP Public Centre	
	Ikhwezi Lomso Adult Centre	
	<b>ADDENDUM 3B: MONITORING OF MARKING.....</b>	<b>98</b>
1	EVALUATION OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE OF THE MARKING CENTRES.....	98
1.1	EASTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	98
1.1.1	MARKING CENTRE: ADELAIDE GYMNASIUM SCHOOL.....	98
1.1.2	MARKING CENTRE: HOËRSKOOL ALIWAL NOORD.....	100
1.1.3	MARKING CENTRE: QUEENSTOWN GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL.....	101
1.2	FREE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	102
1.2.1	MARKING CENTRE: HOËRSKOOL AJC JOOSTE.....	102
1.3	GAUTENG DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	103
1.3.1	MARKING CENTRE: HOËRSKOOL PRESIDENT.....	103
1.4	KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	104
1.4.1	MARKING CENTRE: ARTHUR BLAXALL.....	104
1.4.2	MARKING CENTRE: SUID-NATAL HIGH SCHOOL.....	105
1.5	LIMPOPO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	107
1.5.1	MARKING CENTRE: NORTHERN ACADEMY.....	107
1.6	MPUMALANGA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	108
1.6.1	MARKING CENTRE: DR C N MAHLANGU FET COLLEGE.....	108
1.7	NORTH WEST DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.....	109
1.7.1	MARKING CENTRE: FERDINAND POSTMA HIGH SCHOOL.....	109
1.8	NORTHERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	110
1.8.1	MARKING CENTRE: VUYOUWETHU HIGH SCHOOL.....	110
1.9	WESTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.....	112
1.9.1	MARKING CENTRE: CAPE PENINSULA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY.....	112

<b>ADDENDUM 4: MEMO DISCUSSION MODERATION</b> .....	114
1 LEARNING AREA MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS AND PARTICIPANTS .....	114
Applied Agriculture & Agricultural Technology	
Economic & Management Sciences	
Information and Communication Technology	
LLC isiZulu	
LLC Tshivenda	
LLC Sesotho	
LLC isiXhosa	
LLC Xitsonga	
LLC English	
LLC Setswana	
LLC isiNdebele	
LLC Afrikaans	
Mathematical Literacy	
Technology	
Travel and Tourism	
Wholesale and Retail	
2 ISSUES RELATING TO MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS .....	120
2.1 Issues relating to memorandum discussion meetings .....	120
2.2 Number of scripts pre-marked .....	121
<b>ADDENDUM 5: MODERATION OF MARKING</b> .....	123
<b>1 ANALYSIS OF MARKS</b> .....	123
Analysis of marks attained by candidates whose scripts were sent to Umalusi for external moderation	
1.1 APPLIED AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGIES .....	123
1.2 HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES .....	124
1.3 INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY .....	125
1.4 LIFE ORIENTATION .....	125
1.5 LLC AFRIKAANS .....	126
1.6 LLC ENGLISH .....	127
1.7 LLC ISINDEBELE .....	127
1.8 LLC ISIXHOSA .....	128
1.9 LLC ISIZULU .....	128
1.10 LLC SEPEDI .....	129
1.11 LLC SETSWANA .....	129
1.12 LLC SISWATI .....	130
1.13 LLC TSHIVENDA .....	130
1.14 LLC XITSONGA.1.32 .....	131
1.15 MATHEMATICAL LITERACY .....	131
1.16 SMALL, MEDIUM AND MICRO ENTERPRISES .....	132
1.17 TECHNOLOGY .....	133
1.18 TRAVEL AND TOURISM .....	134
1.19 WHOLESALE AND RETAIL .....	134

2	SUMMARY OF REPORTS ON MARKING AND MODERATION .....	135
2.1	ADHERENCE TO THE MEMORANDUM .....	135
2.2	THE MEMORANDUM MADE PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE RESPONSES.....	137
2.3	CONSISTENCY AND ACCURACY.....	138
2.4	CHANGES TO THE MARKING MEMORANDUM WERE EFFECTED AT THE MARKING CENTRE.....	140
2.5	STANDARD OF MARKING.....	141
2.6	INTERNAL MODERATION.....	143
2.7	UNFAIR QUESTIONS.....	145
2.8	COMMENT ON THE CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE.....	147
2.9	FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS .....	148
2.10	ADJUSTMENT OF MARKS .....	153

# ADDENDUM 1

---

## 1 MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS

Summary of reports received from external moderators on question papers set for November 2012

### 1.1 APPLIED AGRICULTURE & AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

Set 1	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Coverage of all LOs and ASs and correctly weighted. Examples and illustrations are suitable, appropriate, relevant and academically correct.
4	Cognitive skills	All relevant cognitive levels addressed. Reports of examiner and internal moderator included.
5	Language and bias	No evidence of bias or discrimination of any kind.
6	Predictability	This paper cannot be spotted or predicted.
7	Marking memo	Marking memorandum is complete and accurate with correct numbering and sufficient alternative responses. The marking memorandum is complete with mark allocation and mark distribution that correlates with the question paper.
8	Technical criterion	Time, subject code, candidate instructions, numbering and mark allocation are correct. Graphics are clear, complete and correct.
9	Internal moderation	There is evidence that the moderator's recommendations have been effected.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Good! Compares favourably with previous years', but candidates will have to be well prepared for this paper.
11	Approved	√ Meets all requirements.
12	Conditionally approved to be	

No	Criterion	Comment
	re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## APPLIED AGRICULTURE & AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

Set 2	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Verified compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Coverage of all LOs and ASs and correctly weighted. Examples and illustrations are suitable, appropriate, relevant and academically correct.
4	Cognitive skills	All questions are compulsory and there are no choice questions. All relevant cognitive levels addressed. Reports of examiner and internal moderator included.
5	Language and bias	No evidence of bias or discrimination of any kind.
6	Predictability	No evidence of predictability.
7	Marking memo	Marking memorandum is complete and accurate with correct numbering and sufficient alternative responses. The marking memorandum is complete with mark allocation and mark distribution that correlates with the question paper. There are no changes required to warrant a second moderation.
8	Technical criterion	Time, subject code, candidate instructions, numbering and mark allocation are correct. Graphics are clear, complete and correct.
9	Internal moderation	Compliant in all respects. There is evidence that the moderator's recommendations have been effected except, however, question 2.4, where it is unclear whether the question was accepted or re-submitted.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The question paper is fair, valid and reliable. There is a balance between the assessment of skills, knowledge and values. The standard is appropriate.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be	

No	Criterion	Comment
	re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	√ Question 2: change the term “cultivate” to “plant”. The correction is delegated to the internal moderator to approve.
14	Rejected	

## 1.2 WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

Set 1	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes, but grid was completed by examiner only.
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The paper is within the broad scope of the US and the examiner has used a variety of question forms. The examiner used real life scenarios to paint a background picture and then asked applicable questions. This allowed for application and interpretation. All criteria were met.  The weighting of the unit standards is not fully within the assessment guidelines, although the specific outcomes were addressed.
4	Cognitive skills	The different cognitive levels are addressed, although the guideline does not indicate the required spread clearly.
5	Language and bias	No bias. Language complies with standards.
6	Predictability	Not predictable.
7	Marking memo	Complies with minimum standards but a few alterations have been effected to ensure compliance in all respects. Double ticks should be used to indicate two marks.
8	Technical criterion	Errors corrected by DHET.
9	Internal moderation	Internal moderator's signature and the date were inserted on a blank analysis grid and checklist. The only evidence of moderation was the moderator's signature on the question paper and marking memorandum. No moderation report. It is assumed that internal moderation did not take place. Findings, recommendations and changes must be recorded.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is of a good standard. SO and AC numbers must be inserted on the marking memorandum.

No	Criterion	Comment
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	√ Minor alterations required.
14	Rejected	

## WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes, but grid was completed by examiner only.
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The guideline was adhered to. Differences between the guideline and the paper were discussed and addressed. The DHET guidelines must be amended to match the specific outcomes of the unit standards.
4	Cognitive skills	The different cognitive levels are addressed. The examiner ensured that questions allowed for interpretation and application by candidates.
5	Language and bias	No bias. Language complies with standards.
6	Predictability	Not predictable.
7	Marking memo	More alternative responses are needed. Question 4.3 relates to email but the answer provided relates to personal interviews. The answer has to be changed.
8	Technical criterion	Technical criteria were met but could be enhanced.
9	Internal moderation	Internal moderator's signature and the date were inserted on a blank analysis grid and checklist. The only evidence of moderation was the moderator's signature on the question paper and marking memorandum. No moderation report. It is assumed that internal moderation did not take place. Findings, recommendations and changes must be recorded.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Although there are differences in terms of weighting, the paper is acceptable in terms of content.
11	Approved	√ Corrections made and approved.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second	

No	Criterion	Comment
	moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.3 INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Set 1	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Complies in all respects.
4	Cognitive skills	Complies in all respects.
5	Language and bias	Complies in most respects. Suggestions were made on improving grammar so that candidates would not be confused.
6	Predictability	This is the first examination paper in this learning area so this criterion is not applicable.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum had to be revisited and suggestions were implemented accordingly. It was suggested that the theory in Section A be answered in an answer book, while Sections B and C will be answered on a personal computer, saved on a compact disk and marked with a checklist that will be attached to the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	Instructions to candidates were vague. The quality of the snapshot in Question 3.2 needed to be improved to ensure appropriate, print-ready quality.
9	Internal moderation	The moderator's report is complete and there is evidence that the recommendations have been addressed. Although the internal moderator's input was of a high quality, he is advised to consider the standard and relevance of an INCT question paper.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Limited compliance. Question 1 is a knowledge question but candidates were required to type in the answers, which raises this to a higher cognitive level. This was changed to a written answer. Unit standards require typing skills, creating and editing documents. These had not been examined. Section C is practical, but the question paper lacked the necessary instructions to save evidence frequently. Question 2.1 and

No	Criterion	Comment
		Question 2.2 assessed the same skills. Question 3 was added, requiring creating and editing a document. Other grammatical and technical flaws were corrected.
11	Approved	√ Necessary changes and corrections were made.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

### INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Set 2	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Complies in all respects.
4	Cognitive skills	Complies in all respects.
5	Language and bias	Complies in most respects. Suggestions were made on improving grammar so that candidates would not be confused.
6	Predictability	This is the first examination paper in this learning area so this criterion is not applicable.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum had to be revisited and suggestions were implemented accordingly. It was suggested that the theory in Section A be answered in an answer book while Sections B and C will be answered on a personal computer, saved on a compact disk and marked with a checklist that will be attached to the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	Instructions to candidates were vague. A new set of instructions was suggested. The quality of the pictures in Question 1.2 needed to be improved to ensure appropriate, print-ready quality.
9	Internal moderation	The moderator's report is complete and there is evidence that the recommendations have been addressed. Although the internal moderator's input was of a high quality, he is advised to consider the standard and relevance of an INCT question paper.

No	Criterion	Comment
10	Overall impression of the paper	<p>Based on the assessment standards and assessment criterion of each unit standard, the content of the paper is of an appropriate standard, well balanced, fair and reliable.</p> <p>It was suggested that DHET send out clear instructions on how evidence must be captured. Markers will also need additional instructions.</p> <p>This is the first examination for INCT4. The external moderator spent a lot of time showing the examiners how to set papers. The paper is 40% theoretical and 60% practical in nature. DHET manual does not give detailed weightings. Certain unit standards are inherent in the practical questions, but certain aspects will have to be assessed at site level.</p> <p>The analytical grid is inappropriate to this kind of question paper but needs to be populated, including the SBA.</p> <p>The assessment framework has been completed and reflects an adequate spread of marks.</p>
11	Approved	√ Necessary changes and corrections have been made.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.4 ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The weighting and spread of LOs and SOs is reasonable. There is an error in the guidelines (US 13994 summative mark should read 25, not 50).
4	Cognitive skills	The paper complies with the cognitive requirements and there is now an appropriate spread of cognitive levels.
5	Language and bias	Questions have been rewritten to comply with minimum standards.
6	Predictability	Compliant.

No	Criterion	Comment
7	Marking memo	All the errors identified in the first moderation have been corrected.
8	Technical criterion	Now fully compliant. Technical errors addressed.
9	Internal moderation	Compliant. The full history was included, including internal moderator's report. The internal moderator's report is still not signed.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper now compares favourably with those of previous years.
11	Approved	√ Weighting deviations must be reduced in future papers.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The weighting and spread of content of LOs and SOs has been corrected. Deviation percentages now within reason.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper complies with the cognitive requirements and there is now an appropriate spread of cognitive levels.
5	Language and bias	Questions have been well designed and attention paid to detail.
6	Predictability	Compliant.
7	Marking memo	All the errors identified in the first moderation have been corrected.
8	Technical criterion	Technical errors addressed
9	Internal moderation	Compliant. The full history was included, including internal moderator's report. The internal moderator's report is still not signed.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The standard of the paper has improved for the second moderation.

11	Approved	√ Weightings and the cognitive spread are now at an acceptable level of norm deviation.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.5 HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Fully compliant.
4	Cognitive skills	Compliance in all respects.
5	Language and bias	Compliant.
6	Predictability	Compliant.
7	Marking memo	A suitable rubric should be designed to assist markers in assessing short paragraph writing. This will serve as an additional tool to the marking memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
9	Internal moderation	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Very good. This is a re-moderation of the paper.
11	Approved	√ All suggestions and recommendations have been implemented.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Fully compliant.
4	Cognitive skills	Compliance in all respects.
5	Language and bias	Compliant.
6	Predictability	Compliant.
7	Marking memo	A suitable rubric should be designed to assist markers in assessing short paragraph writing. This will serve as an additional tool to the marking memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
9	Internal moderation	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
10	Overall impression of the paper	With the exception of non-submission of a rubric for Question 8, the paper makes a good impression. This is the second moderation.
11	Approved	√ All suggestions and recommendations have been implemented. A few minor changes need to be made.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.6 LLC AFRIKAANS

Set 1	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The analysis grid submitted correlates with the question paper.
4	Cognitive skills	The analysis grid submitted correlates with the question paper.
5	Language and bias	The terminology and vocabulary are adapted to suit all candidates. The terminology in the comprehension passage is appropriate for non-home language speakers.
6	Predictability	No candidate will be able to predict what questions will come of this examination using past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	In all questions there is a correlation between the questions and the answers on the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
9	Internal moderation	Compliant. Internal moderator's checklist submitted late.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is good and up to standard. Passages are interesting and topics for long writing are within the candidates' scope. All questions are reasonable and those candidates who have had good teaching and support will be able to pass this question paper.
11	Approved	√
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## LLC AFRIKAANS

Set 2	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The analysis grid submitted correlates with the question paper.
4	Cognitive skills	The analysis grid submitted correlates with the question paper.
5	Language and bias	The terminology and vocabulary are adapted to suit all candidates. The terminology in the comprehension passage is appropriate for non-home language speakers.
6	Predictability	No candidate will be able to predict what questions will come of this examination using past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	In all questions there is a correlation between the questions and the answers on the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
9	Internal moderation	Examiner's checklist was not included.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is good and up to standard. Passages are interesting and topics for long writing are within the candidates' scope. All questions are reasonable and those candidates who have had good teaching and support will be able to pass this question paper.
11	Approved	√.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.7 LLC ENGLISH

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Compliance in all respects.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper does exhibit elements of Bloom's taxonomy. The examiners have tried to cover all the specified levels. It mostly covers levels 1-3. The other two levels are mainly covered by Questions 4 and 5.
5	Language and bias	Language errors were found in Section A, Question 3(e), Section B, Questions 3 & 5 and, in Section C, Question 1.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all respects.
7	Marking memo	The memorandum is correct but LOs and ASs must be included in the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	Compliance in all respects.
9	Internal moderation	Compliance in all respects.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper meets the required standard and is suitable for the intended level of learners.
11	Approved	√ All the issues which needed to be addressed were corrected and the paper is compliant.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## LLC ENGLISH

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Compliance in all respects.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper does exhibit elements of Barrett's taxonomy. The examiners have tried to cover all the specified levels. It mostly covers levels 1-3. The other two are mainly covered by Questions 4 and 5.
5	Language and bias	Language errors were found in Section A, Question 3(e), Section B, Questions 3&5 and, in Section C, Question 1
6	Predictability	Compliance in all respects.
7	Marking memo	The memorandum is correct but LOs and ASs must be included in the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The paper is compliant; all the required aspects are well covered. The quality of the picture used in Section B needs attention.
9	Internal moderation	The paper complies and the full history, that is, the draft paper and the moderator's comments, were included in the package.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper meets the required standard and is suitable for the intended level of learners.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	√ The picture which is used in Section B needs to be improved for quality purposes.
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.8 LLC ISINDEBELE

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Changes were made to the content of the question paper as suggested.
4	Cognitive skills	Cognitive skills are spread according to recommendations in the first moderation.
5	Language and bias	The language is good and appropriate.
6	Predictability	No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	The memorandum is laid out clearly and there is a correlation between the questions and the answers on the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit the full history of the question paper.
9	Internal moderation	The paper was internally moderated and changes made.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Changes effected as suggested. The question paper is up to required standards.
11	Approved	√ Minor changes to be effected as indicated.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

LLC ISINDEBELE

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Changes were made to the content of the question paper as suggested.
4	Cognitive skills	Cognitive skills are spread according to recommendations in the first moderation.
5	Language and bias	The language is good and appropriate. No evidence of bias.
6	Predictability	No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	Changes were effected as directed.
8	Technical criterion	Compliant in all respects.
9	Internal moderation	The paper was internally moderated and changes made.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Changes effected as suggested. The question paper is up to required standards.
11	Approved	√ Internal moderator to effect minor changes as indicated in both the question paper and the memorandum.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.9 LLC SEPEDI

Set 2	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Question paper covers all LOs and ASs. The paper allows for creative responses and both longer and shorter transactional texts.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper complies with minimum standards and provides opportunities to assess the ability to see causal relationships (visual literacy) and the ability to express an argument clearly (longer transactional text).
5	Language and bias	The correct, standard language has been used throughout – void of impurities and no bias of any type.
6	Predictability	The paper is a completely new creation and would be unpredictable.
7	Marking memo	The memorandum is user friendly and allows for relevant, alternative responses.
8	Technical criterion	Very candidate friendly – a very readable assessment paper.
9	Internal moderation	The full history and the internal moderator's report are included.
10	Overall impression of the paper	This paper has been well researched and is of a high standard.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	√ Typographical, spelling and some grammatical mistakes to be corrected, plus additions.
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.10 LLC SESOTHO

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The assessment grid was submitted with the paper and clearly indicates the spread of learning outcomes and coverage of the syllabus.
4	Cognitive skills	The SOs and ASs are integrated and most aspects of the language are covered.
5	Language and bias	The correct register, appropriate for Level 4 candidates, has been used throughout the paper. Candidates would be able to respond to all questions without difficulty.
6	Predictability	The paper cannot be predicted by candidates as the examiners have set new questions. No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	The SOs and ASs are not indicated on the memorandum. The SOs and ASs need to be indicated before the memorandum discussion.
8	Technical criterion	The question paper complies with criterion, marks tally with the memorandum and the appropriate font has been used.
9	Internal moderation	The paper was internally moderated and changes made.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is fair, valid and reliable because all recommended changes have been effected as suggested. The question paper complies in all respects.
11	Approved	√ All typographical errors must be corrected before the paper is printed.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## LLC SESOTHO

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The assessment grid was submitted with the paper and clearly indicates the spread of Learning Outcomes and coverage of the syllabus.
4	Cognitive skills	The SOs and ASs are integrated and most aspects of the language are covered.
5	Language and bias	The correct register, appropriate for Level 4 candidates, has been used throughout the paper. Candidates would be able to respond to all questions without difficulty.
6	Predictability	The paper cannot be predicted by candidates as the examiners have set new questions. No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	The SOs and ASs are not indicated on the memorandum. The SOs and ASs need to be indicated before the memorandum discussion.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body submitted the full history of the question paper.
9	Internal moderation	The recommendations by the external moderator were effected as indicated. The paper complies in all respects.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is fair, valid and reliable because all recommended changes have been effected as suggested. The question paper complies in all respects.
11	Approved	√ All typographical errors must be corrected before the paper is printed.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.11 LLC SETSWANA

Set 2	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	No
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Analysis grid is not included.
3	Content coverage	The paper complies in all respects.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper covers the cognitive levels very well. The paper complies in all respects.
5	Language and bias	The paper complies in all respects.
6	Predictability	The paper cannot be predicted by candidates as the examiners have set new questions. No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	The SOs and ASs must be indicated on the memorandum. Avoid typing errors.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body complies with most of the minimum standards and provided most evidence, including the draft, the checklist and the internally moderated copy of the paper. The original comprehension text, taken from a book, is also included. The analysis grid must also be included.
9	Internal moderation	The paper complies in all respects.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is fair, reliable and relevant.
11	Approved	√ All the mistakes identified must be corrected.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.12 TSHIVENDA

Set 1	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects. Marking grid for creative writing is nicely illustrated.
3	Content coverage	A high number of questions set for application and analytical thinking. A quality paper that encourages creative writing. Questions are evenly spread. The paper is challenging and allows creative responses. Question 1 allows candidates to analyse and apply knowledge. Bloom's taxonomy levels as indicated in the US are reflected in the paper. Candidates have to apply knowledge and strategise in Question 2. All question types are covered. There is a relationship between weighting, spread of content and time. Covers all content required.
4	Cognitive skills	Questions are evenly spread. The paper is challenging and allows creative responses. It includes reasoning and expression of argument, communication and critical thinking, and includes translation from symbolic to verbal. Shorter and longer transactional text and writing.
5	Language and bias	The paper is not biased. No candidates are favoured by geographical area or dialectic situation. Good terminology and appropriate register for ABET Level 4. Orthography is good. Test is of appropriate length. Language changes must be effected, including diacritics, spelling and correct language usage.
6	Predictability	The paper cannot be predicted by candidates. No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum presented was neat, correct and corresponds with the question paper. It provides alternative responses and makes marking easy. Changes were done and it is approved, although in some cases the marks allocated in the question paper are not the same as the marks allocated in the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper. All details on the cover are correct. The layout is user friendly. The mark allocation is clearly indicated for each sub-question but there is no similarity between some of the marks allocated in the question paper and the memorandum. Arrange and organise the numbering.

