



**2009**

**Report on the quality assurance  
of the National Senior Certificate  
Assessment and Examination:  
The Independent Examinations  
Board (IEB)**

QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE INDEPENDENT  
EXAMINATIONS BOARD ASSESSMENT  
AND EXAMINATIONS  
NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE  
APPROVAL MEETING REPORT –  

---

21 DECEMBER 2009

PUBLISHED BY:



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

COPYRIGHT 2009 UMALUSI COUNCIL FOR QUALITY  
ASSURANCE IN GENERAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION  
AND TRAINING. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

# Contents

---

<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1. Overview of the report.....	1
2. Purpose of the report.....	1
<b>CHAPTER 2: SCOPE</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3: FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1. Moderation of question papers.....	3
2. Moderation of Site-Based Assessment.....	4
3. Monitoring of examinations.....	9
4. Verification of marking.....	12
5. Standardisation of marks.....	13
<b>CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>16</b>
1. Areas of good practice.....	16
2. Areas of concern.....	16
3. Recommendations.....	16
4. Conclusion.....	16

# Acronymns

---

ASs	Assessment Standards
FAL	First Additional Language
HL	Home Language
IEB	Independent Examinations Board
LO(s)	Learning Outcome(s)
NSC	National Senior Certificate
P1, P2, P3	Paper 1, Paper 2, Paper 3
PET(s)	Physical Education Task(s)
SAG(s)	Subject Assessment Guideline(s)
SAL	Second Additional Language
SBA	Site-Based Assessment

# Foreword

---

Umalusi conducted the quality assurance of the Independent Examinations Board (IEB) assessment and examination for the 2009 National Senior Certificate (NSC). Quality assurance was conducted on the following processes:

- (i) Moderation of question papers;
- (ii) Moderation of internal assessment;
- (iii) Monitoring of the examinations;
- (iv) Verification of marking; and
- (v) Standardization of marks.

The quality assurance of each of these processes mentioned above is conducted based on Umalusi criteria. The criteria used are subjected to constant review and refinement, to ensure that they are in line with current trends in assessment and examinations.

Umalusi judges the quality and standard of the question papers by determining the level of adherence to policy and guidelines, the appropriateness and weighting of the content, the cognitive demand of the question papers, the relevance of the marking memoranda, and the level and rigor of internal moderation. While all these aspects are crucial in determining good examination question papers, the cognitive challenge of the papers remains key to Umalusi. The cognitive challenge provides a fair indication of how well the question papers discriminate between high and low achievers.

In moderating the Site-Based Assessment (SBA) portfolios Umalusi seeks to ascertain whether the implementation of SBA is consistent with the national standards, determines the fairness and validity of the assessment tasks, and verifies the level and rigor of the internal moderation conducted.

Umalusi monitored all the aspects of the conduct of the IEB NSC examination through a comprehensive and integrated monitoring system. This integrated system involves self-evaluation by the assessment bodies of their state of readiness to administer the examination, verification of this by Umalusi, sampling of examination and marking centres, direct monitoring, as well as shadowing of monitors.

Umalusi moderators verified the moderation and marking of the IEB scripts during a centralized verification exercise held at Umalusi in the first week of December 2009. The purpose of the verification was to establish the level of consistency in the marking, as well as adherence to the marking memoranda.

As a final quality assurance measure, Umalusi moderated the final marks awarded to the candidates. This is done through a rigorous standardization process carried out in line with established principles and procedures. Through this process, Umalusi ensures the consistency of the NSC examination over time. Apart from the statistical inputs presented, Umalusi considered qualitative inputs, as well as very sound educational reasoning, to arrive at the 2009 standardization decisions. Umalusi is proud to indicate that in the main, the candidates' raw marks were accepted. There were a few instances though where it was necessary to perform minor adjustments to the candidates' raw marks.

# Chapter 1

---

## Overview of the report

### **1. OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT**

Umalusi has been assigned the statutory obligation to perform the quality assurance of all the exit points assessments and examinations within its scope of jurisdiction. In fulfilling this statutory responsibility, and also with the express aim of maintaining and improving the norms and standards in the NSC Examination, Umalusi undertook the following quality assurance initiatives:

- (i) Moderation of the NSC November 2009 question papers;
- (ii) Moderation of the SBA portfolios;
- (iii) Monitoring of the conduct of the NSC examination;
- (iv) Verification of marking; and the
- (v) Standardization of marks.

### **2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of Umalusi's quality assurance of the IEB 2009 NSC examination with respect to the following:

- The salient findings of the question paper moderation from the external moderators' reports, which are synthesized, analyzed, and used to make judgments on the standard of the NSC examinations;
- The quality and standard of the IEB SBA;
- The quality and standard of the marking;
- The efficiency and effectiveness of the IEB processes for the conduct of the NSC examinations; and
- The moderation of marks during the standardization process.