No	Criterion	Comment
9	Internal moderation	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper but it can be seen that moderation was done and recommendations included. Some diacritics have not been effected. The internal moderator must give a full report, not a generalised report.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper contains a number of well-formulated, challenging questions. Many of these questions are of high cognitive level. The paper is fair and of an appropriate standard.
11	Approved	√ All the mistakes identified must be corrected.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	

### LLC TSHIVENDA

Set 2	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects. Marking grid for creative writing is nicely illustrated.
3	Content coverage	A high number of questions set for application and analytical thinking. A quality paper that encourages creative writing. There is a relationship between weighting, spread of content and time. Covers all content required.
4	Cognitive skills	Questions are evenly spread. The paper is challenging and allows creative responses. It includes reasoning and expression of argument, communication and critical thinking, and includes translation from symbolic to verbal. Shorter and longer transactional text and writing.
5	Language and bias	The paper is not biased. No candidates are favoured by geographical area or dialectic situation. Good terminology and appropriate register for ABET Level 4. Orthography is good. Test is of appropriate length. Language changes must be effected, including diacritics, spelling and correct language usage.
6	Predictability	The paper cannot be predicted by candidates. No evidence of a repeat of past years' papers.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum presented was neat, correct and corresponds with the question paper. It provides alternative responses and makes marking easy. Changes were done and it

No	Criterion	Comment
		is approved, although in some cases the marks allocated in the question paper are not the same as the marks allocated in the memorandum.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper. All details on the cover are correct. The layout is user friendly. The mark allocation is clearly indicated for each sub-question but there is no similarity between some of the marks allocated in the question paper and the memorandum. Arrange and organise the numbering.
9	Internal moderation	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper but it can be seen that moderation was done and recommendations included. Some diacritics have not been effected. The internal moderator must give a full report on each question, not a generalised report.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper contains a number of well-formulated, challenging questions. Many of these questions are of high cognitive level. The paper is fair and of an appropriate standard.
11	Approved	√ All the mistakes identified must be corrected.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.13 LLC ISIXHOSA

Set 1	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects. Marking grid for creative writing is nicely illustrated.
3	Content coverage	The paper covers the LOs and ASs prescribed in the guidelines. The paper allows for creative responses from candidates and gives room for thinking. The analysis grid is included and shows the spread of questions and level of thinking.
4	Cognitive skills	The analysis grid has been provided with the LOs and ASs used. The spread of questions on different levels is shown using Barrett's taxonomy.

No	Criterion	Comment
5	Language and bias	The language used is of an acceptable standard for ABET Level 4. It does not have any bias.
6	Predictability	The paper is original. There is no way that it can be predicted. There are questions that need innovation and creativity.
7	Marking memo	Question 1.9 needs to be rephrased to answer the question.
8	Technical criterion	In all aspects there is compliance and guidelines are followed. The history of the paper has been provided. The second part of the text on page 3 needs a border. The source of the text has to be acknowledged. The paper has lots of spelling mistakes.
9	Internal moderation	The internal moderator's report is included and the history of the paper has been provided with the proof of internal moderation, but the final version of the paper has so many spelling mistakes that it makes one doubt the quality of the internal moderation.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is fair and reliable. Spelling errors must be corrected.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved: to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	√ The paper meets the requirements as prescribed in the guidelines. Spelling mistakes and question 1.9 on the memorandum must be corrected by the internal moderator.
14	Rejected	

## 1.14 LLC XITSONGA

Set 1	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects. Marking grid for creative writing is nicely illustrated.
3	Content coverage	The content is within the broad scope of the statement.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper provides opportunity to assess reasoning ability.
5	Language and bias	Subject terminology is used correctly.
6	Predictability	The paper contains an appropriate degree of innovation.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum corresponds with the question paper.
8	Technical criterion	The layout is candidate friendly.
9	Internal moderation	The internal moderator's report is included.

No	Criterion	Comment
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is of an appropriate standard. There is a balance between the assessment of skills, knowledge and values.
11	Approved	√ The paper is fair, valid and reliable.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

### LLC XITSONGA

Set 2	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects. Marking grid for creative writing is nicely illustrated.
3	Content coverage	The assessment standards are appropriately linked and integrated.
4	Cognitive skills	There is an appropriate distribution in terms of cognitive levels.
5	Language and bias	Subject terminology is used correctly.
6	Predictability	There is no repetition of questions.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum corresponds with the question paper.
8	Technical criterion	The layout is candidate friendly.
9	Internal moderation	The internal moderator's report is included.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is fair, valid and reliable, and in line with current policy.
11	Approved	√
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.15 LLC ISIZULU

Set 1	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects. Marking grid for creative writing is nicely illustrated.
3	Content coverage	The content covered is in line with the requirements of ABET Level 4. Correct USs have been used.
4	Cognitive skills	Questions set on the question paper cover different cognitive levels and Section C (choice question) is at an equal level of difficulty. Interesting topics were selected.
5	Language and bias	The language used is of an acceptable standard for ABET Level 4. It does not have any bias.
6	Predictability	There is no repetition of questions from previous years' papers. This question paper is not predictable and cannot be spotted by candidates.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum corresponds with the question paper and allows for alternative responses from candidates.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper. Spelling and orthography should be corrected.
9	Internal moderation	The paper complies but the full history was not included; hence no comment on input of the moderator and evidence.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is of an acceptable standard, and in line with the assessment policy/guidelines. The paper is fair, valid and reliable and covers all required USs, SOs and ASs.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	√ Errors on question paper and marking tool must be corrected as indicated.
14	Rejected	

## LLC ISIZULU

Set 2	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The content covered is in line with the requirements of ABET Level 4. Correct USs have been used.
4	Cognitive skills	Questions set on the question paper cover different cognitive levels and Section C (choice question) is at an equal level of difficulty. Interesting topics were selected and represent the latest in development in education.
5	Language and bias	The language used is of an acceptable standard for ABET Level 4. It does not have any bias.
6	Predictability	There is no repetition of questions from previous years' papers. This question paper is not predictable and cannot be spotted by candidates.
7	Marking memo	The marking memorandum corresponds with the question paper and allows for alternative responses from candidates.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper. Spelling and orthography should be corrected.
9	Internal moderation	The paper complies but the full history was not included; hence no comment on input of the moderator and evidence.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is of an acceptable standard, and in line with the assessment policy/guidelines. The paper is fair, valid and reliable and covers all required USs, SOs and ASs.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	√ Errors on question paper and marking tool must be corrected as indicated.
14	Rejected	

## 1.16 LIFE ORIENTATION

Set 1	First moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The Learning Outcomes and their co-locative Assessment Standards have been covered in a satisfactory manner.
4	Cognitive skills	This aspect has been fully and appropriately complied with.
5	Language and bias	There is no bias.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all respects.
7	Marking memo	While there is correlation between the mark allocation in the question paper and the memorandum, unit standards and assessment criteria have not been indicated in the memorandum. This must be done.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body submitted a full history of the paper. The paper satisfies the Examinations and Assessment Guidelines 2010-2012 Page 59, which states that Sections B and C, respectively, shall have FOUR questions each with a choice THREE.
9	Internal moderation	The paper complies fully. The internal moderator has outdone herself in this regard.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The question paper has complied clearly with the standards of setting. Well done.
11	Approved	√
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.17 NATURAL SCIENCES

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The paper meets the requirements in most respects. Not all question types are covered, as there are no essay or paragraph questions.
4	Cognitive skills	This aspect has been fully and appropriately complied with.
5	Language and bias	There is no bias. Complied in all material respects.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all material respects.
7	Marking memo	While there is correlation between the mark allocation in the question paper and the memorandum, unit standards and assessment criteria have not been indicated in the memorandum. This must be done.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper.
9	Internal moderation	The history of the paper has not been supplied. The comments of the internal moderator were not included, hence no comment on moderator input and evidence.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The question paper is fair.
11	Approved	√ The assessment body needs to correct the mistakes that are on the paper.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## NATURAL SCIENCES

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The paper meets the requirements in most respects. Not all question types are covered, as there are no essay or paragraph questions.
4	Cognitive skills	This aspect has been fully and appropriately complied with.
5	Language and bias	There is no bias. Complied in all material respects.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all material respects.
7	Marking memo	While there is correlation between the mark allocation in the question paper and the memorandum, unit standards and assessment criteria have not been indicated in the memorandum. This must be done. Complies in other respects.
8	Technical criterion	The assessment body did not submit a full history of the paper.
9	Internal moderation	The history of the paper has not been supplied. The comments of the internal moderator were not included, hence no comment on moderator input and evidence.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The question paper is fair and moderate.
11	Approved	√ The paper is print ready.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.18 SMALL, MEDIUM AND MICRO ENTERPRISES

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The current guideline does not recommend the cognitive level composition % for SMME. The weightings, however, are within a 10% deviation and are accepted as reasonable. Detailed weighting and cognitive analysis supplied. Technical and grammatical errors to be corrected.
4	Cognitive skills	This aspect has been fully and appropriately complied with.
5	Language and bias	Compliance in most respects.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all respects.
7	Marking memo	Unit standards and assessment criteria have not been indicated in the memorandum. This must be done. Complies in other respects.
8	Technical criterion	Time allocated is reasonable. Total time needed to answer the paper was calculated at 96 minutes. The analytical grid was submitted but was not accurate. The question numbering was not aligned to the questions. The mark allocation within the grid is not accurate.
9	Internal moderation	In the second moderation, the history of the paper and moderator comments and input were included. Overall, this paper was well moderated and there are only a few typing errors to be corrected. More attention must be given to the accuracy of the grid.
10	Overall impression of the paper	This is a well-designed question paper with minimal errors. The standard compares favourably with previous years' and is in line with current guidelines. The examiners and internal moderator must be commended for the good work.
11	Approved	
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	√ Only minor errors that need to be corrected. Typing errors and one grammatical error to be amended and the external moderator will then sign off at DHET.
14	Rejected	

## SMALL, MEDIUM AND MICRO ENTERPRISES

Set 2	Third moderation
-------	------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliant in all respects.
3	Content coverage	The examination and assessment guidelines were adhered to. Differences from the guideline were within reason and were accepted.
4	Cognitive skills	The paper complies with the requirements. The spread of cognitive levels is reasonable. The analysis grid was attached. Guidelines need to be amended to provide clearly defined cognitive level standards.
5	Language and bias	Compliance in most respects.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all respects.
7	Marking memo	Complies with minimum standards.
8	Technical criterion	Compliance in most respects.
9	Internal moderation	Complies with minimum requirements.
10	Overall impression of the paper	The paper is of a much better standard than those of a number of prior years. Most of the errors were corrected by the internal moderator. The SO and AC numbers must be inserted in the marking
11	Approved	√ The content is of a high standard. Deviations in weightings have been accepted as reasonable, but efforts must be made to improve weightings and cognitive levels in future papers. DHET must amend the manual.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

## 1.19 TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Set 1	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects.
3	Content coverage	Compliance in most respects.
4	Cognitive skills	The assessment grid was included.
5	Language and bias	Good paper that tests different abilities.
6	Predictability	Compliance in all respects.
7	Marking memo	Changes made as indicated in first moderation report.
8	Technical criterion	Missing documentation was submitted and mistakes were rectified.
9	Internal moderation	Report submitted.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Good paper.
11	Approved	√ All mistakes identified in first moderation corrected and all recommended changes were made.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

### TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Set 2	Second moderation
-------	-------------------

No	Criterion	Comment
1	Analysis grid and assessment framework included?	Yes
2	Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guideline Documents	Compliance in all respects. Questions were adapted to alter weighting.
3	Content coverage	Language and technical errors corrected.
4	Cognitive skills	The assessment grid was included and different cognitive skills are tested.
5	Language and bias	Language and spelling errors were corrected.

No	Criterion	Comment
6	Predictability	No predictability found.
7	Marking memo	Changes made as indicated in first moderation report.
8	Technical criterion	Missing documentation was submitted and mistakes were rectified.
9	Internal moderation	Report submitted.
10	Overall impression of the paper	Compliance in all respects. Errors and shortcomings were corrected.
11	Approved	√ All mistakes identified in first moderation were corrected and all recommended changes were made.
12	Conditionally approved to be re-submitted for second moderation	
13	Conditionally approved – no re-submission	
14	Rejected	

# ADDENDUM 2

---

## 1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF EXTERNAL MODERATION OF SBA TASKS

The files of educators in Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Western Cape were fully compliant, whereas there was a high degree of non-compliance in Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal.

### 1.1 LEARNING AREA: APPLIED AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

Province	Mpumalanga	Western Cape	Limpopo
Districts where portfolios were moderated	Gert Sibande, Nkangala, Ehlanzeni	Overberg, Metro East	Vehembe, Mopani, Capricorn, Waterberg
Dates of moderation	9 – 10 October 2012	14 – 17 October 2012	25 – 26 October 2012
Compliance with policy	All three sampled districts use the provincial and national guidelines for internal and external assessments. The moderated centres comply with the national guideline policies on assessment and SBA guidelines.	The province uses the national guidelines for SBA assessments. The districts that were sampled comply with national guideline policies and SBA guidelines.	The province uses the national guidelines for SBA assessments. The districts that were sampled comply with national guideline policies and SBA guidelines. The province has a documented ABET sub-directorate policy guideline for the implementation of AET in the province.
Quality of internal moderation at all levels	The quality of moderation is good, especially in Volksrust circuit, since internal moderation of learners' portfolios took place at centre, district	The quality of moderation is excellent. The internal moderators are qualified – D A Smuts is a SAQA- qualified and registered assessor and moderator.	Vhembe district: There is evidence of good practice of internal moderation. Moderation took place at circuit, district and provincial levels.

Province	Mpumalanga	Western Cape	Limpopo
	and provincial level.		The quality of moderation in the four districts sampled was good. Recording of marks is consistent with electronic mark sheets and re-marking of all tasks took place in Mopani and Capricorn districts.
Quality and standard of the assessment task	The assessment tasks were aligned to the AAAT4 unit standards. The five SBA tasks and the assessment tools included in educators' files were correct at all the sites sampled in Mpumalanga. The SBA tasks included a range of cognitive levels, including knowledge, comprehension, application and synthesis.	The SBA tasks included a range of cognitive levels, i.e. knowledge, comprehension, application and synthesis. Developmental and national SBA assessments were done and SBA moderation and re-marking of learner scripts was undertaken. Marks were confirmed.	The SBA tasks include the cognitive levels, i.e. knowledge, comprehension, application and synthesis. Developmental and national SBA assessments were done and SBA moderation and re-marking of learner scripts was undertaken. Marks were confirmed.
Recording and reporting	Assessment body mark sheets were completed and included with the educator and learner portfolios of evidence submitted for verification. Provincial mark sheets and moderators' reports were also included.	The recording of assessment evidence, i.e. confirmation of learner scores, internally and externally moderated mark sheets, was included in the portfolios of evidence.	The province has developed uniform mark sheets. Both the raw score mark sheets and the electronic mark sheets were available. They were moderated internally and externally. Recording of marks was accurate.
Strengths	The marks are consistent with the learner progress report and provincial mark sheet containing moderated marks.	The marks are consistent with the learner progress report and provincial mark sheet containing moderated marks, including SBA marks. Centre of excellence: Share ABET Centre has the best mark sheet for recording learner	The marks on the electronic mark sheets are consistent with the recorded marks on the educators' mark sheets. Re-marking of all tasks was completed in the Mopani and Capricorn districts. The recording of assessment evidence, i.e.

Province	Mpumalanga	Western Cape	Limpopo
		<p>achievement. This mark sheet could well be adopted by the province.</p> <p>The learner mark sheet was moderated and signed and ready for the final marks to be transferred to the electronic mark sheet.</p>	<p>learner achievement and marks, had been internally and externally moderated. The mark sheets themselves were moderated. The province had captured the raw marks on the electronic mark sheets.</p>
Areas of concern	<p>Moderation at centre level was not done in the Malelane circuit at Vukotakhe centre in the Ehlanzeni district. In Nkangala, the Vaalbank centre was not moderated. In both Ehlanzeni and Nkangala districts, moderation takes place at district and provincial levels only.</p>	<p>Mark sheets are not standardised in the Western Cape. Each centre in the province has its own innovative mark sheet. However, some of these centre mark sheets did not have all the necessary columns, or the final mark column was too narrow.</p>	<p>The five SBA tasks must be re-marked and audited, especially in Vhembe and Waterberg districts, where the tests were the only SBA tasks re-marked. No re-marking of assignments, investigations, projects and work sheets was undertaken at district level. Thorough moderation, including re-marking, took place at provincial level. The review system of policy guides and training are non-existent in the province. Training has taken place, but not evaluation of the training. There is no evidence of monitoring, or implementation, of the curriculum at the centres.</p>
Recommendations	<p>More attention must be paid to Nkangala and Ehlanzeni districts. District officials must supervise and monitor the educators and centres in these districts.</p>	<p>A standard mark sheet must be developed by the province and used by all centres to record marks at centre, district and provincial levels. Selected learners must be available for the verification of oral marks.</p>	<p>At provincial level, the five SBA tasks must be re-marked and audited in the Vhembe and Waterberg districts. Centre monitoring and evaluation must take place after training / interventions. Learners must be informed of the appeals procedure</p>

Province	Mpumalanga	Western Cape	Limpopo
			at the time of placement. The ABET sub-directorate was last reviewed in 2008. It needs review and update urgently.
Learner performance	The performance in the province shows an improvement on the previous year. There is an improvement from the 2011 provincial average of 61% for SBA. The provincial average in 2012 is 64%.	Learner portfolios of evidence were moderated.	Learner portfolios of evidence were moderated.
Conclusion	The quality of assessment and moderation is better than in previous years. The ABET director was present during the full verification process and he indicated he will intervene where necessary to ensure that all AET processes are up to standard.	The quality of assessment and moderation is better than in previous years, since the Western Cape used to apply six provincially developed SBA tasks that were not comparable with other provinces. AET oral examinations for Communications Literacy are not properly moderated, since learners are not available for moderation of their oral marks. This has been pointed out to the province.	Limpopo has captured the raw marks for all districts. The capturing process was credible and consistent in all respects. No marks were changed in the process. The electronic mark sheets were moderated at both district and provincial levels. The quality of assessment and moderation is better than in previous years.

## 1.2 LEARNING AREA: HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Province	Northern Cape
Districts	Namaqua, Siyananda, Pixley ka Seme
Sites	Bergsig, Refentse, De Aar Correctional Centre
Dates of moderation	25 – 26 October 2012
Compliance with policy	There is generally compliance with policy but not all the relevant documents were included in the portfolios. The educator portfolio from the Pixley ka Seme region had no policy documentation and there was no evidence of planning documents in the file of the educator from Siyananda region.
Quality of internal moderation at all levels	Moderation had taken place in Namaqua, but there was no evidence of re-marking having taken place; there was no evidence of site moderation at the De Aar Correctional Centre or at Refentse. In the majority of portfolios there was no feedback to learners.
Quality and standard of the assessment task	Assessment forms included investigation, test, project, assignment and worksheet. Types of assessment included case studies, cartoons, sources, pictorials and graphs. These covered the appropriate cognitive levels. Rubrics were detailed, comprehensive and appropriate.
Recording and reporting	Educator portfolios had no record of learners' developmental progress and there was no evidence that internal assessment contributed to learner achievement. All marks were correctly recorded and transferred.
Strengths	Generally compliant. Educator portfolios were well structured and highly presentable.
Areas of concern	In a number of instances there was no evidence of a declaration of own work by learners. Policy documentation was not included in some educator files. Moderation does not appear to be taking place at all sites. Insufficient numbers of portfolios were received from one site.
Recommendations	The province must ensure that moderation at site level takes place and assist where necessary. Educators and moderators must be trained to provide feedback to learners. This will improve the learning experience.
Learner performance	Satisfactory.
Conclusion	The quality of support and moderation should improve at all levels. The province and the districts must ensure educators receive adequate support and guidance for quality teaching. Educators must provide better, more useful, feedback to learners.

## 1.3 LEARNING AREA: LIFE ORIENTATION

Province	EASTERN CAPE	GAUTENG	NORTH WEST
Learning Area	LIFE ORIENTATION		
Criteria			
A sample of sites from which portfolios were verified	Not provided	Not provided	Not provided
Compliance with policy	There are a requisite number of tasks, in line with assessment requirements, which are treated as prescribed.	Although centres did not have their own policies, all have SBA management plans with clear time frames. The number of tasks is adhered to and the forms of assessment are treated as they should be.	The number of tasks is adhered to and the forms of assessment are treated as prescribed.
Quality of internal moderation at all levels	Done correctly	All levels of moderation were executed diligently. There is good feedback given to assessors.	Some of the tasks were signed off without being moderated.
Quality and standard of the assessment task	Since the tasks are national and are therefore externally moderated, they are of acceptable quality. The assessment tools are thus appropriate and up to scratch.	Since the tasks are national and are therefore externally moderated, they are of acceptable quality. The assessment tools are thus appropriate and up to scratch.	Since the tasks are national and are therefore externally moderated, they are of acceptable quality. The assessment tools are thus appropriate and up to scratch.
Recording and reporting	The reporting and recording were done satisfactorily. All the files have provincial mark sheets.	The reporting and recording were done satisfactorily. All the files have provincial mark sheets.	The reporting and recording were done satisfactorily. All the files have provincial mark sheets.
Strengths	There is enough extra work and it is marked with feedback.	Informative internal moderation is good.	All centres have internal assessment policies.

Province	EASTERN CAPE	GAUTENG	NORTH WEST
Learning Area	LIFE ORIENTATION		
Criteria			
Areas of concern	The said assessment policies are generic and not centre-derived.	None.	The said assessment policies are generic and not centre-derived.
Recommendations	Encourage centres to tweak the generic assessment policies to suit their circumstances.	The declaration form dates should correspond with the provincial moderation dates.	Encourage centres to tweak the generic assessment policies to suit their circumstances.
Conclusion	Good work.	Good work.	Good work.

## 1.4 LEARNING AREA: LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION ENGLISH

Province	KwaZulu-Natal	Eastern Cape	Gauteng
Sites from which portfolios were moderated	Bhekuzulu Mafukuzela Nfuthuko Ncumuse Manaye Fuku Enduduzweni Qalakabusha	Adelaide Mbulukweza Mfundisweni Khanyisa Heatherbank Lady Frere Sinethemba Nqeleni Nompumelelo	Morakapula Santo Lekoa Daveyton City Deep Kagiso Thokozakagiso Mohlakeng Fourways Masakhane
Dates of moderation	29/10/2012	27/10/2012	09/09/2012
Compliance with policy	All the centres have complied with policy. They have administered all the prescribed tasks. However, none of the portfolios contain copies of the provincial assessment policy.	All centres comply with policy dictates.	All centres have complied with policy. They have all administered the prescribed tasks. The quality of portfolios needs to improve and all requisite documents must be filed in the portfolios.

Province	KwaZulu-Natal	Eastern Cape	Gauteng
Quality of internal moderation at all levels	<p>The quality of internal moderation left much to be desired. Moderation was superficial. Mistakes were made by educators that were not identified during the moderation process. As a result, some learners obtained high marks which, in all fairness, they did not deserve.</p> <p>If the quality of moderation does not improve then the quality of marking by educators will remain poor. Moderation must not be a mere formality, where the moderators simply concur with educators. Moderation must seek to improve the standards of both teaching and learning.</p>	<p>The quality of internal moderation left much to be desired. Moderation was superficial. Educator errors were not picked up and corrected.</p> <p>The quality and standard of moderation needs to improve drastically.</p>	<p>The quality of internal moderation has improved. This has led to an improvement in the quality of marking. Although the format used for moderation is mostly a checklist, the moderators have gone the extra mile to add valuable information for the educators.</p>
Quality and standard of the assessment task	<p>The quality of the tasks is of an acceptable standard. The tasks are appropriate for Level 4 candidates.</p>	<p>The quality of the portfolios of evidence is quite pleasing.</p>	<p>The quality of the tasks is of an acceptable standard. The tasks are appropriate for Level 4 candidates.</p>
Recording and reporting	<p>In all instances except one, the recording of marks was found to be accurate.</p>	<p>Recording and reporting was found to be accurate. No discrepancies found.</p>	<p>Recording and reporting was found to be accurate.</p>
Strengths	<p>The work that I quality assured shows very little in terms of strengths. A lot still needs to be done.</p>	<p>The quality of portfolios has improved.</p>	<p>The quality of portfolios shows a marked improvement.</p>
Areas of concern	<p>The superficial nature of the moderation is a serious cause for concern. It compromises the validity of the assessment. Furthermore, most educators don't adhere to the marking tools. They merely place ticks all over the creative writing pieces,</p>	<p>Moderation is a major concern. It has to improve 10-fold before it can do justice to quality assessment. In addition, the quality of marking needs to improve. Educators have tended to be generous in awarding marks. Most</p>	<p>The superficial nature of the moderation is a matter of serious concern. It compromises the validity of the assessment. Furthermore, most educators still battle with the marking matrix.</p>

Province	KwaZulu-Natal	Eastern Cape	Gauteng
	<p>which makes for shoddy marking.</p> <p>The educators also place the marks that the learners have been awarded on the tool, not on the learners' scripts.</p>	<p>learners ignored instructions, yet still received high marks.</p> <p>An example can be seen in the portfolio of one learner who wrote an essay in point form but was not penalised.</p>	<p>This has led to most educators being very generous in the awarding of marks.</p>
Recommendations	<p>A huge effort has to be put into ensuring the correct use of assessment instruments. The quality of moderation has to improve markedly.</p>	<p>The use of assessment instruments and the quality of moderation have to show vast improvement before this province can be said to meet required standards.</p>	<p>A huge effort has to be put into ensuring the correct use of assessment instruments. The quality of moderation has to improve markedly.</p>
Learner performance	<p>Learner performance needs to be adjusted downwards by 10%.</p>	<p>Marks need to be adjusted downwards by 10%.</p>	<p>A downward adjustment of 5% is recommended.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The SBA marks need to be tested against the final examination score before they can be accepted as valid marks.</p>	<p>Over-marking of the assignment and the project have resulted in inflated marks.</p>	<p>The standard has not been met and marks need to be adjusted downwards.</p>

## 1.5 LEARNING AREA: MATHEMATICAL LITERACY

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	MPUMALANGA	GAUTENG	FREE STATE
Learning Area	<b>MATHEMATICAL LITERACY</b>			
Criteria				
Sites from which portfolios were verified	<p>Hawa Farm</p> <p>Makhomba</p>	<p>Buthelani AET</p> <p>Masibekela, Ndima nde</p> <p>Thulani AET</p> <p>Vaalbank AET</p>	<p>Diepkloof AC</p> <p>Thutomfundo</p> <p>Thokoza PALC</p>	<p>Tia Keni Adult Centre</p> <p>Phalole PALC</p> <p>Ipatlele Lesedi</p> <p>Bodibeng PALC</p>
Compliance with policy	<p>Internal assessment policy: neither a provincial internal assessment policy nor centre assessment policy</p>	<p>Internal assessment policy: not always evident in the educators' portfolios.</p> <p>A provincial subject</p>	<p>Internal assessment policy: not evident in the educators' portfolios.</p>	<p>No specific provincial assessment policy evident.</p> <p>No evidence of clear appeal</p>

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	MPUMALANGA	GAUTENG	FREE STATE
Learning Area	<b>MATHEMATICAL LITERACY</b>			
Criteria				
	were evident in the educators' portfolio. Subject specific guideline: a provincial subject specific guideline was not evident. The DHET assessment guidelines document was evident, but only the first 24 pages. SBA exemplars were excluded.	specific guideline was not evident.	A provincial subject specific guideline was not evident.	procedure if a learner wants to challenge the assessment decision. The DHET assessment guidelines document is evident and provides the necessary exemplars.
Quality of internal moderation at all levels	Internal moderation restricted to a re-mark of tasks. Moderation was conducted during October. Tasks were re-marked at three levels – site, district and provincial – but there is no evidence of feedback that enables development. This is understandable since moderation was done after completion of the teaching programme. No evidence of any relevant internal moderation reports.	Internal moderation restricted to a re-mark of tasks. Moderation conducted at the end of the teaching programme; no qualitative feedback given. Moderation tools are merely checklists.	No evidence of any internal moderation at one centre. Internal moderation conducted only at provincial level at the other two centres.	There is evidence of internal moderation. All tasks have been re-marked. The SBA tasks were all moderated at three different levels. Moderation reports at two levels are included, but are essentially checklists. No feedback given to enable development.
Quality and standard of the assessment task	The DHET-developed SBA tasks have been used: worksheet, project, investigation, assignment and test.	The DHET-developed SBA tasks have been used: worksheet, project, investigation, assignment and	The DHET-developed SBA tasks have been used: worksheet, project, investigation, assignment and	All five SBA tasks have been completed. DHET have supplied all rubrics and memoranda of marking.

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	MPUMALANGA	GAUTENG	FREE STATE
Learning Area	<b>MATHEMATICAL LITERACY</b>			
Criteria				
		test.	test.	
Recording and reporting	<p>Generally, progress reports of learner performance were evident.</p> <p>Assessment body mark sheets not submitted for verification.</p>	<p>Generally, progress reports of learner performance were evident, except for one centre.</p> <p>Assessment body mark sheets could not be verified.</p> <p>None were submitted.</p>	<p>Progress reports of learner performance in the SBA tasks were evident for two of the centres.</p> <p>Assessment body mark sheets not submitted by two of the centres.</p> <p>No internal assessment mark sheets evident in the educators' portfolios at two centres.</p>	<p>The records of learners' progress were included.</p> <p>Developmental tasks were done and assessed before the SBA tasks were attempted.</p> <p>Marks were correctly transcribed.</p> <p>The educator used various developmental activities before engaging with the SBA task. This is not applicable to the internal moderation.</p>
Strengths	<p>Developmental tasks were completed before learners engaged with the SBA tasks.</p> <p>Learner files were generally well organised.</p>	<p>Developmental tasks were completed before learners engaged with the SBA tasks.</p> <p>Learner files were generally well organised.</p> <p>An assessment plan indicating the dates of implementation of tasks was evident.</p>	<p>All learners signed declarations of authenticity.</p> <p>Learner files were generally well organised.</p> <p>An assessment plan indicating the dates of implementation of tasks was evident at two centres.</p>	<p>The DHET examination and assessment guideline document was in use and provided guidance.</p> <p>Some developmental tasks were given prior to engagement with the SBA tasks.</p> <p>Copies of a learning programme, lesson plans, development tasks and an assessment</p>

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	MPUMALANGA	GAUTENG	FREE STATE
Learning Area	<b>MATHEMATICAL LITERACY</b>			
Criteria				
				plan with dates of implementation were evident.
Areas of concern	<p>No policy of internal assessment and no subject assessment guidelines were evident.</p> <p>An assessment plan indicating the dates of implementation of tasks was not evident.</p> <p>Internal moderation of SBA is done only after completion of the teaching programme, so no feedback is given to assist development.</p> <p>No evidence of progress records in learner files.</p> <p>No evidence of progress records in the educator file at one centre.</p> <p>Authenticity declarations not signed.</p> <p>A test other than the 2012 SBA test was done at Makhomba.</p> <p>The learner was given zero by the PM.</p>	<p>Policy of internal assessment was not always evident; subject assessment guidelines were not evident.</p> <p>Internal moderation of SBA done only after completion of the teaching programme; so no feedback is given to assist development.</p> <p>Assessment body mark sheets could not be verified due to non-submission.</p> <p>Learners at Thulani had not signed declarations of authenticity.</p>	<p>No policy of internal assessment and no subject assessment guidelines were evident.</p> <p>No evidence of developmental tasks.</p> <p>Internal moderation of internal assessment is done only after completion of the teaching programme, so no feedback to assist development is given.</p> <p>No evidence of progress records in the educator portfolio at one centre.</p>	<p>District and provincial internal moderations are conducted only at the end of the teaching programme.</p> <p>The educators have assessed the learners' work in accordance with the agreed criteria, except for the investigation and the project.</p>
Recommendations	Internal moderation of SBA must be conducted as prescribed in the national guidelines. Internal moderation must be conducted	Internal moderation of SBA must be conducted as prescribed in the national guidelines. Internal moderation must be conducted	Internal moderation of SBA must be conducted as prescribed in the national guidelines.	Educators should be trained to assess investigations and projects. The internal moderations were

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	MPUMALANGA	GAUTENG	FREE STATE
Learning Area	<b>MATHEMATICAL LITERACY</b>			
Criteria				
	<p>in a manner that allows for feedback that contributes to ongoing learner development.</p> <p>A provincial policy for internal assessment and subject-specific guidelines must be included in all the educators' portfolios.</p>	<p>in a manner that allows for feedback for ongoing learner development.</p> <p>A provincial policy for internal assessment and subject-specific guidelines must be included in all the educators' portfolios.</p> <p>The PED must ensure that assessment body mark sheets are submitted for verification.</p>	<p>Internal moderation must be conducted in a manner that allows for feedback that contributes to ongoing learner development.</p> <p>A provincial policy for internal assessment and subject-specific guidelines must be included in all the educators' portfolios.</p>	<p>conducted only at the end of the programme for the year, with the last task completed in August 2012.</p> <p>Internal moderation should take place more than once a year so moderation can contribute to learner development.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The quality of internal assessment complies with the DHET minimum requirements.</p> <p>However, the internal moderation process must ensure that all policy documents are included; that tasks are re-marked at all levels of moderation; and that progress records of learners' performance are in portfolios.</p>	<p>The quality of internal assessment complies with the DHET minimum requirements.</p> <p>However, the internal moderation process must ensure that all policy documents are included; that tasks are re-marked at all levels of moderation; and that progress records of learners' performance are in portfolios.</p>	<p>The province is not compliant with the policy requirements of internal assessment.</p>	<p>Internal moderation is taking place and reports are provided, but the quality of moderation and feedback needs to improve.</p>

## 1.6 LEARNING AREA: NATURAL SCIENCES

Province / Assessment Body	EASTERN CAPE	NORTHERN CAPE	NORTH WEST
Learning Area	NATURAL SCIENCES		
Criteria			
A sample of sites from which portfolios were verified	Nyameko Adult Centre Tsolo PALC Sakhisizwe Adult Centre Auckland PALC Lady Frere Adult Centre	St. Johns PALC Tswelopele Correctional Centre Carel van Zyl	Iphatlhose PALC Tshwedi-Tshwedi Adult Centre Reamogetse-Thuto Adult Centre
Compliance with policy	There is compliance in terms of policy.	There is compliance in terms of policy.	There is compliance in terms of policy.
Quality of internal moderation	Let us improve the quality of moderation.	Let us improve the quality of moderation.	Let us improve the quality of moderation.
Quality and standard of the assessment task	Let us adhere to guidelines and memorandums.	Let us adhere to guidelines and memorandums.	Let us adhere to guidelines and memorandums.
Recording and reporting	Maintain the good work. Include educator files.	Maintain the good work.	Maintain the good work.
Strengths	Moderate all the tasks at all levels of moderation.	Moderate at all levels.	Moderate at all levels.
Areas of concern	Let us include moderation reports for all levels.	Discourage learners from writing as a collective in projects.	Discourage learners from writing projects and experiments as a collective.  The province was not ready for Umalusi to conduct moderation. The venue was changed on the eve of moderation and Umalusi was not informed. Moderators had to wait for the province to moderate the portfolios.
Recommendations	We strongly recommend that all reports be included, as well as dates for each task.	We strongly recommend that all tasks be moderated at all levels.	We strongly recommend that all tasks be moderated at all levels.
Conclusion	Let us have consistency across the province.	Not all tasks are moderated but there is	Let moderators guide assessors and learners in

Province / Assessment Body	EASTERN CAPE	NORTHERN CAPE	NORTH WEST
Learning Area	NATURAL SCIENCES		
Criteria			
	Supply educators with current unit standards.	compliance in terms of policy.	all the tasks. Use moderator's report as checklist. PED to follow the selection criteria stipulated by Umalusi.

## 1.7 LEARNING AREA: TECHNOLOGY

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	FREE STATE
Learning Area	TECHNOLOGY	
Criteria		
A sample of sites from which portfolios were verified	Siyakanyisa, Isulabasha, Enduduzweni, Usizuzulu AEC, School of Industries, Siphimfundo, Masifunde, Nsligwane, Intiwe	Aganang AC, Tiakeni
Compliance with policy	Yes. In all cases the national policy was followed.	Yes. In all cases the national policy was followed.
Quality of internal moderation at all levels	Quality cluster, district and provincial moderation is evident. No evidence of site moderation.	No evidence of site, cluster or district moderation.
Quality and standard of the assessment task	Good. National tasks were used.	Good. National tasks were used.
Recording and reporting	Marks were recorded in most cases. Accuracy in capturing of marks needs to be attended to.	Marks were recorded in both cases.
Strengths	Sample was taken from all nine districts.	National tasks were used.
Areas of concern	No mark sheets were supplied. No evidence that moderated marks will be captured.	No evidence of moderation prior to provincial moderation.
Recommendations	Include mark sheets in future.	There needs to be a provincial management plan for moderation to which districts and clusters must adhere.

Province	KWAZULU-NATAL	FREE STATE
Learning Area	TECHNOLOGY	
Criteria		
Conclusion	The sample was better than those of previous years. Layout of files was also good.	The sample was better than those of previous years in that all tasks were available and clearly demarcated.

## 1.8 LEARNING AREA: TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Province / Assessment Body	FREE STATE	LIMPOPO	MPUMALANGA
Learning Area	TRAVEL AND TOURISM		
Criteria			
A sample of sites from which portfolios were verified	QwaQwa Kutlwano Siyavana Rammolotsi Adult Centre	Sondela (Waterberg) Nanodoni (Vhembe) Mogoboya (Mopani) Mdauma (Kone Kwen) Soka Leholo (Capricorn) Thonda Lushaka (Vhembe) Redeeming (Vhembe); Matashe (Vhembe) Moleke Adult Centre (Capricorn)	Embhuleni Thulamahashe Saselane Eamogetswe
Compliance with policy	Yes, all tasks were done and assessed using the correct tools.	All tasks were done according to the assessment schedule, although centres did not stick to the dates provided in the provincial assessment plan. Assessment policies and appeals procedures were not submitted for all centres.	All tasks were given and assessed using the prescribed tools. Calculation of marks was done according to prescribed weighting.
Recording and reporting	Good in all cases. Educators in all centres kept thorough records of developmental and SBA marks.	No record keeping of marks in learner files, except for Moleke Adult Centre. Recording and transfer of marks done accurately. Electronic mark sheets show moderated marks, but no	Done accurately. Mark sheets were amended by moderators. But no electronic provincial mark sheets were available.