This report presents the findings emanating from the above-mentioned quality assurance processes. The report also highlights areas of concern that require improvement by the IEB, as well as areas of good practice that the IEB should be commended on.

# Chapter 2

## Scope

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The tables below provide the extent to which quality assurance was conducted for each of the processes:

**Table 1: Moderation of question papers**

Number of subjects	Number of question papers	Approved / Conditionally approved at 1 <sup>st</sup> moderation	Approved / Conditionally approved at 2 <sup>nd</sup> moderation	Approved / Conditionally approved at 3 <sup>rd</sup> moderation
34	73	44	20	9

**Note:** Only one paper was rejected at first moderation – Sepedi First Additional Language (FAL) Paper (P)1. The paper was subsequently approved at 2<sup>nd</sup> moderation.

**Table 2: Moderation of internal assessment**

Subjects selected	Sample size	Total number of portfolios moderated	Number of external moderators
Business Studies	60 portfolios (6 from 10 schools)	57	2
Physical Science	60 portfolios (6 from 10 schools)	30	1
History	60 portfolios (6 from 10 schools)	60	1
Life Orientation	60 portfolios (6 from 10 schools)	30	1

**Table 3: Monitoring of the examinations**

Number of exam centres	Number of candidates enrolled	Number of exam centres monitored by Umalusi monitors	Number of exam centres monitored by Umalusi staff	Number of marking centres monitored	Number of Umalusi monitors
172	8 571	6	3	1	1

**Table 4: Verification of marking**

Subjects moderated	Sample size	Total number of scripts
Accounting P1, Paper (P)2; Afrikaans P1, P2; Business Studies P1, P2; Economics; English FAL P1, P2; Geography P1, P2; History P1, P2; Life Sciences P1, P2; Mathematics P1, P2, Paper (P)3; Mathematical Literacy P1, P2; Physical Science P1, P2	20 scripts per paper	420 scripts



# Chapter 3

---

## Findings

### 1. MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS

The off-site moderation approach was used for the IEB question papers. The IEB sent the question papers by courier, with all the accompanying documents, to individual external moderators who moderated them and then returned them to the IEB.

60% of the IEB papers were approved at first moderation and very few went for third moderation, about 12%. This scenario illustrates the effort made by the IEB examiners to ensure that the papers were of the desired quality.

The findings are presented according to the Umalusi criteria for the moderation of question papers:

#### (i) Technical aspects

Generally the IEB question papers and memoranda complied in all respects with this criterion. They were neatly typed and clearly laid out with clearly specified instructions to candidates.

Only in a few papers were concerns pertaining to technical aspects raised. These papers were: Visual Arts, IsiZulu Second Additional Language (SAL) P2, Sesotho FAL P1, History P2, Music and Siswati Home Language (HL) P1.

- In Visual Arts the layout of the paper was not candidate-friendly with the result that weaker candidates would find the document complex and confusing. The external moderator's concern in this regard could not be addressed because she was told that teachers and candidates were already familiar with the structure of the paper as it was. The external moderator, however, still maintained that the format of the paper was too complex.

The concerns in the other papers listed above (quality of pictures and numbering) were addressed during the subsequent moderations.

#### (ii) Internal moderation

The internal moderation was generally of a high standard in the IEB. This sentiment was expressed in a number of subjects, including Mathematics. No concerns pertaining to internal moderation were raised.

#### (iii) Content coverage

The majority of papers complied with this criterion in all respects. Concerns regarding inadequate coverage of content were raised in Music. It was reported that Learning Outcomes (LOs) 2 and 3 were not adequately assessed and that the skill of melody writing and harmonization of melodies was not assessed.

The moderators received all the analysis grids, and gave some suggestions and recommendations towards their improvement.

**(iv) Cognitive demand**

No major concerns were raised with regard to the cognitive demand in the IEB question papers. A concern regarding an improper distribution of cognitive skills was raised in Mathematics P1 in the first moderation. Many questions were found to fall under 'routine procedures' and a recommendation was made that they should be replaced with more challenging questions. This concern was addressed in the second moderation.

**(v) Marking memoranda**

Suggestions that memoranda needed attention were made only in Sepedi FAL, Mathematics P2 and Siswati HL P1. These were minor problems entailing language, grammatical, and typographical errors, which were resolved in the subsequent moderation.

**(vi) Language and bias**

The language usage was appropriate for the majority of the IEB papers.

The only concerns raised with regard to language were in Mathematics, and Visual Arts, where it is suggested that the language be simplified to accommodate non mother-tongue speakers.