Province / Assessment Body	FREE STATE	LIMPOPO	MPUMALANGA
Learning Area	TRAVEL AND TOURISM		
Criteria			
		changes were made by moderators to marks in any centre.	
Strengths	<p>All portfolios show that learners and educators worked hard and were committed.</p> <p>Moderated marks entered on provincial marks sheets.</p> <p>Moderation altered high marks to a more realistic level.</p>	<p>All tasks were done and learners seemed to cope well. Representatives from centres in all districts were present at the moderation session. It was good to be able to communicate with them and discuss pressing issues. One serious issue raised was the lack of resources at centres, e.g. magazines and resource centres.</p>	<p>Educator feedback forms went to learners after each task.</p> <p>Test was given as the last task, which gave educators a chance to cover all the relevant unit standards.</p> <p>Qualifications of educators are good and this reflects in the good marking.</p>
Areas of concern	<p>Qualifications of educators, as well as their level of experience in marking.</p> <p>Internal moderation not up to standard.</p> <p>Spreading of the tasks is not standardised: some educators gave three tasks in one week in February.</p> <p>No learners obtained low marks.</p>	<p>Lack of internal moderation of marking. There were many marking mistakes (especially with regard to the project where marks were allocated for wrong pictures and the role play where the rubric was not used for assessment).</p> <p>Few educators have any formal tourism training.</p> <p>In some centres 24 marks were awarded for six ticks only.</p> <p>Level of marking was not up to standard.</p> <p>Moderation is done at a very late stage: when all tasks have been completed. Any input by a moderator will not have an impact. Moderation after each task is ideal and should be followed by a thorough feedback session to the learner.</p>	<p>It appears there are two provincial moderators: don't know if this is standard practice.</p> <p>Electronic mark sheets not yet available: unclear whether moderated marks will be captured.</p> <p>The number of learners enrolled in some centres is too high to be taught effectively by only one educator.</p>

Province / Assessment Body	FREE STATE	LIMPOPO	MPUMALANGA
Learning Area	TRAVEL AND TOURISM		
Criteria			
Recommendations	<p>Efforts should be made to either appoint aptly qualified educators or train them in the areas where they lack knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Internal moderation should be done after every task and feedback given to learners to enhance their performance in future tasks.</p> <p>Use a standardised time table for assessments.</p> <p>Give more guidance in marking memorandum.</p>	<p>Make sure re-marking is done at district and provincial level for all tasks.</p> <p>Assist educators with resources such as magazines, etc. that learners can also use.</p> <p>A training session should be held with educators (by examiners) to ensure they know how to mark. In addition, tools should be made more user friendly and be more instructive to assist the inexperienced marker.</p> <p>Educators should attend training courses and workshops where possible.</p>	<p>NO RECOMMENDATIONS OR CONCLUSIONS INCLUDED HERE?</p>
Conclusion	<p>Performance of learners is satisfactory and educators show commitment and dedication, despite their lack of knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>There is evidence of hard work in the province.</p> <p>Some portfolios are stunning: neat and creative.</p> <p>Good work by all in general: we just need to pay attention to the small areas of concern.</p>	

# ADDENDUM 3: PART A

## MONITORING OF WRITING CENTRES

---

### 1 MONITORING OF WRITING CENTRES

#### 1.1 EASTERN CAPE

##### 1.1.1 NTEKELELO JSS

Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	2
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2

##### Areas of good practice

- None.

##### Areas for improvement

- New school but poorly maintained and no electricity.
- Too much furniture in the classrooms because they are waiting for additional classrooms.

##### Recommendations

- The centre manager must investigate and remedy the high rate of absenteeism.

## Conclusion

- Roads in the area are treacherous and there are no sign posts, making it very difficult to find and monitor the school.

### 1.1.2 DALUBUHLE ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.4

#### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

#### Areas for improvement

- The high rate of candidates who register but do not write needs to be investigated.
- Adults sit in desks made for Grade 1 and 2 learners.
- The chief invigilator uses public transport to collect question papers and return scripts. This is highly risky.

#### Recommendations

- The district must address the issue of more acceptable premises for the centre, and appropriate furniture.
- The district must find a safer mechanism for the delivery and collection of question papers.

## Conclusion

- Risks to the security of question papers and answer scripts are unacceptably high.
- The furniture is unsuitable for the conduct of an adult examination.
- The ABET programme does not seem to receive adequate attention at this centre. The school simply tolerates the presence of an ABET centre.

### 1.1.3 JEFFREYS BAY AET

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Seating of candidates is good.
- The identity of candidates was thoroughly checked.
- The Uitenhage district office must be congratulated on delivering question papers on time in rural areas with inadequate and poor infrastructure.
- It is good practice to store question papers and examination material at the district office.

#### Areas for improvement

- A crisis plan must be developed, written up and made available to invigilators.
- The appointment of invigilators by the district office must be given consideration.

#### Recommendations

- A crisis plan must be developed.
- A register of visits by monitors must be kept.

## Conclusion

- The examination was well managed and credible.

### 1.1.4 ALGOA CLUSTER FOR ABET CENTRES

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	2.7

#### Areas of good practice

- Safekeeping of question papers by the district office.
- The distribution and collection of question papers by the district office.
- The quality of furniture used in the venue.

#### Areas for improvement

- The venue is a large hall. More space must be allowed between desks.
- The centre manager should make himself available for discussions with the monitor.
- Development of a crisis plan.
- Candidates should know in which venue they will write.
- The centre manager should approach the examination more calmly.

#### Recommendations

- Advice to develop a crisis plan and to space desks correctly must be taken seriously.
- Centre numbers should be written on posters in front of each row of desks to assist candidates to find their places.
- Sufficient invigilators, as per policy, must be appointed to invigilate the examination.
- A monitor register must be kept.

## Conclusion

- Despite serious shortcomings, the examination was not compromised.

## 1.2 FREE STATE

### 1.2.1 MAMAHABANE ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	2
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.7

#### Areas of good practice

- None.

#### Areas for improvement

- Access to the examination material.
- Space between desks.
- Seating plan.
- Location of examination room.
- Daily reports.
- Noise.
- IDs and examination permits.
- Calculators and other programmable devices.
- Reading time.

#### Recommendations

- The chief invigilator, or the principal of the host school, must have access to examination material.
- Space between candidates' desks should be adequate (one metre apart).
- Candidates must be seated according to the seating plan.
- Location of the examination room must be clearly indicated to candidates and well displayed.

- Noise must be controlled.
- IDs and examination permits must be checked and verified prior to candidates entering the examination room.
- Calculators and other programmable devices must be checked.
- 10 minutes' reading time must be given to candidates before the commencement of the examination.
- Conclusion
- School / examination centre partially meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires intervention, support and follow up monitoring.

### 1.2.2 MELODING ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	1
8.	Overall judgement	2.5

#### Areas of good practice

- Good cooperation between the AET staff and the staff of the host school in the use of facilities.
- Registration of candidates and issuing of admission letters was done on time.
- AET staff attended training on the conduct of examinations and they are confident and competent.
- Areas for improvement
- The venue has a few broken windows and no electricity, so candidates and officials depend on natural light. The weather may have an impact on the examination.
- The venue should be chosen to accommodate special needs' candidates.
- The chief invigilator should negotiate for extra classes, in good time, from the host school and use the enrolment figures as leverage.
- The chief invigilator should insist on appointment letters from the district office in good time, to avoid controversy.

- All eight staff members should attend training.
- Update the examination file regularly.

### Recommendations

- The host school should allocate and maintain dedicated space for exams.
- The venue should be suitable for special needs' candidates.
- The centre manager should be assisted with resources to communicate with the district office in an emergency.
- If there is a dispute the district director should be consulted, and involved, to ensure that there is compliance.

### Conclusion

- Despite the venue, the invigilators showed commitment to conduct the examinations as expected. The rules of the exams are implemented correctly and I am satisfied that the standards have not been compromised.

## 1.2.3 GROOTVLEI PRISON ABET

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	1
8.	Overall judgement	2.71

### Areas of good practice

- The examination file is well kept and contains all the relevant documents. It makes it easy for one to see how the examination is managed.
- The security of examination material/stationery is tight.

### Areas for improvement

- None.

## Recommendations

- None.

## Conclusion

- The examination centre is conducting the examination according to prescribed procedures and has shown evidence of good practice.

### 1.2.4 HOREBE PALC

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	2.7

#### Areas of good practice

None noted.

#### Areas for improvement

Candidates arrive late and consider this acceptable practice.

## Recommendations

The chief invigilator and/or centre manager needs to find a way to address the problem of latecomers.

## Conclusion

The examination centre meets the minimum standards and conducted a credible examination.

### 1.2.5 THAHASELLANG

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.85

### Areas of good practice

None noted.

### Areas for improvement

The irregularities register and the stationery register must be kept updated.

Examination numbers must be made, and put on candidates' desks, before the examination, according to the seating plan.

### Recommendations

The school should be requested to provide signage directing visitors and candidates to the examination room.

### Conclusion

Indications are that all rules and regulations are followed.

## 1.2.6 BOSELE ADULT CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	4
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3.6

### Areas of good practice

- Record keeping is well-designed and maintained.
- Procedures at the start of the examination are handled very clearly and competently.

- Areas for improvement
- Irregularities reports must be kept in the file.

#### Recommendations

- Identity documents must be checked.

#### Conclusion

- The examination is conducted according to prescriptions.

### 1.2.7 CENTRE 3194011\*

\* Name of centre not provided

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Examination question papers are delivered and collected by district officials daily.
- Punctuality of invigilators and candidates is laudable.
- Recounting of scripts by more than one official is good practice.
- Sessions start with a scripture reading and prayer.

#### Areas for improvement

- Cell phones belonging to invigilators must be switched off.
- The chief invigilator, not one of the other invigilators, must access the question papers in the strong room.

#### Recommendations

- The areas for improvement must be addressed.
- Conclusion

- Except for the above concerns, the centre meets the minimum requirements and conducts a credible examination.

## 1.3 GAUTENG

### 1.3.1 PETER LENGENE ABET

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.4

#### Areas of good practice

- Chief invigilator and invigilators carry out their duties in a professional manner.

#### Areas for improvement

- Rules must be read out to candidates at the commencement of each examination.
- The chief invigilator must take candidates through the paper page by page.
- There must be sufficient invigilators.
- A clock is required in each examination room.
- The location of the examination room must be clearly indicated, using signboards.

#### Recommendations

- The areas for improvement must be taken seriously to ensure that the examination is not compromised.

#### Conclusion

- The centre is trying hard to make the examinations a success.

### 1.3.2 HERBERT MDINGI ABET

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	2.4

#### Areas of good practice

- Invigilators are punctual.

#### Areas for improvement

- Clocks must be visible in each examination room.
- Identity documents must be displayed on the desks.
- Candidates must be seated according to the seating plan.
- Candidates must be encouraged to arrive on time.

#### Recommendations

- The areas for improvement must be addressed.
- The centre requires regular monitoring.

#### Conclusion

- The centre needs to improve significantly.

### 1.3.3 ALEXANDER ADULT CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	2.85

#### Areas of good practice

- There were three clocks in the hall and one in each additional classroom used for writing examinations.
- Of the 103 candidates, only three did not have their identity documents on display.

#### Areas for improvement

- The centre does not have any security – no security guards, burglar alarm or fire extinguishers.
- The facilities are in poor condition; dilapidated; and windows cannot open so there was insufficient airflow on a very hot day.
- There were no records of examination material received and returned.
- No evacuation or contingency plans are in place.

#### Recommendations

- Candidates must be properly and timeously registered to prevent unregistered candidates arriving to write.
- Daily report forms should be completed.

#### Conclusion

- Despite the problems, the examination was being conducted in a fair and credible way.

### 1.3.4 LEEUWKOP MAXIMUM ADULT CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	4
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	4
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	3.1

#### Areas of good practice

- All candidates were seated by 13h25. There is no late-coming at this centre.
- Discipline among candidates exceeded expectations.
- Seating arrangements were impressive.

#### Areas for improvement

- A visitor/monitor register is not kept.
- Officials from the district do not monitor the examinations because they are apparently afraid to go into the correctional facility and meet the inmates.
- The invigilators' register is not signed by all invigilators.
- There was no record/inventory of examination material.

#### Recommendations

- GDE District 9 officials must be instructed to monitor the facility.
- A record/inventory of all examination material received and dispatched must be kept.
- The chief invigilator should be appointed in writing.

#### Conclusion

- The chief invigilator and her team are doing their best to conduct examinations efficiently, despite the lack of monitoring.
- The examination was conducted in a fair and credible manner.

### 1.3.5 RENEILWE AET

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Examination rules and a copy of the mark sheets, including candidates' numbers, were pasted outside each examination room.
- The chief invigilator diligently keeps records of the examinations.
- One of the candidates is invited to open the sealed box of question papers.

#### Areas for improvement

- The rules for the examination must be read aloud before each examination.

#### Recommendations

- Daily reports should be submitted.

#### Conclusion

- A large number of candidates write at the centre and there are stringent control measures to manage the candidates.
- The centre adheres to regulations and conducts a very credible examination.

### 1.3.6 DIEPKLOOF ADULT CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	4
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
5.	The writing of the examination	4
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4
7.	Monitoring	4
8.	Overall judgement	3.5

#### Areas of good practice

- Considering that the chief invigilator is not a trained educator, a very good job has been done to train her. She is doing very well.

#### Areas for improvement

- The candidates must be encouraged to arrive on time.

#### Recommendations

- None.

#### Conclusion

- The examination was professionally conducted.

## 1.4 KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 1.4.1 INHLOSO AET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Ensuring that all information was correctly provided on the front page of the answer book.

### Areas for improvement

- Planning for evacuation must be done and supplied to the chief invigilator and invigilators.

### Recommendations

- Limited monitoring required at this centre.

### Conclusion

- The examination is being conducted in a credible manner.

## 1.4.2 THANDA AET CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

### Areas for improvement

- Planning for evacuation during an examination session. Chief invigilator advised to have this in place.

### Recommendations

- Limited monitoring required at this centre.

### Conclusion

- The examination is being conducted in a credible manner.

### 1.4.3 ASIFUNDE PALC

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

#### Areas for improvement

- Two invigilators and the chief invigilator, who was confined to one examination room, invigilated 76 candidates seated in three examination rooms. The chief invigilator was not in a position to supervise the other two invigilators, or assist where necessary.
- The time table does not make provision for relief invigilators.
- This examination centre relocated to another venue without making proper arrangements with the district office. It took the Umalusi monitor more than an hour to find the examination centre.
- The invigilation attendance register is kept in the 1st examination room. There is no invigilation attendance register in the other rooms. The two invigilators sign the attendance register in the 1st examination room at 13:30 and when they leave, after the session.

#### Recommendations

- Relocation of this centre to a new venue to be investigated.
- The number of invigilators to be increased to allow the chief invigilator time to supervise all the examination rooms and render assistance to invigilators.
- Timetable to make provision for relief invigilators.
- Invigilation attendance registers to be placed in all three examination rooms.

#### Conclusion

- The examination is being conducted in a credible manner.

#### 1.4.4 SIYAKULA PALC

##### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	4
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	4
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

##### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

##### Areas for improvement

- The clock in the examination room is broken and does not show the time.

##### Recommendations

- The clock must be replaced or repaired.

##### Conclusion

- The examination rules are strictly adhered to. This examination centre runs a credible ABET level 4 examination.

### 1.5 LIMPOPO EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

#### 1.5.1 BURGERSDORP ABET CENTRE

##### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	4
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	4
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3.3

**Areas of good practice**

- None noted.

**Areas for improvement**

- A clock must be provided by the centre.

**Recommendations**

- None noted.

**Conclusion**

- The examination was conducted in accordance with the examination manual.

**1.5.2 TSHUKUDU AET CENTRE**

**Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre**

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	4
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3.2

**Areas of good practice**

- There are many areas of good practice, e.g.
- The chief invigilator, invigilators and candidates were all punctual.
- The question papers and examination material were kept in a locked safe in the principal's office.

**Areas for improvement**

- There are many areas where improvement is necessary:
- Candidates and monitors must be made aware when question papers are opened.

- The circuit must deliver question papers no later than one hour before the examination begins.

#### Recommendations

- It is recommended that special attention be paid to the timeous delivery of the examination question.

#### Conclusion

- The conduct of examinations at this centre meets the requirements.

### 1.5.3 TOMPI SELEKA ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.85

#### Areas of good practice

- All invigilators were at the centre an hour before the start of the session.

#### Areas for improvement

- More training has to be provided to the chief invigilator, especially on the procedures and usage of time before the start of the writing session.

#### Recommendations

- The centre should provide a clock in the examination room for the convenience of the candidates.

#### Conclusion

- There was nothing to jeopardise the integrity of these examinations.

## 1.5.4 SENDEDZA ABET CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Keeping of an examination file with documents relating to the running of the examination is highly commended. This made verification of information required during my visit very easy.
- Keeping question papers in a safe place after delivery by the driver from the circuit office, is also appreciated. Unfortunately on the day of my visit, question papers were delivered very late. They arrived at 14h00 and there was no time for candidates to first read them.

#### Areas for improvement

- The chief invigilator should page through the question paper with candidates to check for technical problems.
- The chief invigilator should read out examination rules to candidates before the commencement of the examination.
- The chief invigilator should make sure that question papers are delivered to the centre in good time.
- The circuit driver who collects the scripts should be made to sign for them.

#### Recommendations

- It is recommended that the same good standard of conducting examination displayed during my visit be maintained throughout the examination period.
- A relief invigilator(s) must be in place all the time.

## Conclusion

- Based on observations during the visit, despite the late delivery of question papers on that particular day, the centre did meet the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and cyclic monitoring.

### 1.5.5 LITSHOVHU AET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Question papers and stationery were kept safely in the principal's office after delivery by the circuit manager.

#### Areas for improvement

- The chief invigilator should compile a well-organised file for examinations, instead of putting loose papers and documents in a box.
- The chief invigilator should read examination rules to candidates at the beginning of the session.
- The chief invigilator should page through the question paper with candidates to check for any technical problems.
- The chief invigilator should ensure that candidates verify whether they are writing the correct paper.
- Candidates should be given ten minutes of reading through the question paper before they start writing.

#### Recommendations

- It is strongly recommended that the standard of managing and conducting examinations be improved from that pertaining on the day of my visit.

## Conclusion

- Based on my observations and assessment, the examination centre partially meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires intervention, support and follow up monitoring, since the chief invigilator is new to the job.

## 1.6 MPUMALANGA EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

### 1.6.1 KADISHI AET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.4

#### Areas of good practice

- Examination rooms and surroundings were clean.
- The chief invigilator is diligent and willing to learn.

#### Areas for improvement

- Invigilators looked tired and unsure of themselves despite training and years of experience. The chief invigilator had to take responsibility for all actions.
- The deputy chief invigilator should receive her delegation in writing.
- Candidates' admission letters and identity documents should be checked at the door before they enter, and they must be displayed on their desks.
- Candidates must have identity documents.
- The chief invigilator must page through the question paper with candidates to check for technical errors.
- There is minimal monitoring of the centre.

#### Recommendations

- See above.

- Consideration should be given to appointing new invigilators in the future.
- Regular monitoring is required.

### Conclusion

- The credibility of the process and administration of the examinations was not compromised despite the many areas needing improvement.

## 1.6.2 BUYISONTO AET CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.4

### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

### Areas for improvement

- The chief invigilator had not planned for the examinations and had left her examination file at home.
- There was no seating plan.
- The deputy chief invigilator must be appointed, in writing, to the position.
- The invigilators must check identity documents and admission letters before candidates enter the examination room.
- All candidates must produce identification.
- The chief invigilator must instruct candidates to check that they have the correct paper and page through it with them, checking for printing errors, etc.
- There is minimal monitoring of the centre.
- 

### Recommendations

- See above.
- The centre must be monitored regularly.

## Conclusion

- The credibility of the examination was not compromised, but regular and frequent monitoring is essential.

### 1.6.3 KENNEN ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	1
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.4

#### Areas of good practice

- None.

#### Areas for improvement

- The chief invigilator was unsure of her responsibilities.
- The chief invigilator failed to plan and to prepare the examination room.
- The late delivery of question papers was not an issue for the chief invigilator, although it should be reported as an irregularity.
- The invigilators must check identity documents and admission letters before candidates enter the examination room.
- All candidates must produce identification.
- The chief invigilator must instruct candidates to check that they have the correct paper, and page through it with them to check for printing errors, etc.
- There is minimal monitoring of the centre.

#### Recommendations

- See above.
- Regular and thorough monitoring is required.

## Conclusion

- The credibility of the examination was not compromised but the areas where improvement is required put the examination at risk and must be addressed urgently.

### 1.6.4 KWAZANELE ADULT CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- None indicated.
- Areas for improvement
- The examination centre has no evidence of a contingency plan.
- Examination permits were checked and verified when candidates were already seated.
- Unused examination books were kept at the centre.
- Reading time must be reduced from 30 minutes to 10 minutes.
- Evidence must be provided of learning areas taught by invigilators.

#### Recommendations

- To ensure that there are no unauthorised persons in and around the examination room, it is recommended that invigilators also wear identification cards/tags.

## Conclusion

- In spite of the recommendation above, the examination was well managed and the integrity and standard was not compromised.

## 1.6.5 HLOMA STATE AET CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

#### Areas for improvement

- The invigilators looked tired and were slow and unsure of what they were doing.
- The examination centre had no evidence of a contingency plan.
- Examination permits were checked and verified when candidates were already seated.
- Unused examination books were kept at the centre.
- Candidates were given five minutes' reading time.
- The invigilators did not page through the question paper with candidates to check for technical problems e.g. blank or missing pages or incorrect numbering.
- Examination permits were not checked or verified prior to candidates entering the examination room.
- Candidates were observed leaving the examination room to visit bathrooms without being accompanied.
- The location of the examination room is not clearly indicated.

#### Recommendations

- From the observations made, the chief invigilator needs vigorous training which must be cascaded to invigilators.
- To ensure that there are no unauthorised persons in and around the examination room, it is recommended that invigilators wear identification cards/tags.

### Conclusion

- The credibility of the process has not been compromised in spite of the many areas for improvement.

### 1.6.6 LYNNVILLE ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	4
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	4
5.	The writing of the examination	4
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4
7.	Monitoring	4
8.	Overall judgement	3.86

#### Areas of good practice

- Good management by the chief invigilator.

#### Areas for improvement

- Calculators should be checked.
- The deputy chief invigilator must be appointed, in writing, to the position.
- The examination room could be much cleaner.

#### Recommendations

- See above issues that must be addressed.

#### Conclusion

- The examination was well managed and credible.

## 1.7 NORTH WEST EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

### 1.7.1 MOGALE AET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.5

#### Areas of good practice

- Security at the centre is good.
- Invigilators and candidates are punctual.
- Candidates are reminded of the rules at the start of the examination.

#### Areas for improvement

- A clock is required in the examination room.
- The chief invigilator must give the candidates exactly 10 minutes to read through the paper, and no more time.

#### Recommendations

- The centre should purchase clocks.
- The chief invigilator should study the invigilation manual and keep it at hand for reference during the examination.

#### Conclusion

- The examination was well managed except for one or two challenges mentioned above.

## 1.7.2 LEMOGANG AET CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Invigilators ensured that the correct information was provided on the cover of the answer script.
- Reading time was correct and properly used.

#### Areas for improvement

- Candidates must be advised to be punctual.
- Emergency plans must be drawn up and made available to invigilators.

#### Recommendations

- An information session for all candidates before the examinations commence would be helpful to prepare candidates and to advise them about the necessity for punctuality, etc.

#### Conclusion

- An incident-free session.
- Satisfactorily managed.

### 1.7.3 TLHOHALO ABET CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Invigilators are alert and vigilant.
- All candidates could be identified positively.

#### Areas for improvement

- Appointments are recorded on obsolete forms that are not updated. The form is also not relevant for invigilators.
- The chief invigilator was not appointed in writing.
- The invigilation time table does not reflect the subjects taught by invigilators.
- The centre has no invigilator registers or irregularities register.

#### Recommendations

- The invigilation time table must reflect the subject taught by each invigilator, as well as subjects to be invigilated.
- All appointment letters should be written on appropriate and updated forms.
- The centre should establish both the invigilation and irregularities registers.

#### Conclusion

- Lack of facilities for AET examinations reduces the integrity of these examinations.
- A good attempt was made to run this examination within prescribed rule and regulations.

## 1.7.5 RUTANANG ABET L4 CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.85

#### Areas of good practice

- Invigilators are alert and vigilant.

#### Areas for improvement

- The writing venue was prepared hurriedly, as it was vacated only at 14:00. Question papers could not be issued in time to start writing at 14:00.
- Some candidates arrived 45 minutes after starting time.
- The invigilation time table does not reflect the subjects taught by invigilators.
- Not all candidates could produce identity documents.

#### Recommendations

- The venue must be made available no later than 13:00.
- The invigilation time table must reflect the subject taught by each invigilator as well as subjects to be invigilated.
- All candidates should be seated at least by 13:30 or as prescribed in the general regulations of writing of examinations.
- It is essential that all candidates be positively identified.

#### Conclusion

- Lack of facilities for AET examinations reduces the integrity of these examinations.

## 1.7.6 UTLWANANG ABET CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Necessary information is available in the examination file.
- Documents are checked and candidates are guided to correctly provide the required information on the front cover of the answer script.

#### Areas for improvement

- Rules need to be read before every examination.
- Reading time may not be used for rough work but strictly for reading the question paper.

#### Recommendations

- The need for punctuality must be stressed.
- Rules must be read at every session.
- The district should assist the centre to find a more permanent venue for examinations.
- The centre must use only one name and not use several interchangeably.

#### Conclusion

- A well-managed session that ran without incident.

## 1.8 NORTHERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

### 1.8.1 PABALLELO HIGH SCHOOL / MASAKHANE ABET CENTRE

There was no ABET examination on the day of the visit.

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
	General management of the examination	3
	The examination room – general	3
	The examination room – seating of candidates	Not monitored
	Before the commencement of the examination	Not monitored
	The writing of the examination	Not monitored
	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4
	Monitoring	Not monitored
	Overall judgement	3.3

#### Areas of good practice

- None noted.
- Areas for improvement
- No specific improvement required. The chief invigilator is quite competent.
- Recommendations
- None.

#### Conclusion

- No examinations were written on the day of monitoring but the administration of the examination was found to be in order and everything in place for the writing of credible examinations.

## 1.8.2 SCHMIDTSDRIFT BATLHAPING INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	2.71

#### Areas of good practice

None noted.

#### Areas for improvement

- The attendance of the chief invigilator at the venue for every examination needs addressing.
- Ad hoc delegation to invigilators must be avoided and, where necessary, a deputy must be appointed in writing.

#### Organisation of ABET files.

- Studying instructions, circulars and monitoring instruments.
- Training.
- Preparation of the examination room and the development of seating plans.

#### Recommendations

- Chief invigilators at ABET centres should attend the training workshops with the CIs of NSC schools.
- Conclusion
- If ABET want their L4 examination and certificates to be credible, factors that compromise these must be looked at and rectified.

### 1.8.3 IKHWEZI LOMSO ADULT CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	1
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	1
5.	The writing of the examination	1
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	1.85

#### Areas of good practice

- The monitor noted that it was hard to find areas of good practice.
- Areas for improvement
- The entire organisation and preparation for examinations must be improved.

#### Recommendations

- The chief invigilator and the Northern Cape Education Department need to address the inadequacies as a matter of urgency.
- Follow up visits required.

#### Conclusion

- Most unsatisfactory and ill-prepared examination centre ever experienced in a monitoring exercise.
- The integrity of this examination was not compromised, but without the intervention of the monitor it could have been. The absence of an Invigilator time table is most disconcerting, as the possibility of the invigilator invigilating his or her own subject is great.

### 1.8.4 BERGSIG PUBLIC CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
	General management of the examination	3
	The examination room – general	3
	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
	Before the commencement of the examination	2

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
	The writing of the examination	2
	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
	Monitoring	3
	Overall judgement	2.7

#### Areas of good practice

- It was noted that the chief invigilator opens the session with a short prayer.
- Areas for improvement
- Start and finish times must be written on the board.
- Calculators must be checked before the commencement of the examination.
- Candidates must display their ID documents and admission letter on their desks.
- Daily reports must be completed – there is no policy in Namaqua district in this regard.
- Unregistered candidates, those who changed learning areas or language levels, are not permitted to write – contrary to policy and must be treated as an irregularity.

#### Recommendations

- Irregularities must be addressed.

#### Conclusion

- None noted.

### 1.8.5 NABABEEP PUBLIC CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	1
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	2
5.	The writing of the examination	1
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	1
8.	Overall judgement	1.85

### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

### Areas for improvement

- The chief invigilator and his substitute must be appointed, in writing.
- The secretary may not enter the strong room alone when examination papers are stored there.
- Arrangements must be made to enable invigilators to summon assistance while the examination is in progress.
- Starting and finishing times must be clearly displayed.
- Late-comers must be given the rules to read before commencing the examination.
- The chief invigilators must page through the question paper with candidates to check for blank pages, etc.
- The 10 minute reading period must happen prior to 14h00.
- The chief invigilator must be in the venue at 13h30 and not be distracted by stragglers.
- The fire extinguishers must be serviced as indicated on the cylinders.
- The regulation for dealing with unregistered candidates must be correctly applied.

### Recommendations

- See Areas for improvement – these must be attended to.

### Conclusion

- The late commencement of procedures by the chief invigilator is the cause of most problems at the centre. He is inexperienced and needs both training and support from the district office.

## 1.8.6 LEARN FOR LIFE PUBLIC CENTRE

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	2

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.7

#### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

#### Areas for improvement

- Invigilators require proper training and support.
- A clock must be placed in the examination room.
- One invigilator smelt of alcohol (although he did not appear drunk) but it is not acceptable for candidates to write under an invigilator smelling of alcohol.
- Documentation was missing from the examination file.

#### Recommendations

- The district must train and support the chief invigilator and assist in training invigilators.
- The district must monitor and check that examination files have all necessary documentation.

#### Conclusion

- The examination was fairly well managed and could be deemed credible.

## 1.9 WESTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

### 1.9.1 WORCESTER CLC

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	2
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	2

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
7.	Monitoring	2
8.	Overall judgement	2.5

**Areas of good practice**

- None noted.

**Areas for improvement**

- Security of question papers must be improved.
- Invigilators need identification tags.

**Recommendations**

- The steel cabinet containing the question papers should be locked in the strong room.
- Name tags should be supplied for invigilators.

**Conclusion**

- The examination was well managed and credible.

**1.9.2 ATLANTIS ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE**

**Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre**

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	4
2.	The examination room – general	4
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	4
5.	The writing of the examination	4
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3.7

**Areas of good practice**

- None noted.

**Areas for improvement**

- Security of question papers could be improved.

### Recommendations

- Question papers should be kept in a lockable steel cabinet in the school strong room.
- The centre should provide invigilators with name tags.

### Conclusion

- The examination was credible.

## 1.9.3 MALMESBURY CLC

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

### Areas of good practice

- None noted.

### Areas for improvement

- Everything is in order.

### Recommendations

- None noted.

### Conclusion

- All processes and procedures followed the examination manual supplied by WCED at the invigilator training session.
- The examination was credible.

## 1.9.4 GEORGE CLC

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	4
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	4
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	4
7.	Monitoring	4
8.	Overall judgement	3.71

#### Areas of good practice

- The exam venue is well secured to ensure the safety of the examination question papers and other material such as scripts. The examination process is managed and conducted very well. All the relevant documents for the exams and invigilation process are kept neatly in a file.

#### Areas for improvement

- Although management of this centre seemed to be in order, the chief invigilator struggled to answer various technical questions as indicated in the instrument above. At times the centre manager would chip in to assist her.
- Recommendations
- The centre manager needs to take the chief invigilator through the manual again so as to improve her understanding of the whole invigilation process.
- Conclusion
- The centre is trying its level best to adhere to the rules and regulations for the management and conducting of the examinations.

## 1.9.5 MATIE COMMUNITY SERVICES

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	3
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	3
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3
6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	3
8.	Overall judgement	3

### Areas of good practice

None noted.

### Areas for improvement

- All procedures were followed, according to those prescribed in the manual provided at the training done by the district office.

### Recommendations

- None noted.

### Conclusion

- The monitor is satisfied that the examination was administered in a manner that would ensure that the integrity and validity of the examination was not in any way threatened.

## 1.9.6 OUDTSHOORN CLC

### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	2
2.	The examination room – general	2
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3

6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	4
8.	Overall judgement	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Invigilators were trained.

#### Areas for improvement

- There are a number of recommendations.

#### Recommendations

- Letter of delegation of authority must be put in file.
- Spare key of safe must be kept at safe place and letter put in file.
- Old seating plans must not be left against door.
- Centre must have a register to record dispatch of answer books.
- The candidates made a lot of noise outside when they left the hall. There were a few candidates still busy.
- A contingency plan must be set up.
- Centre manager must arrange with the caretaker to clean the hall properly and to open the windows.
- Centre number must be displayed on board as well.
- One rude candidate left answer book – and hall – without signing script control list. Centre manager must address such behaviour.

#### Conclusion

- Examination centre met minimum standards and requires limited support and cyclic monitoring.

### 1.9.7 MARYLAND LITERACY PROJECT CENTRE

#### Judgement on the level of compliance of the examination centre

	Key Monitoring Areas	Monitor's judgement
1.	General management of the examination	3
2.	The examination room – general	4
3.	The examination room – seating of candidates	4
4.	Before the commencement of the examination	3
5.	The writing of the examination	3

6.	Packaging and transmission of answer scripts	3
7.	Monitoring	4
8.	Overall judgement	3.4

#### Areas of good practice

- The exam venue was well secured to ensure the safety of the examination question papers and other material such as scripts. The examination process was managed and conducted very well. All the relevant documents for the exams and invigilation process were kept neatly in a file.

#### Areas for improvement

- Although the management of this centre seemed to be in order, the chief invigilator struggled to answer various technical questions as indicated in the instrument above. At times the centre manager would chip in to assist her.
- Recommendations
- The centre manager needs to take the chief invigilator through the manual again so as to improve her understanding of the whole invigilation process.

#### Conclusion

- The centre is trying its level best to adhere to the rules and regulations for the management and conducting of the examinations.

## 2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF THE MONITORING OF WRITING CENTRES

### 2.1 KEY ISSUES RAISED BY MONITORS

Issues raised frequently by monitors included:

- Inadequate knowledge and / or implementation of pre-writing procedures, including checking of question papers for missing pages etc., reading regulations and providing the correct amount of reading time.
- The appointment of sufficient, efficient invigilators and chief invigilators in writing, and adequate training of invigilators and chief invigilators.
- The availability of contingency or crisis plans.

- The late arrival of candidates.
- The lack of, or non-adherence to, seating plans.
- The availability of a working clock in the examination room.
- The signing of appropriate registers.
- The lack of suitable facilities and / or furniture for ABET examinations, particularly in the Eastern Cape and North West provinces.
- Lack of monitoring, particularly in Mpumalanga.

## 2.2 PERFORMANCE OF CENTRES

A total evaluation of above 3.5 could be considered an indication of a well-managed examination centre and a well-conducted examination. The most efficient, effective and credible of the centres visited were as follows:

Centre	Evaluation average
Lynnville ABET Centre	3.86
George CLC	3.71
Atlantis Adult Education Centre	3.71
Bosele Adult Centre	3.6
Diepkloof Adult Centre	3.5

- An average evaluation of 2 or less can be considered an indication of a very weak centre. The deregistration of writing centres scoring an average evaluation of under 2 should be given serious consideration, as centres that are evaluated so poorly can put the integrity of the examination at risk.
- Below are the centres that presented a very weak impression of the management and conduct of the examination:

Centre	Evaluation average
Nababeep Public Centre	1.85
Ikhwezi Lomso Adult Centre	1.85

# ADDENDUM 3B: MONITORING OF MARKING

---

## 1 EVALUATION OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE OF THE MARKING CENTRES

LEVEL	RATING	RATING DESCRIPTION / LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1	Poor / unacceptable	Marking centre does not meet the minimum requirements / standards and requires urgent intervention, development, support and follow up monitoring.
2	Fair / partially meets requirements / standards	Marking centre partially meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires intervention, development, support and follow up monitoring.
3	Good / meets requirements / standards	Marking centre meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and cyclic monitoring.
4	Very good / exceeds requirements / standards	Marking centre exceeds the minimum requirements / standards and has shown evidence of good practice and requires limited monitoring.

### 1.1 EASTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

#### 1.1.1 MARKING CENTRE: ADELAIDE GYMNASIUM SCHOOL

Address: Welch Street, Adelaide, Eastern Cape.

##### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	3
2	Marking centre	3
3	Security	3
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	2

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
7	Internal moderation	3
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	3
9	Monitoring of marking	2
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	3
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	3
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Records of irregularities are kept.
- Management of the marking centre and marking processes is good.
- Officials from Head Office visited the centre quite often to give support to the marking centre manager.

#### Areas for improvement

- Only five out of 35 CDs that were used to save candidates' information were received by the marking centre. This caused a delay and forced the centre manager to send markers to Mount Frere to retrieve the information.
- Recommendations
- Strict supervision and control of candidates' work should be exercised, especially in subjects like Information Technology.

#### Conclusion

- The marking centre meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and monitoring.

## 1.1.2 MARKING CENTRE: HOËRSKOOL ALIWAL NOORD

Address: 82 Somerset Road, Aliwal North, Eastern Cape.

### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	4
2	Marking centre	4
3	Security	4
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	4
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	-
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	-
9	Monitoring of marking	3
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	4
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	4
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	4
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	4

#### Areas of good practice

- Security is very tight at all entry points into the school.
- There is evidence that the marking centre is well run and maintained.
- Everything is done in an orderly manner.

#### Areas for improvement

- None.

#### Recommendations

- Marking management and marking processes are sound. Even the issue of stray scripts that seemed to be more prevalent this year did not dishearten the officials.

## Conclusion

- The marking centre meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and monitoring. It is a pleasure to visit a centre like this.

### 1.1.3 MARKING CENTRE: QUEENSTOWN GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL

Address: 18 Frost Street, Queenstown, Eastern Cape.

## Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	4
2	Marking centre	4
3	Security	4
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	4
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	4
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	-
9	Monitoring of marking	4
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	4
12	Reports	4
13	Electronic capturing of marks	4
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	-
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	4

### Areas of good practice

- The layout of the marking venues, the offices of management and the sign-postings on the school grounds are very effective.
- Security is tight and everybody inside the school must have a name tag or a sticker if visiting the centre.

### Areas for improvement

- Minor issues that undermine efficiency are not the making of the marking centre, but of the provincial office.

### Recommendations

- None.

## Conclusion

- There is visible support for the marking teams by the school staff and the principal.

## 1.2 FREE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 1.2.1 MARKING CENTRE: HOËRSKOOL AJC JOOSTE

Address: 38 Ossewa Street, Petrusburg

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	3
2	Marking centre	3
3	Security	3
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	3
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	3
9	Monitoring of marking	3
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	3
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	3
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Chief markers and internal moderators cannot submit their claims for marking before submitting their qualitative reports.
- The centre has a centre manager and a deputy centre manager.

#### Areas for improvement

- None reported.

#### Recommendations

- None.

## Conclusion

- The whole marking process is conducted in a way that will ensure the integrity of the examinations.

## 1.3 GAUTENG DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 1.3.1 MARKING CENTRE: HOËRSKOOL PRESIDENT

Address: Corner Rifle Range Road & Swart Street, Ridgeway, Johannesburg

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	4
2	Marking centre	4
3	Security	3
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	4
5	Training of markers	4
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	3
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	4
9	Monitoring of marking	4
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	4
13	Electronic capturing of marks	3
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	3
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3.5

#### Areas of good practice

- The centre was well organised. There was a good relationship between the centre manager and all chief markers.
- Security transporting scripts from Department headquarters to the marking venue was good.
- All markers were dedicated to the job at hand.

### Areas for improvement

- Chief markers must learn to observe norm time as set out by the assessment body authorities.
- Chief markers must get into a habit of keeping formal minutes when they conduct their memoranda meetings.
- Candidates enrol in great numbers but few arrive to write the examination.

### Recommendations

- It is recommended that all aspects mentioned under Areas for improvement be addressed.

### Conclusion

- The general impression gained was that the centre was well organised and well run with an efficient centre manager. The marking processes were fair and credible.

## 1.4 KWAZULU-NATAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 1.4.1 MARKING CENTRE: ARTHUR BLAXALL

Address: 69 Royston Road, Mountain Rise, Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu-Natal

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	4
2	Marking centre	4
3	Security	3
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	4
7	Internal moderation	2*
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	-
9	Monitoring of marking	3
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	4
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	-
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	3
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3.25

\* Seven internal moderators should be present from the first day. One came on the first day, three on the second day and two on the third day. The internal moderator moderates only 20 scripts and does not sample the marking of all markers.

#### Areas of good practice

- All necessary arrangements for marking and accommodation were made at short notice.
- Security guards were stationed in strategic positions.
- The marking centre was well maintained and the needs of markers were well looked after, via a daily management meeting.

#### Areas for improvement

- Searching at the gate was not particularly thorough.
- Not all moderators were present on the first day.

#### Recommendations

- Security must be tightened and internal moderators must be present for memorandum discussions.

#### Conclusion

- The marking centre was well organised and met the requirements for the marking of AET.

### 1.4.2 MARKING CENTRE: SUID-NATAL HIGH SCHOOL

Address: 12 Unity Road, Port Shepstone, KwaZulu-Natal

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	2
2	Marking centre	4
3	Security	2*
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	4
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	-
9	Monitoring of marking	3

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	-
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	4
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3.1

\*3. Security needs to be tightened up at the access gate.

#### Areas of good practice

- The quick response by centre management in organising accommodation for some of the markers at lodges on short notice.
- Security arrangements were very efficient.

#### Areas for improvement

- Security personnel at the marking venues should search the bags of people entering and exiting.
- It was a challenge when markers arrived before the scheduled day.

#### Recommendations

- Confirmation of marking centres should take place much earlier to give centres time to prepare.
- Security must be tightened.

#### Conclusion

- The conduct at and administration of the marking centre met the requirements of the AET examination process. Marking was fair and valid.

## 1.5 LIMPOPO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 1.5.1 MARKING CENTRE: NORTHERN ACADEMY

Address: 243 Suid Street, Flora Park, Polokwane

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	3
2	Marking centre	3
3	Security	4
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	4
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	4
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	4
9	Monitoring of marking	3
10	Handling of irregularities	4
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	4
13	Electronic capturing of marks	4
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	4
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3.4

#### Areas of good practice

- The idea of having one centre where the marking of all ABET learning areas takes place is good and should be continued. The marking staff were always available, e.g. chief markers and internal moderators.

#### Areas for improvement

- None.

#### Recommendations

- None.

#### Conclusion

- The assessment body had made good arrangements whereby all staff marking scripts for all ABET areas were together. This makes marking and control easy.

- Marking is conducted according to the marking guidelines. A high standard of marking is maintained.

## 1.6 MPUMALANGA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### 1.6.1 MARKING CENTRE: DR C N MAHLANGU FET COLLEGE

Address: Training Street, Siyabuswe, Mpumalanga

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	4
2	Marking centre	2*
3	security	3
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	-
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	2
9	Monitoring of marking	3
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	3
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	-
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3 2.9

\*2. Large number of marking centres. Accommodation at this college was not acceptable as beds had very thin mattresses and were not comfortable. The water supply in the men's hostel varied between an availability of only hot or only cold water.

#### Areas of good practice

- Excellent planning and implementation of marking policies and guidelines.

#### Areas for improvement

- The conditions in the hostel have not improved since the last monitoring visit on 4 April 2012.
- The situation with the security guards has the potential of putting the markers and the security of the examination at risk.

## Recommendations

- The security guards need to be trained until they know and understand how to maintain strict security at the marking centre.
- The hostel facilities must be renovated immediately or the college should not be used in future.

## Conclusion

- The marking centre meets the minimum requirements / standards and requires limited support and cyclic monitoring.

# 1.7 NORTH WEST DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 1.7.1 MARKING CENTRE: FERDINAND POSTMA HIGH SCHOOL

Address: M C Roode Drive, Vyfhoek, North West

### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	3
2	Marking centre	3
3	Security	4
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	3
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	4
9	Monitoring of marking	2
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	4
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	3
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	4
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3

### Areas of good practice

- Scripts are strictly secured.
- Provincial monitors supervise the process.
- Novice markers constitute 33% of the markers, thus building capacity.
- Improved attendance of candidates.

### Areas for improvement

- Chief invigilators at writing centres do not take their duties seriously, resulting in many technical irregularities that must be managed at the marking centre.

### Recommendations

- Chief invigilators at writing centres must be better trained and must take their responsibilities seriously.

### Conclusion

- The marking of scripts is good and prescribed standards are adhered to. The management of the centre should be commended for their good work.

## 1.8 NORTHERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

### 1.8.1 MARKING CENTRE: VUYOUWETHU HIGH SCHOOL

Address: 205 Letsholo Street, Mankurwane, Kimberley, Northern Cape.

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	4
2	Marking centre	4
3	Security	4
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	4
5	Training of markers	3
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	4
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	3
9	Monitoring of marking	4
10	Handling of irregularities	4
11	Quality assurance procedures	4
12	Reports	4
13	Electronic capturing of marks	-
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	4
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3.76

### **Areas of good practice**

- The timely realisation by the centre manager that learning areas were behind the required pace, and the consequent amendment of times, displayed good management. Marking was moved to the head office of the department on Friday night.
- Good control of answer scripts.
- Copies of all documentation kept.
- Well compiled marking guide.
- Suitable venue.
- Good accommodation and good food.

### **Areas for improvement**

- More timeous arrival of final memoranda from DHET is essential.
- Provision of own "marking memoranda" by markers who have worked through the question paper is essential.
- The training period for markers is too short, especially in light of a lack of preparation by markers.

### **Recommendations**

- Final memoranda must be sent to PEDs immediately and should be available in the marking centre the next day.
- Application forms and appointment letters should indicate the need for markers to work through the question paper and to bring their own "memos".
- AET educators should improve their knowledge of their learning area.
- Life Orientation, LC English and Ancillary Health Care, which had large numbers of candidates, struggled to complete the marking. However, EMS, with only 338 scripts, also battled to finish, and there was no valid reason for this.

### **Conclusion**

- The marking centre was well managed and met the requirements for the marking of AET.
- The preparation and training of markers could have been better.
- The late arrival of memoranda must be addressed.

## 1.9 WESTERN CAPE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

### 1.9.1 MARKING CENTRE: CAPE PENINSULA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Address: Symphony Way, Bellville South, Cape Town, Western Cape.

#### Evaluation

NO.	KEY MONITORING AREAS	MONITOR'S EVALUATION
1	Planning for marking	3
2	Marking centre	3
3	Security	3
4	Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants	3
5	Training of markers	4
6	Marking procedure	3
7	Internal moderation	3
8	Selection of scripts for external moderation	3
9	Monitoring of marking	3
10	Handling of irregularities	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	3
12	Reports	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	3
14	Packing and transmission of documentation	3
	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	3

#### Areas of good practice

- Contracted security guards at the CPUT campus control the entry of all persons.
- Marking personnel and support staff wear identity tags, which allow them access to the campus and the building where marking is taking place.
- Markers and moderators have been thoroughly screened and appointed by means of a written contract that demands confidentiality of marking.
- There is very strict control of script movement.
- The chief markers and internal moderators work closely as teams. Both are available at least eight hours a day.

#### Areas for improvement

- Three learning areas, i.e. AAAT, EMS and ANHC had not received the final memoranda from DHET by Tuesday 27 November, which held up marking in these learning areas.

**Recommendations**

- None

**Conclusion**

- Markers were comfortable and satisfied with the arrangements for meals and accommodation.
- Overall, it would appear that the process is managed according to required processes and procedures.
- The integrity and validity of the examinations were not compromised by the marking process.

# ADDENDUM 4: MEMO DISCUSSION MODERATION

---

## 1 LEARNING AREA MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS AND PARTICIPANTS

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
Applied Agriculture & Agricultural Technology	26/11	J J Louw	Internal Moderator	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		M B Mvubu	Examiner	
		N L Gwentshu	Internal Moderator	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		N Shugwana	Internal Moderator	Gauteng Dept of Education
		F B Luthuli	Educator	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		T I Mzobe	Chief Marker	
		M E Mphekgoane	Chief Marker	Limpopo Education Dept
		T L Mulaudzi	Internal Moderator	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		L J Tshikukuvhe	Chief Marker	
		T Mokgope	Internal Moderator	North West Education Dept
		A M Keitsemore	Internal Moderator	
		O B Koloane	Internal Moderator	Northern Cape Education Dept
		K W Hammer	Internal Moderator	
		M A Selonyane	Chief Marker	Western Cape Education Dept
		A Smuts	Chief Marker	
A Clarke	Internal Moderator			
Economic & Management Sciences	Not indicated	H G Mdaka	Positions not indicated	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		V Mabuto		Eastern Cape Education Dept
		N Mati		Free State Dept of Education
		M T Pule		
		M F Tshongwe		Gauteng Dept of
		D Farude		

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
		B Makinta		Education
		N S Mthethwa		KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		V N Ngxongo-Dolwana		Limpopo Education Dept
		N T Ramuima		Mpumalanga Education Dept
		B Xaba		North West Education Dept
		X J Nyakane		Northern Cape Education Dept
		DR Mangea		Western Cape Education Dept
		K A Seloni		
		S Cloete		
		U Grove		
		E Hoosain		
Information and Communication Technology	08/11	Not available	Examiner	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		Not available	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		Not available	Internal Moderator	
		Not available	Examiner	Gauteng Dept of Education
		Not available	Internal Moderator	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		M S Dramat	Chief Marker	Western Cape Education Dept
LLC isiZulu	12/11	B M Mbokane	Examiner	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		N S Ndaba	Examiner	
		W M Nzimande	Internal Moderator	
		Z Shezi	Internal Moderator	Gauteng Dept of Education
		F D Dlamini	Internal Moderator	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		B M Mbokane	Chief Marker	
		A M Mngomezulu	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		V S Dlamini	Internal Moderator	
LLC Tshivenda	12/11	N R Mutambedzo	Internal Moderator	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		M T Makhavhu	Examiner	
		M T Masengane	Chief Marker	Gauteng Dept of Education
		V S Mukwevho	Chief Marker	Limpopo Education Dept
		M E Mahamba	Internal Moderator	

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
L LC Sesotho	12/11	J M Sethabela	Internal Moderator	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		M A Molatsi	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		M M F Lerothodi	Internal Moderator	
		S D Hlohlolo	Internal Moderator	Free State Dept of Education
		S M Mosia	Internal Moderator	Gauteng Dept of Education
		E M Ngobeni	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		S Baase	Chief Marker	North West Education Dept
LLC isiXhosa	09/11	B L Tshokolwana	Examiner	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		M J Vava	Examiner	
		N F Sobetwa	Internal Moderator	
		P Jola	Internal Moderator	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		T Ntweka	Chief Marker	
		L Nomqubelam	Chief Marker	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		F Mabinza	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		U Ddumba	Chief Marker	Northern Cape Education Dept
		T Nofemelo	Internal Moderator	
		T Nkunkwana	Chief Marker	Western Cape Education Dept
		L Ngondo	Internal Moderator	
		A H Williams	Internal Moderator	
		LLC Xitsonga	09/11	S G Bila
H E Chuma	Examiner			
T G Mathebula	Chief Marker			Gauteng Dept of Education
AT Chauke	Internal Moderator			
T G Chuma	Chief Marker			Limpopo Education Dept
TS Mashimbye	Internal Moderator			
M A Ngobeni	Chief Marker			Mpumalanga Education Dept
M B Mpenyana	Internal Moderator			
LLC English	13/11	N R Dingiswayo	Examiner	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		N V Guzana	Examiner	
		B Chabane	Examiner	

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
		D Twala	Examiner	
		S Busawe	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape
		N Mkiva	Internal Moderator	Education Dept
		M N Dkwakane	Chief Marker	Free State Dept of
		S Moreng	Internal Moderator	Education
		G Msiza	Internal Moderator	Gauteng Dept of
		N C Shozi		KwaZulu-Natal
		S T Maphanga		Education Dept
		N D Nemaungani	Chief Marker	Limpopo Education
		K A Setati		Dept
		M N Hlatswayo	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga
		N D Magagula	Internal Moderator	Education Dept
		M C Nutle		North West Education
		I Kalamore		Dept
		L Kgadiete		Northern Cape
		D Chabaemang		Education Dept
		A Julies		Western Cape
		W Taylor		Education Dept
LLC Setswana	09/11	M M E Noge	Internal Moderator	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		M D Dibobo	Examiner	
		S S Phaltse	Examiner	
		S S Maodi	Chief Marker	Gauteng Dept of Education
		M M E Noge	Internal Moderator	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		E M Molate	Internal Moderator	
		N P Mogoshi	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		K C Maifadi	Chief Marker	North West Education Dept
		K E Peme	Chief Marker	Northern Cape
		S C Meruti	Internal Moderator	Education Dept
		LLC isiNdebele	08/11	D M Masango
S A Mahlangu	Examiner			
N J Malele	Internal Moderator			
S S Fenyane	Chief Marker			Mpumalanga
E Ngoma	Internal Moderator			Education Dept

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
LLC Afrikaans	13/11	W Pienaar	Examiner	Dept of Higher Education & Training
		H Ramnarian (KZN)	Examiner	
		R Scholtz	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		G D S Brown	Internal Moderator	
		S Kupega	Chief Marker	Free State Dept of Education
		C Coetzee	Chief Marker	Gauteng Dept of Education
		N Schroder	Internal Moderator	
		K J Nyathikazi	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		M S Obaray	Chief Marker	Northern Cape Education Dept
		P van Wyk	Internal Moderator	
		J Harris	Chief Marker	Western Cape Education Dept
		Mr MC Cupido	Internal Moderator	
		Mathematical Literacy	15/11 – 16/11	E Peck
G D Giyani	Examiner			
G T Chauke	Internal Moderator			
G V Matshazini	Chief Marker			Eastern Cape Education Dept
H Venter	Internal Moderator			
L Mosala	Chief Marker			Free State Dept of Education
S C Hugo	Marker			
P Mosikare	Examiner			Gauteng Dept of Education
N Mpanza	Chief Marker			
C K Zulu	Internal Moderator			KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
L Mazwi	Chief Marker			
H V Mkansi	Chief Marker			Limpopo Education Dept
G E Nkuna	Internal Moderator			
M M Mahlangu	Chief Marker			Mpumalanga Education Dept
K M Mokone	Internal Moderator			
E M Morake	Chief Marker			North West Education Dept
I S Motuba	Internal Moderator			
M Scheppers	Chief Marker			Northern Cape Education Dept
E B Theo	Internal Moderator			
V A Louw	Chief Marker			Western Cape Education Dept
I B Simpson	Internal Moderator			
Small, Medium & Micro	16/11	E N Jiba	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		M D Nkomokau	Internal Moderator	

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
Enterprises		N M Demiso	Chief Marker	Free State Education Dept
		T V Mothomi	Internal Moderator	
		G Sehlapelo	Chief Marker	Gauteng Dept of Education
		S Mokgetsi	Internal Moderator	
		M Nonhlanhla	Chief Marker	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		T G Maranele	Chief Marker	Limpopo Education Dept
		CA Nemaungane	Internal Moderator	
		M A Maloka	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		J C Kgomongwe	Chief Marker	North West Education Dept
		K A Mmope	Chief Marker	
		M Koopman	Marker	Northern Cape Education Dept
		L R Hendricks	Chief Marker	Western Cape Education Dept
		Technology	8/11	N S Mbatha
M A Pick	Internal Moderator			
N Mazinyo	Chief Marker			Eastern Cape Education Dept
M Malunga	Internal Moderator			
C M Kekana	Chief Marker			Gauteng Dept of Education
M J Mokhele	Internal Moderator			
S P S Mazibuko	Internal Moderator			KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
N E Nkuma	Chief Marker			Limpopo Education Dept
T Mopomat	Internal Moderator			
B Mabila	Chief Marker			Mpumalanga Education Dept
M P Legodi	Internal Moderator			
C Lenkoe	Chief Marker			North West Education Dept
M T Mkondo	Internal Moderator			
M Dames	Chief Marker			Northern Cape Education Dept
R Molao	Internal Moderator			
D Krack	Chief Marker			Western Cape Education Dept
Travel and Tourism	20/12	A Mbangata	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		P Louw Nkau	Marker	
		P N Maphike	Chief Marker	Free State Dept of

Learning Area	Date of meeting 2012	Attendees		
		Name	Position	Assessment Body
		T P Makhekhe	Marker	Education
		F Msibi	Examiner	Gauteng Dept of Education
		M Phale	Chief Marker	Education
		B P Mthembu	Internal Moderator	KwaZulu-Natal Education Dept
		J S Mathenjwa	Chief Marker	Education Dept
		M K Malesa	Chief Marker	Limpopo Education Dept
		E M Dhladhla	Internal Moderator	Dept
		S M Boqwana	Chief Marker	Mpumalanga Education Dept
		C Mokoena	Internal Moderator	Education Dept
		B N Kekana	Marker	North West Education Dept
		M P Molapong	Marker	Dept
		V Pemba	Marker	Northern Cape Education Dept
		JJ Mondsinger	Marker	Education Dept
		C Swartz	Chief Marker	Western Cape Education Dept
		Freshen Hugo	Internal Moderator	Education Dept
Wholesale and Retail	28/11	B M Ngobeni	Examiner	DHET
		S Malindi	Examiner	
		P Moagi	Internal Moderator	
		G Harris	Chief Marker	Eastern Cape Education Dept
		S Z Hloma	Internal Moderator	Education Dept
		M S Thage	Chief Marker	Gauteng Dept of Education
		M E Ndobe	Internal Moderator	Education

## 2 ISSUES RELATING TO MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS

### 2.1 ISSUES RELATING TO MEMORANDUM DISCUSSION MEETINGS:

- Many chief markers and internal moderators did not attend the meetings.
- Participants were unprepared and had not worked through the question paper.
- Participants did not pre-mark answer scripts, or pre-marked too few answer scripts.

- Participants arrived late, or left meetings early for various reasons.

Issues relating to question papers that emerged at memorandum discussions; or which were not appropriately addressed during the setting and moderation of question papers:

- Errors in printed question papers.
- Poor reproduction of diagrams.
- Use of “stored” question papers.
- A question that the external moderator recommended be omitted caused candidates difficulties.
- Over-allocation of marks.
- Memorandum should have included alternative answers.
- Memorandum should have included codes for marking essays and transactional writing.
- Expected length of essays and extended pieces of writing not included.
- Format errors that were not corrected.
- Ticks on memorandum did not correlate with marks allocated.
- Marks allocated to questions did not adhere to the weightings in the guidelines.

## 2.2 NUMBER OF SCRIPTS PRE-MARKED

	Learning Area	Number of scripts pre-marked	Confirmed no of participants in memo discussions (excl Umalusi moderator)*
1.	Applied Agriculture & Agricultural Technology	267	16
2.	Economic and Management Sciences	205	17
3.	Information and Communication Technology	36	1
4.	LLC isiZulu	120	10
5.	LLC Tshivenda	55	5
6.	LLC Sesotho	?	7
7.	LLC isiXhosa	123	12
8.	LLC Xitsonga	63	8
9.	LLC English	?	21
10.	LLC Setswana	65	9
11.	LLC isiNdebele	5	5
12.	LLC Afrikaans	116	12
13.	Mathematical Literacy	372	21
14.	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	145	14

	Learning Area	Number of scripts pre-marked	Confirmed no of participants in memo discussions (excl Umalusi moderator)*
15.	Technology	231	16
16.	Travel & Tourism	363	17
17.	Wholesale and Retail	77	7

\*This is dependent on the number of provinces writing a particular paper – the expected number of participants should be compared to the actual number of participants

# ADDENDUM 5: MODERATION OF MARKING

Below is an analysis of the results of the scripts sent for moderation; and an analysis of the number of passes and failures in the sample sets provided. The Independent Examination Board results are included where the learning area was written and scripts moderated.

## 1 ANALYSIS OF MARKS

Analysis of marks attained by candidates whose scripts were sent to Umalusi for external moderation

### 1.1 APPLIED AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY

COMPOSITE:		LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE / ASSESSMENT BODY											
Province / Assessment body	Number of scripts marked	0 – 9%	10 – 19%	20 – 29%	30 – 39%	40 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 100%	Average	
Eastern Cape	20	0	2	2	6	2	6	2	--	-	-	3,3	
Free State	16	0	3	2	1	3	6	1	-	-	-	2,6	
Gauteng	20	1	4	3	3	7	1	1	-	-	-	2,9	
KwaZulu-Natal	20	0	0	1	5	4	3	3	2	1	1	2,5	
Limpopo	20	1	1	3	-	9	2	3	1	-	-	2,9	
Mpumalanga	20	0	0	5	3	3	4	2	3	-	-	3,3	
North West	20	1	1	1	3	5	6	2	1	-	-	2,5	
Northern Cape	15	3	5	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	
Western Cape	20	-	2	4	4	5	1	2	2	-	-	2,86	
No of scripts marked	171											171	
Total number passed	96						40	29	16	9	1	1	96
Pass Rate (%)	56,14												

COMPOSITE:		LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE / ASSESSMENT BODY										
Province / Assessment body	Number of scripts marked	0 – 9%	10 – 19%	20 – 29%	30 – 39%	40 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 100%	Average
Total number failed	75	6	18	24	27							75
Failure Rate (%)	43,86											

## 1.2 HUMAN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	0											
Free State	10		1	3	0	1	1	2	1	1		
Gauteng	10		1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1		
KwaZulu-Natal	10		0	2	1	2	1	1	2	1		
Limpopo	10		2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1		
Mpumalanga	10		1	1	1	1	1	2	3	0		
North West	10		1	1	2	1	3	0	2	1		
Northern Cape	10		0	1	2	2	3	1	1	0		
Western Cape	10		1	1	2	0	2	1	2	1		
Total number of scripts marked	80											
Total number passed	52					9	13	11	13	6		
Pass Rate %	65											
Total number failed	29	0	7	12	10							
Failure Rate %	35											

## 1.3 INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape												
Free State	17	0	0	2	4	5	4	0	2	0	0	44.94%
Gauteng	16	1	2	0	3	1	5	2	2	0	0	45.63%
KwaZulu-Natal												
Limpopo												
Mpumalanga												
North West												
Northern Cape												
Western Cape	20	0	2	2	3	3	4	3	0	3	0	46.27%
Total number of scripts marked	53											
Total number passed	34					9	13	5	4	3	0	
Pass Rate %	64											
Total number failed	19	1	4	4	10							
Failure Rate %	36											

## 1.4 LIFE ORIENTATION

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	0											
Free State	10		1	2	0	1	4	1	0	1	0	
Gauteng	10		1	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	2	
KwaZulu-Natal	10		2	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	
Limpopo	10		2	0	0	0	4	2	0	2	0	
Mpumalanga	10		2	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	0	
North West	10	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	
Northern Cape	10		1	1	0	2	1	2	1	0	2	
Western Cape	10		1	1	1	0	4	1	0	2	0	
Total number of scripts marked	80											

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Total number passed	56					5	18	13	7	8	5	
Pass Rate %	70											
Total number failed	24	1	12	7	5							
Failure Rate %	30											

## 1.5 LLC AFRIKAANS

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	20	0	3	2	2	2	3	5	2	1	0	
Free State	20	0	2	0	3	4	2	4	2	2	1	
Gauteng	20	0	3	3	0	8	1	1	4	0	0	
KwaZulu-Natal	20	2	0	2	0	2	4	5	2	1	0	
Limpopo												
Mpumalanga	20	0	3	2	2	2	3	5	2	1	0	
North West												
Northern Cape	20	0	1	1	4	0	4	6	3	1	0	
Western Cape	20	0	2	2	2	5	2	3	1	2	1	
Total number of scripts marked	140											
Total number passed	98					23	19	29	19	7	1	
Pass Rate %	70											
Total number failed	41	2	14	12	13							
Failure Rate %	30											

## 1.6 LLC ENGLISH

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	50-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	
Free State	10	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	
Gauteng	20	1	3	4	2	3	2	3	2	0	0	
KwaZulu-Natal	8	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	
Limpopo												
Mpumalanga												
North West												
Northern Cape												
Western Cape												
Total number of scripts marked	45											
Total number passed	29					12	7	5	5	0	0	
Pass Rate %	64											
Total number failed	16	1	7	4	4							
Failure Rate %	36											

## 1.7 LLC ISINDEBELE

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Gauteng	7					2	2	1	2			
Mpumalanga	20	0	2	0	3	6	1	3	4	1	0	
Total number of scripts marked	27											
Total number passed	22					8	3	4	6	1	0	
Pass Rate %	81											
Total number failed	5	0	2	0	3							
Failure Rate %	19											

## 1.8 LLC ISIXHOSA

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape												
Free State												
Gauteng	10	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	
KwaZulu-Natal	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	
Limpopo												
Mpumalanga	10	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	
North West												
Northern Cape	9					3	3	3				
Western Cape	10											
Total number of scripts marked	50											
Total number passed	38					10	12	8	5	3	0	
Pass Rate %	76											
Total number failed	12	0	3	3	6							
Failure Rate %	24											

## 1.9 LLC ISIZULU

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape												
Free State												
Gauteng	10	1	0	1	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	44.6
KwaZulu-Natal	10	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	1	0	1	52.3
Limpopo	10	1	0	2	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	44.1
Mpumalanga	10	0	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	49.3
North West												
Northern Cape												
Western Cape												
Total number of scripts marked	40											

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Total number passed	26					5	7	8	5	0	1	
Pass Rate %	65											
Total number failed	14	3	1	4	6							
Failure Rate %	35											

## 1.10 LLC SEPEDI

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Gauteng	20	1	1	1	3	4	2	4	2	2		
Limpopo	20	1	1	1	3	3	2	5	3	1		
Mpumalanga	20	0	2	0	4	1	6	3	4			
Total number of scripts marked	60											
Total number passed	42					8	10	12	9	3		
Pass Rate %	70											
Total number failed	18	2	4	2	10							
Failure Rate %	30											

## 1.11 LLC SETSWANA

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province / Assessment body	No of scripts marked	0 – 9%	10 – 19%	20 – 29%	30 – 39%	40 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 100%	Average
Eastern Cape												
Free State												
Gauteng	20		3		3	4	4	3	3			3
KwaZulu-Natal												
Limpopo	19	1	1	1	2	2	3	6	3			2
Mpumalanga	20	1		3	2	2	4	5	2	1		3
North West	20	1	2	1	2	5	2	3	3	1		2
Northern Cape	20		2		3	2	2	6	5			3

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY													
Province / Assessment body	No of scripts marked	0 – 9%	10 – 19%	20 – 29%	30 – 39%	40 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 100%	Average	
Western Cape													
Total number of	99											13	
Total number passed	71						15	15	23	16	2		14
Pass Rate (%)	72												
Total number failed	28	3	8	5	12						7		
Failure Rate (%)	28												

## 1.12 LLC SISWATI

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY													
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average	
Mpumalanga	20	0	0	2	4	3	2	3	3	3	0		
Total number of scripts marked	20												
Total number passed	14						3	2	3	3	3	0	
Pass Rate %	70												
Total number failed	6	0	0	2	4								
Failure Rate %	30												

## 1.13 LLC TSHIVENDA

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY													
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average	
Gauteng	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	1	0		
Limpopo	20	0	2	1	3	3	4	3	4	0	0		
Total number of scripts marked	32												
Total number passed	26						5	7	7	6	1	0	
Pass Rate %	81												
Total number failed	6	0	2	1	3								
Failure Rate %	19												

## 1.14 LLC XITSONGA

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Gauteng	20	3	1	1	1	1	3	6	3	1	0	49.5
Limpopo	20	1	1	3	2	2	4	3	1	2	1	50.1
Mpumalanga	20	1	1	3	2	3	2	4	2	1	1	50.0
Total number of scripts marked	60											
Total number passed	40					6	9	13	6	4	2	
Pass Rate %	66.6											
Total number failed	20	5	3	7	5							
Failure Rate %	33.3											

## 1.15 MATHEMATICAL LITERACY

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	0											
Free State	20	0	3	1	2	1	5	4	3	1	0	49.2
Gauteng	20	1	0	2	3	3	1	6	3	1	0	57.9
KwaZulu-Natal	20	0	4	1	2	2	2	3	4	2	0	50.2
Limpopo	20	3	0	2	2	3	5	2	1	2	1	54.8
Mpumalanga	20	1	2	2	1	3	3	4	2	1	1	49.8
North West	20	1	1	2	1	3	4	3	1	1	2	50.6
Northern Cape	20	0	2	3	1	3	6	2	3	0	0	53.0
Western Cape	20	0	3	2	2	5	1	3	2	2	2	49.3
Total number of scripts marked	160											
Total number passed	110					23	27	27	19	8	6	
Pass Rate %	68.7											
Total number failed	50	6	15	15	14							
Failure Rate %	31.3											

## 1.16 SMALL, MEDIUM AND MICRO ENTERPRISES

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	20	0	1	1	4	3	5	2	2	2	0	52.8
Free State	20	0	0	2	4	1	7	2	2	2	1	52.5
Gauteng	20	1	1	1	3	2	4	4	2	1	1	51.75
KwaZulu-Natal	20	2	4	2	4	0	2	1	2	2	1	40.45
Limpopo	20	2	1	1	2	4	3	3	3	1	0	47.4
Mpumalanga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North West	7	1	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	34.6
Northern Cape	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Western Cape	20	2	1	6	3	2	4	1	0	1	0	41.65
Total number of scripts Marked	127											-
Total number passed	76					18	25	13	11	9	3	-
Pass Rate (%)	60											
Total number failed	51	8	9	13	21							-
Failure Rate (%)	40											
Eastern Cape	20	0	1	1	4	3	5	2	2	2	0	52.8

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	0											
Free State	20	0	3	2	1	1	5	4	1	3	0	
Gauteng												
KwaZulu-Natal												
Limpopo	20	0	2	3	1	4	3	4	3	0	0	
Mpumalanga	20	2	1	2	1	4	3	5	2	0	0	
North West	20	1	1	2	2	6	2	3	2	1	0	

Northern Cape	20	0	2	2	3	9	3	0	1	0	0	
Western Cape	20	0	1	2	4	3	2	4	1	3	0	
Total number of scripts marked	120											
Total number passed	82					27	18	20	10	7	0	
Pass Rate %	68											
Total number failed	38	3	10	13	12							
Failure Rate %	32											

## 1.17 TECHNOLOGY

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	20	0	1	1	4	6	2	4	2	0	0	48
Free State	20	0	2	2	2	4	4	2	4	0	0	48
Gauteng	20	0	4	2	0	5	1	4	3	1	0	47
KwaZulu-Natal	20	0	1	2	3	5	3	2	3	1	0	49
Limpopo	20	1	1	2	2	5	3	5	1	0	0	46
Mpumalanga	20	2	1	2	1	4	3	5	2	0	0	42
North West	20	0	1	2	3	7	3	2	2	0	0	46
Northern Cape	20	1	6	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	26
Western Cape	20	0	0	1	4	1	4	6	4	0	0	55
Total number of scripts marked	180											
Total number passed	115					41	24	28	20	2	0	
Pass Rate %	64											
Total number failed	65	4	18	19	24							
Failure Rate %	36											

## 1.18 TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Composite: LEARNER PERFORMANCE PER PROVINCE/ASSESSMENT BODY												
Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	0											
Free State	20	0	0	0	3	3	3	1	5	5	0	52.0
Gauteng	20	0	3	2	2	3	4	3	0	3	0	48.6
KwaZulu-Natal	19	0	2	3	1	4	1	4	4	0	0	47.8
Limpopo	20	1	1	1	3	4	4	2	3	1	0	53.0
Mpumalanga	20	0	2	1	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	51.0
North West	20	1	2	1	2	3	5	2	3	1	0	47.7
Northern Cape	20	0	1	1	4	6	3	2	2	1	0	47.6
Western Cape	20	0	1	3	2	3	4	3	3	1	0	49
Total number of scripts marked	159											
Total number passed	113					29	28	20	23	13		
Pass Rate %	70											
Total number failed	47	2	12	12	20							
Failure Rate %	29											

## 1.19 WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Eastern Cape	20	0	0	1	3	1	7	4	3	1	0	55.9
Free State												
Gauteng	20	0	2	3	0	3	3	5	1	2	1	52.3
KwaZulu-Natal												
Limpopo												
Mpumalanga												
North West												
Northern Cape												
Western Cape												
Total number of scripts marked												40

Province/Assessment Body	No of marked scripts	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%	Average
Total number passed						4	10	9	4	3	1	31
Pass Rate %												
Total number failed		0	2	4	3							
Failure Rate %												9

## 2 SUMMARY OF REPORTS ON MARKING AND MODERATION

### 2.1 ADHERENCE TO THE MEMORANDUM

No	Subject	Adherence to memo		Remarks
		Yes	No	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	√		Only approved memorandum used.
2	Human & Social Sciences	√		Final version of memorandum adhered to.
3	Information Communication Technology	√		Markers adhered to the guideline. The theory component in Section A was marked precisely according to the memo. Error made by one or two markers in awarding too many marks in PowerPoint question in Section C.
4	LLC Afrikaans	√		In most cases the memorandum was adhered to by the marker; occasionally the internal moderator corrected an error. Some moderators do not underline mistakes in transactional writing.
5	LLC English	√		Mostly the marking was correct. A few elements of non-adherence were evident in questions 1.4, 1.7 and 2.5.
6	LLC isiNdebele	√		Markers adhered to the marking memorandum signed after memorandum discussions.
7	LLC isiXhosa	√		No evidence of deviation.
8	LLC isiZulu	√		Marking as per marking guideline. Matrix for Section C remains a problem. The province that did not attend the memo discussion awarded marks incorrectly.
9	LLC Sepedi	√		Good training took place.
10	LLC Setswana	√		The markers have adhered to the marking memo.
11	LLC siSwati	√		Marking was thorough. No real difference between

No	Subject	Adherence to memo		Remarks
		Yes	No	
				provincial marks and external moderation.
12	LLC Tshivenda	√		The memorandum was adhered to by the markers. Changes effected at the memorandum discussions were taken into consideration by markers. Chief markers trained their markers well.
13	LLC Xitsonga	√		Marking was according to the marking memorandum.
14	Life Orientation	√		Followed as agreed at the memorandum discussions.
15	Mathematical Literacy	√		In the main, the markers adhered to the memorandum, with a few exceptions. The internal moderator in KwaZulu-Natal did not meet the standard.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	√		All markers adhered to the memorandum. Generally, the internal moderator understood and applied the memorandum consistently. Carried accuracy marks were appropriately awarded as per memorandum.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	√	√	Limpopo and Free State adhered to the marking memorandum. Other provinces showed partial adherence but Mpumalanga seemed to mark with no reference to the marking memorandum at all. Any irrelevant answer was marked as correct. Eastern Cape, Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal did not send any samples.
18	Technology	√		The marking memorandum was adhered to by all provinces. Alternative answers/similar explanations were accepted and accommodated.
19	Travel and Tourism	√		Questions were marked according to the memorandum.
20	Wholesale and Retail		√	The markers adhered to the memo in most cases, giving credit to candidates for correct answers even if not worded exactly as in the memo. The non-adherence to the memo was in Question 2 – calculations. The memo indicated a mark for the correct number and a mark for the correct calculation symbol. The first mark was not always given.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	

## 2.2 THE MEMORANDUM MADE PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE RESPONSES

No	Subject	Provision for alternative responses		Remarks
		Yes	No	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	√		Yes, alternate responses included at memorandum discussion.
2	Human and Social Sciences	√		The memo indicated that "any relevant response" could be accepted.
3	Information Communication Technology	√		At least four multiple choice questions allowed for one of two answers depending on the experiences of the candidates.
4	LLC Afrikaans	√		During the memorandum discussions, alternative answers were added and a provision was added that chief markers could accept any relevant answer. This is, however, a problem for markers who do not/cannot accommodate other relevant answers because they are not written into the memorandum.
5	LLC English	√		
6	LLC isiNdebele		√	No new alternatives were added.
7	LLC isiXhosa	√		Alternative responses were added at the memorandum discussion.
8	LLC isiZulu	√		Alternate answers were catered for where the application of knowledge was assessed.
9	LLC Sepedi	√		Alternate answers were accepted where dialectical and suppletive alternates applied.
10	LLC Setswana	√		Provision was made in the memorandum during memo discussion.
11	LLC siSwati	√		Alternative answers were given on the memorandum in questions 1.2, 1.11, 2.6 and 3.4.
12	LLC Tshivenda			An agreement in the memorandum discussion was that markers could consult their chief markers with regard to alternate answers, especially in question 1.1.
13	LLC Xitsonga	√		Alternative answers were added during the memorandum discussions following inputs from provinces.
14	Life Orientation	√		Provision was made for any other correct answer that the candidate might give. Alternatives were added at the memorandum discussions.

No	Subject	Provision for alternative responses		Remarks
		Yes	No	
15	Mathematical Literacy	√		This was undertaken and agreed to at the memorandum discussion meeting.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	√		The memorandum provided alternative answers for some questions.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	√		Many alternative answers could be, and were, accepted.
18	Technology	√		The memorandum allowed markers to accept appropriate and suitable answers. Chief markers had to include these alternatives in the memo that they submitted for sample moderation.
19	Travel and Tourism	√		Many questions allowed for alternative answers.
20	Wholesale and Retail	√		Some questions in Section B were open questions and allowed for own responses. The memo allowed for a number of different responses and allowed markers to accept applicable answers.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	

## 2.3 CONSISTENCY AND ACCURACY

The allocation of marks was consistent and totals were correct

No	Subject	Consistency and accuracy		Remarks
		Yes	No	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology			No response given
2	Human and Social Sciences	√		No problems experienced.
3	Information Communication Technology	√		Mark allocations were adhered to, apart from one exception, and marks were correctly noted, transferred and totalled, with only one marker making one error in totalling.
4	LLC Afrikaans	√		There was consistency in allocation of marks but markers occasionally marked wrong answers right and internal moderators did not rectify the errors. Some markers ignored the instruction to accept "any relevant answer".
5	LLC English	√		Predominantly the allocation of marks was spot on, with

No	Subject	Consistency and accuracy		Remarks
		Yes	No	
				only one instance of inaccuracy.
6	LLC isiNdebele		√	Owing to poor marking of Section C, the mark allocation was not consistently distributed.
7	LLC isiXhosa	√		
8	LLC isiZulu	√		Except in a few cases in the PED that did not attend the memo discussions.
9	LLC Sepedi	√		Good internal moderation.
10	LLC Setswana	√		There was consistency and accuracy in the allocation of marks, although there were a few minor differences in the totals.
11	LLC siSwati	√		There was consistency in the allocation of marks and totals were accurate.
12	LLC Tshivenda	√		Mark allocation was indicated by ticks. Marks where a moderator made a calculation error deprived a candidate of two marks. Consistent and accurate in both allocating marks and totalling.
13	LLC Xitsonga	√		Markers were consistent. The allocation of a tick followed by a mark was adhered to. Most provinces transferred marks correctly but the positioning of the total mark in some provinces is a challenge.
14	Life Orientation	√		The marking was quite accurate and tallying of marks was correct.
15	Mathematical Literacy	√		There was consistency in allocation of marks and scoring of scripts. One province was let down by poor internal moderation. There were occasional examples of inaccuracy in marking.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	√		There was a reasonable degree of consistency in the allocation of marks and accuracy of totals.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises		√	Error rating in respect of consistency is as follows: Free State 30%; Limpopo and Western Cape 50%; Northern Cape 70% and by far the worst was Mpumalanga, with 83.3% errors.
18	Technology	√		The samples moderated showed that the mark allocation was as per the memo discussion meeting. Totals were correct in most cases.
19	Travel and Tourism	√	√	Mostly consistent but errors were made by markers, most of which were picked up by internal moderators and adjusted, mostly downwards. The correct marks were entered on the mark sheets.
20	Wholesale and Retail		√	The external moderator used a question-by-question

No	Subject	Consistency and accuracy		Remarks
		Yes	No	
				approach to determine consistency in marking. Markers allocated marks to some of the candidates for writing the steps correctly while four candidates were not awarded the marks they deserved. In two of the scripts, inaccuracies in the calculation of marks were identified. One candidate was awarded more marks than the question was worth.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	

## 2.4 CHANGES TO THE MARKING MEMORANDUM WERE EFFECTED AT THE MARKING CENTRE

No	Subject	Changes were effected		Remarks
		Yes	No	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology		√	In all sampled learners scripts submitted to Umalusi, copies of question paper and approved marking memo were included for verification and comparison with the approved marking memo.
2	Human and Social Sciences		√	
3	Information Communication Technology		√	
4	LLC Afrikaans		√	No changes were made at the marking centres.
5	LLC English		√	
6	LLC isiNdebele		√	
7	LLC isiXhosa		√	
8	LLC isiZulu		√	
9	LLC Sepedi		√	Moderator did not attend memo discussion but there do not seem to be changes.
10	LLC Setswana		√	
11	LLC siSwati		√	
12	LLC Tshivenda		√	
13	LLC Xitsonga		√	
14	Life Orientation		√	

No	Subject	Changes were effected		Remarks
		Yes	No	
15	Mathematical Literacy		√	
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences		√	
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises		√	
18	Technology		√	
19	Travel and Tourism		√	
20	Wholesale and Retail		√	The marking guideline was changed during the memorandum discussion and sent to provinces. They adhered to the memorandum during marking.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	

## 2.5 STANDARD OF MARKING

How the standard of marking was rated

No	Subject	Standard of marking				Remarks
		Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology			√		The markers improved in marking compared with last year. However, there is room for improvement in counting of marks and allocation of marks.
2	Human and Social Sciences			√		Good adherence to the memorandum and no carelessness noted.
3	Information Communication Technology			√		The standard of marking was relatively consistent, Question 3 allowed for a degree of subjectivity but it was well managed. Owing to the easy nature of the INTC4 question paper (introductory level), the markers were able to adequately interpret all questions and give credit for correct answers.
4	LLC Afrikaans		√			Some markers cannot determine whether an answer is relevant or not. Markers cannot interpret rubrics. Markers do not carry out instructions, e.g. Questions 1, 2 and 3.
5	LLC English			√		Very few, and insignificant, discrepancies between the

No	Subject	Standard of marking				Remarks
		Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
						markers and the external moderation.
6	LLC isiNdebele		√			Markers were not able to use the marking rubric properly to score creative writing. Markers' comments showed a distinct isiZulu influence.
7	LLC isiXhosa			√		Markers adhered to the memorandum and showed a good grasp of how to use the matrix.
8	LLC isiZulu		√			The differences in mark allocations were evident in Section C, where markers were unable to use the marking matrix correctly.
9	LLC Sepedi			√		
10	LLC Setswana			√		The markers' performance was on par as there were only minor differences.
11	LLC siSwati				√	All questions were well marked, with answers of the same value given the same marks. Compositions and the invitation were particularly well marked.
12	LLC Tshivenda			√		Markers were vigilant and marks awarded to candidates were authentic.
13	LLC Xitsonga			√		Panel marking is consistent. Ticks indicated marks.
14	Life Orientation				√	The whole process was carried out in a professional manner.
15	Mathematical Literacy		√	√	√	Some provinces were merely average, but Limpopo, North West and Western Cape produced a good standard of marking. Marking was excellent in the Free State.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences			√		Generally the markers attempted to apply the memorandum consistently. In some instances markers recognised alternative answers and awarded marks correctly.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	√	√	√	√	Free State – excellent. Limpopo – good. North West, Western Cape, Northern Cape – average. Can be improved. Mpumalanga – poor. Too many ticks, inconsistent mark allocation, marks are scratched over on the cover by markers, chief marker, etc.
18	Technology			√		Mark allocation was on target. Alternative answers were accepted. There were only a few addition errors that should have been picked up by the checkers.
19	Travel and Tourism	√	√			The standard of marking was mostly average, but markers and internal moderators ignored gross errors in

No	Subject	Standard of marking				Remarks
		Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	
						spelling place names, which is not acceptable. A fair number of questions had marks adjusted downwards by the internal moderator. Unfortunately, marking in KwaZulu-Natal was poor, with spelling errors marked correct. Markers marked key words even though, when full answers were read during external moderation, the meaning was completely incorrect.
20	Wholesale and Retail			√		Generally marking was consistent and fair and candidates were given credit for correct answers. Only two calculation errors were identified.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	

## 2.6 INTERNAL MODERATION

There was evidence of internal moderation

No	Subject	Evidence of internal moderation		Remarks
		Yes	No	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	√		Internal moderation was done in most provinces except one, where some scripts not internally moderated were sent to Umalusi.
2	Human and Social Sciences	√		Mostly several layers of moderation.
3	Information Communication Technology	√		In total 53 scripts were submitted for external moderation. Only seven out of 17 submitted by Free State were moderated. These did not include high performers, but entire scripts were moderated. 18 out of 20 scripts were moderated in the Western Cape but some seemed to have been shadow marked. Eight of 16 Gauteng scripts were moderated, but neither the marker nor the internal moderator picked up a glaring irregularity of copying in three scripts.
4	LLC Afrikaans	√		In most provinces internal moderation is thorough and adds value in terms of better teaching and better results. In KZN, the internal moderator repeats what the marker has done with a different pen.

No	Subject	Evidence of internal moderation		Remarks
		Yes	No	
5	LLC English	√		The scripts had been re-marked. Internal moderation minimised inconsistencies and non-adherence. The internal moderator in Gauteng was not effective.
6	LLC isiNdebele	√	√	Mpumalanga scripts were well moderated but Gauteng scripts were not moderated.
7	LLC isiXhosa	√	√	Some provinces moderated, others did not moderate at all; one province moderated only Section C and one province moderated, but no changes were made to the markers' allocations.
8	LLC isiZulu	√		Different coloured pens and initials appeared on the covers of scripts.
9	LLC Sepedi	√		Mistakes corrected by internal moderators.
10	LLC Setswana	√		Internal moderation was visible within the scripts and the effects of the changes were reflected in most of the total marks.
11	LLC siSwati	√		The internal moderator had re-marked the 20 scripts sent to Umalusi. Mark allocations and totals were checked by the internal moderator.
12	LLC Tshivenda	√		There is evidence of moderation by the chief marker and the internal moderator. Good standard and relevant input from moderators.
13	LLC Xitsonga	√		The internal moderators used different coloured ink and agreed with markers in some cases but made changes in others.
14	Life Orientation	√		The sample which was internally moderated was correct to the letter.
15	Mathematical Literacy	√		Moderation was very poor in one province but in some provinces there were up to four levels of moderation.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	√		The internal moderator ensured that the marking was conducted in line with the agreed marking memorandum and practices. Thus resulting was fair, valid and reliable. Generally, the internal moderator's suggestions were followed through in the marking process. Re-marking was evident in the moderated scripts.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	√		Between 60% and 80% of the scripts submitted per province had been internally moderated, but the Mpumalanga moderator simply pushed up marks.
18	Technology	√		Different coloured pens were used for internal

No	Subject	Evidence of internal moderation		Remarks
		Yes	No	
				moderation. In none of the cases was the entire sample moderated. Moderated scripts numbered between one and 15 of the 20 scripts submitted.
19	Travel and Tourism	√		No report was submitted by KwaZulu-Natal and only one set of the submitted scripts had been moderated. In other cases internal moderation was good and Gauteng had three layers of moderation.
20	Wholesale and Retail	√		There was evidence in some of the scripts that they had been moderated. Scripts had been re-marked and in some cases, marks adjusted. Internal moderators initialled the scripts and recorded the moderated/adjusted mark on the mark sheet.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	

## 2.7 UNFAIR QUESTIONS

There were questions that were unfairly presented, outside the syllabus or beyond the level of the candidates.

No	Subject	Unfair questions		Remarks
		Yes	No	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology		√	
2	Human and Social Sciences		√	All questions were within the unit standards and competency level of ABET 4 candidates.
3	Information Communication Technology		√	
4	LLC Afrikaans		√	All questions were within the syllabus.
5	LLC English		√	All questions were at an appropriate level. The only question that posed a challenge was 3.3 but it was removed at the memo discussion and marks will be scaled up to make up for this.
6	LLC isiNdebele		√	
7	LLC isiXhosa		√	
8	LLC isiZulu		√	
9	LLC Sepedi		√	
10	LLC Setswana		√	

No	Subject	Unfair questions		Remarks
		Yes	No	
11	LLC siSwati		√	
12	LLC Tshivenda		√	The paper is relevant to the current policy and is relevant to classroom practice. The paper was not biased but contained questions of an appropriate standard.
13	LLC Xitsonga		√	
14	Life Orientation		√	
15	Mathematical Literacy		√	
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences		√	
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises		√	Questions set were well within the syllabus and expectations of Level 4, but candidates had a language problem and struggled to write sentence answers. They had not been taught appropriate terminology.
18	Technology		√	No unfair questions, although provinces complained, mostly about Question 5. However, the cause was candidates not being properly prepared and not unfair questions.
19	Travel and Tourism		√	
20	Wholesale and Retail	√		Section B, Question 3 – candidates were expected to draw an organogram of an organisation and then answer questions relating to the organogram, promotion prospects and self-development. Many candidates opted not to do this question as ABET Level 4 candidates are only expected to interpret a hierarchy, to explain and to describe. The internal moderator believed candidates should have been taught this work.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	

## 2.8 COMMENT ON THE CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE

According to responses from the candidates, did they find the paper

No	Subject	Candidates' performance			Remarks
		Fair	Easy	Difficult	
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	√			The question was fair. Only candidates in two provinces struggled in this learning area.
2	Human and Social Sciences	√			It was a good paper; no ambiguities or distractions, and instructions were clear.
3	Information Communication Technology	√			The median is 45% and the average 44.9%. Most candidates who underperformed did poorly in the theory component. No candidate in the sampled scripts obtained above 80% and only five obtained a mark below 40%.
4	LLC Afrikaans	√			The top candidates in the seven provinces moderated scored between 78 and 90 out of 100. Of the 140 scripts sampled, only 38 candidates had less than 40 out of 100. Candidates who were taught well managed to answer all the questions.
5	LLC English	√			The majority of candidates in the sample did well in the examination.
6	LLC isiNdebele	√			The paper was fair but some candidates used English in answering questions. Some candidates were simply ill-prepared for the examination.
7	LLC isiXhosa	√			Sample scripts showed candidates scored a range of marks, from under 40% to over 70%.
8	LLC isiZulu	√			Candidates were able to answer most questions correctly. In Section C some candidates interpreted the topics incorrectly or did not know the structure of some shorter pieces.
9	LLC Sepedi	√			Most questions were attempted. Topical issues were discussed in the question paper. Candidates were generally well prepared.
10	LLC Setswana	√			Most candidates performed fairly well.
11	LLC siSwati	√			Just a few found questions challenging, especially those who achieved less than 30%.
12					
13	LLC Tshivenda	√			Most candidates struggled with question 2.1 but the paper contained a number of well formulated,

					challenging questions of a high cognitive level.
14	LLC Xitsonga	√			Highest marks in sampled scripts were 80 and 91. Prepared candidates did well.
15	Life Orientation	√			With a median of 6 and a mean of 51.4, the paper was fair.
16	Mathematical Literacy	√			The scripts submitted for verification showed that the performance of candidates was fair, with a normal spread across the percentage range.
17	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	√			Eleven out of 20 students scored above 50% and six students scored below 40%.
18	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	√	√	√	Candidate responses to the DHET paper showed that the paper ranged from difficult to fair to easy.
19	Technology	√			For the first time, candidates attained 70% and higher. Educators are getting to grips with the content and using past papers so that candidates have exposure to different types of questions.
20	Travel and Tourism	√	√	√	Generally candidates found it a very fair paper and this was reflected in the marks. Free State candidates, however, found it an easy paper and attained good marks, except for the question on the map where the average was only 3 out of 10. The Western Cape candidates found the paper very difficult and only nine out of 20 candidates passed.
1	Wholesale and Retail	√			Candidate results in the sample ranged from 27% to 81% and the average for the group was 55.9%. The weaker candidates struggled with interpretation questions, but achieved 50% in answering short questions. They therefore knew the content.
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	

## 2.9 FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

### i. For internal moderators

No	Subject	Remarks
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	All scripts for external moderation must be re-marked to confirm the markers' marks. The internal moderator must authenticate, by signing for changes made. Electronic mark sheets must be moderated in full and signed by the internal moderator.
2	Human and Social Sciences	Internal moderation was competent. Moderators could spend more time training markers on how to record marks on scripts.
3	Information Communication	Internal moderators must remember to submit a report. Internal moderators must be alert to the possibility of copying in practical

No	Subject	Remarks
	Technology	components of a question paper. Electronic copies should be submitted together with sample scripts, in the case of INCT4 candidates.
4	LLC Afrikaans	In some provinces there is no evidence of thorough internal moderation. In Mpumalanga the pen used by the marker and internal moderator is almost the same colour. In KwaZulu-Natal, no marks were changed during internal moderation, although a number of marks were changed in the external moderation process.
5	LLC English	Training of markers in the use of the matrix is imperative. If they cannot use the matrix they will over-score in these sections.
6	LLC isiNdebele	It is advised that scripts should be moderated by a chief marker if there is no internal moderator. The internal moderator should attend the memorandum discussions.
7	LLC isiXhosa	Internal moderators must moderate all questions in all provinces. They need to re-mark the script and not just confirm whatever the marker decided.
8	LLC isiZulu	Acceptable standard of question paper was noted.
9	LLC Sepedi	Internal moderator should check candidates who are awarded a borderline mark.
10	LLC Setswana	Moderation was done accordingly. When moderating the scripts, make sure that all the questions in the script are moderated and not just one question. Mark changes must be transferred / written on the outside, neatly. Do not scratch over the markers' marks.
11	LLC siSwati	All the questions in the script are moderated and not one question only. The changes of marks must be transferred/written outside neatly, do not write over the markers' marks (Gauteng and Mpumalanga)
12	LLC Tshivenda	
13	LLC Xitsonga	
14	Life Orientation	Good internal moderation.
15	Mathematical Literacy	The majority of internal moderation carried out was good. It is assumed that feedback was given to markers to prevent inappropriate practices permeating the system. Good internal moderation will result in improved teaching as well as improved marking.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	The internal moderation ensured that the marking memorandum was consistently applied and alternative answers were appropriately awarded in most instances. The standard of internal moderation was reasonably good.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	Moderators must be sure to adhere to the marking memorandum. Free State moderation was very good.
18	Technology	Moderation was of a good standard. Marker errors and alternative answers were corrected. All bodies should use the same colour pen for moderation – perhaps green.

No	Subject	Remarks
19	Travel and Tourism	Internal moderating ranged from fair to poor. Internal moderator reports must be submitted, as must the final mark sheet, so that it can be checked that moderated marks have been / will be captured. Moderators must not simply agree with markers to the extent that incorrectly marked answers are approved.
20	Wholesale and Retail	Internal moderation was good. The internal moderator knows his subject and has suggested that workshops be held to assist facilitators to understand the unit standards.

**i) ii. For examiners**

No	Subject	Remarks
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	There is a need to appoint a second examiner for AAAT 4 who is trained in the setting of question papers.
2	Human and Social Sciences	DHET examiner – marks allocated to questions must be clear and self-evident for candidates. Simple language makes understanding easy.
3	Information Communication Technology	Many candidates edited and made changes in Question 3 on the document saved for Question 2, thereby losing the evidence of Question 2. Instructions to candidates to save their work must be inserted at the beginning of every question in Sections B and C.
4	LLC Afrikaans	Examiners must ensure that questions are not biased against non-home language speakers. All candidates must be able to answer the questions if taught well. The examiners are commended on the variety and relevance of source topics.
5	LLC English	Avoid a repeat of question 3.3, where the instruction was not clear.
6	LLC isiNdebele	Examiners are setting questions with appealing visuals, but there should be a balance in terms of appropriate cognitive levels (Barrett and Bloom's taxonomies). The question on banking machines was too easy.
7	LLC isiXhosa	Innovation has been shown in this question paper. Unit standards are covered and there is a spread of questions across cognitive levels.
8	LLC isiZulu	The paper was fair and current topics were used in Section C for creative writing and shorter pieces of writing.
9	LLC Sepedi	Examiners should probe aspects pertinent to the marking as a whole.
10	LLC Setswana	Good, well balanced question paper. Text used for comprehension was short, simple and relevant to the times. Tutors and candidates need to practise how to write essays and letters.

No	Subject	Remarks
		A job well done to those who have trained them to use the mind map.
11	LLC siSwati	Questions pertaining to cartoons must be specific to the cartoon, not general language questions.
12	LLC Tshivenda	The paper is relevant to current policy and to classroom practice. Current issues in the country are well-incorporated into questions. Formatting is good and the marking grids for creative writing are nicely illustrated according to performance.
13	LLC Xitsonga	The paper was fair and well designed. There is an improvement in performance. The candidates are examined on current issues, which prepare them well. The quality of pictures has improved.
14	Life Orientation	Fair paper.
15	Mathematical Literacy	No comment.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	The question paper assessed the core assessment standards adequately. The paper was cognitively balanced. The structure of the memorandum, which also contained alternative answers, contributed to successful facilitation of marking and moderation.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	
18	Technology	The paper was answered much better than in previous years, clearly indicated by fewer results at the lower end. However, the quality of the diagrams needs to be improved so as not to create any doubt as to the question. The use of diagrams, and not pictures, will help tremendously.
19	Travel and Tourism	A good paper. The wording of questions such as Question 5 must be attended to. The majority of questions should not have posed a problem for candidates.
20	Wholesale and Retail	Although the questions were pitched at the correct level, the following should be considered: adherence to the examination guidelines in respect of the structure of the question paper, i.e. include a Section C with elements of comprehension etc.; ensure questions meet the criteria of the unit standards; ensure weighting is according to guidelines; and illustrations must correlate to questions.

iii. For chief markers and markers

No	Subject	Remarks
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	Only subject matter specialists in AAAT 4 must be appointed to mark the scripts for this learning area. The chief marker must be a subject matter specialist in AAAT 4.
2	Human and Social Sciences	The accuracy in marking and counting final marks of the learners must be improved. Calculators must be made available to count learners' final scores.
3	Information Communication Technology	
4	LLC Afrikaans	The marking must not be done by one marker for all questions, per script. Different markers must be allocated different questions, especially from section B and C, in questions that have 20 marks.
5	LLC English	The matrix must be understood and properly applied to avoid giving undeserved marks.
6	LLC isiNdebele	Markers should refer to the marking guideline frequently. They must use their subject/language knowledge when marking. Because the isiNdebele word for pin number is not commonly used, "pin number" should have been accepted as correct. Chief markers should attend the memorandum discussion.
7	LLC isiXhosa	Markers adhered to the memorandum.
8	LLC isiZulu	All chief markers must attend memo discussions – no absences are acceptable. Incorrect marking occurred in the province where the chief marker did not attend the memo discussion.
9	LLC Sepedi	Pencil must not be used for marking.
10	LLC Setswana	Markers and chief markers, the use of the new matrix for Questions 3 and 4 is very important. Check the addition of marks and, again, their transfer, and whether it is accurate. Stick to the memo, especially Q2.
11	LLC siSwati	The marking of creative writing must be given serious attention. Not only must spelling be checked, but also creativity, content, language, etc.
12	LLC Tshivenda	Chief markers should train educators through workshops on how to teach summary questions and creative writing. Teachers need to be trained to use the marking matrix.
13	LLC Xitsonga	Educators need to attend workshops on creative writing and transactional writing, as well as language issues like spelling and punctuation.
14	Life Orientation	The marking was sterling.
15	Mathematical Literacy	The good marking is acknowledged. Every effort must be made to continue the development of markers and to maintain a level

No	Subject	Remarks
		of good practice.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	Carried accuracy marks allocated appropriately. Candidate's argument / explanation followed through. Alternative answers recognised.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	Markers and chief markers must double-check mark allocations. Mpumalanga markers need to refer to memo model answers and to spend more time training to mark a memo.
18	Technology	Markers should insert totals for sub-questions, and total at the end of questions. They must also initial the question marked. Where sub-totals were used, there were no computation errors. Markers must mark per question or even two questions per paper, but not the entire question paper.
19	Travel and Tourism	Marking was not particularly good. In many instances incorrect answers were marked as correct and really badly spelt place names were marked correct, which is not acceptable. The KwaZulu-Natal markers seemed to lack knowledge and experience in marking.
20	Wholesale and Retail	Marking was consistent and fair. Guidelines as to how marks should be allocated and recorded were followed.

## 2.10 ADJUSTMENT OF MARKS

No	Subject	Remarks
1	Applied Agriculture and Agricultural Technology	No comment
2	Human and Social Sciences	The question papers were of a reasonable standard, marking was good and moderation consistent.
3	Information Communication Technology	An 8% upward adjustment is recommended. This is the first INCT4 external examination and neither facilitators nor candidates had a reference point from which to prepare themselves. Many candidates did not complete the practical session. The failure rate needs to be reduced.
4	LLC Afrikaans	Most candidates passed the paper. All provinces were satisfied with the standard of the question paper.
5	LLC English	The paper was fair and within the scope of Level 4.
6	LLC isiNdebele	The sample candidates received an average of 57%. The paper was fair, despite the difficulties with creative writing.
7	LLC isiXhosa	The paper was fair, with questions spread across cognitive levels and unit standards.
8	LLC isiZulu	There were generally no real differences in Umalusi and PED marks.
9	LLC Sepedi	No comment.

No	Subject	Remarks
10	LLC Setswana	The paper was fair, relevant and gives a true reflection of the candidates' abilities.
11	LLC siSwati	Scripts were fairly marked; marks were well allocated; questions reasonable. 70% of the sample passed.
12	LLC Tshivenda	The candidates performed well in most sections. The paper is of a fair and appropriate standard.
13	LLC Xitsonga	The performance of sample candidates was well balanced. The performance is fair to excellent, except for the few candidates who were not prepared for the examination.
14	Life Orientation	The marking was accurate and candidates understood the questions. The paper was pitched at ABET Level 4 standard.
15	Mathematical Literacy	A fairly normal distribution of marks was evident, with a relatively even spread of marks on either side of the 50% mark. This observation is limited to the sample submitted to Umalusi for verification.
16	Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences	No comment.
17	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	Raw scores could be accepted as there were no major differences in results following external moderation. Mpumalanga needed to be adjusted downwards because of poor marking and upward adjustment by the internal moderator.
18	Technology	There is a much better spread of marks across all levels. Candidates who studied performed well.
19	Travel and Tourism	Marks needed to be adjusted downwards, as marks on the sample scripts were adjusted downwards by between 3% and 9% during external moderation.
20	Wholesale and Retail	This is the first question paper in this learning area and so comparisons could not be made.



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

**UMALUSI**



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training