**(vii) Predictability**

No issues pertaining to predictability were raised.

**(viii) Adherence to assessment policies or guidelines**

Adherence to the IEB assessment policies or guidelines was observed in the majority of papers. Instances of non-adherence were reported in Economics and Physical Science P2. These were however addressed in the subsequent moderations.

<b>Paper</b>	<b>Finding/Concern</b>
Physical Science P2	Certain questions needed to be modified so that they were within IEB policy.

**(ix) Overall impression**

The IEB question papers were generally of a high standard. As alluded to, a large percentage of the papers were approved at first moderation with only a few requiring third moderation.

## 2. MODERATION OF SBA

### Part 1: Business Studies, Physics, History

#### (i) Compliance with policy and guidelines

Across the four moderated subjects, the moderators reported that the IEB has developed a document called the *IEB Manual for the Moderation of School Based Assessment for the National Senior Certificate Examination*, and another titled *Regional Portfolio Moderation* intended to guide the moderation of internal assessment and improve the quality thereof.

Generally, the majority of the IEB schools complied with the implementation of the NCS and the IEB Subject Assessment Guidelines (SAGs).

#### (ii) Quality and standard of internal moderation

It was observed that the IEB conducted their internal moderation to an acceptable standard and within expectations. The moderation panels were pleased to find convincing evidence that the internal moderation conducted at the cluster and national levels included intensive remarking of tasks. However, there were some instances where moderation was compromised, as can be seen in the following table:

Subject	Finding
Physical Science	Some educators administered tasks that were not moderated, neither were the marking guidelines.
Business Studies	Very few portfolios had evidence of school-based moderation. In some tasks, in particular the oral presentation, peer-group assessment was implemented and the educator merely appended his/her signature.

#### (iii) Quality and standard of tasks

- **Validity of tasks**

No major concerns were raised regarding how well the set tasks measured what was intended, except for the cases that are indicated in the table below:

Subject	Finding
Physical Science	Some of the tasks used to assess Practical Investigation were inappropriate and invalid as they did not evaluate the learners' ability to use science investigation to solve problems. Instead, the educators preferred to set tasks that assessed theory. Many of those tasks that were set to assess investigations appeared in textbooks, thus learners could easily copy answers.

- **Cognitive demand**

The cognitive demand of the internally-set tasks is still a challenge to some educators. Concerns relating to cognitive demand were noted in the subjects indicated in the following table:

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Finding</b>
History	<p>The cognitive levels in some instances were not addressed in terms of the IEB SAG. In cases where they were addressed, some educators could not reflect a well-balanced range of levels as per the guideline requirement.</p> <p>Some of the class-work and tests were found to be lacking, as some sources were not appropriately contextualized.</p> <p>Some educators preferred to photocopy activities directly from textbooks without adapting them to suit the intended outcome. As a result an unbalanced distribution of cognitive levels compromised the intended standards.</p> <p>The standard of some of the historical investigation topics set was too low cognitively.</p>
Physical Science	<p>The Practical Investigations tasks indicated that the top end of the taxonomy (problem solving) was neglected.</p>

**(iv) Marking reliability**

IEB conducted intensive training on marking for their educators. It was noted that this training improved the quality and standard of the marking significantly. It was noted in Business Studies that mock marking improved and strengthened the internal marking of tasks.

The following concerns were, however, raised:

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Finding</b>
Business Studies	<p>The marking style of some educators does not allow learners to be able to identify their mistakes.</p> <p>The marking a dialogue seems to be problematic as it still poses a challenge to many markers.</p>
History	<p>There was a degree of inconsistency in the allocation of marks by some schools. In certain centres there were no evidence of marking of historical tasks in the portfolios, but marks were recorded on mark-sheets.</p>
Physical Science	<p>There were cases where marks were unreliable as the marking guideline had errors. There was no evidence to suggest that marks were adjusted to accommodate these errors.</p> <p>Theoretical questions that were set to assess practical investigations inflated the mark for the tests and examinations, making their weighting more than the 40% prescribed in the SAG document.</p> <p>Another concern is that the average percentages for the SBAs were too high to be credible.</p>

## **Part 2: Life Orientation**

The following practices were observed regarding Life Orientation implementation:

- All the tasks for the Further Education and Training band (i.e., Grades 10-12) are taken into consideration for the final Grade 12 mark;
- All the learners had to complete a number of Certificate Tasks;
- All the learners had to do community work and provide evidence of said work;
- The September Task is a Common Assessment Task similar to the Grade 9 CTA in public schools; and
- The mark allocation is calculated proportionally for the three years and constitutes 100% of the final mark in Grade 12.

### **(i) Compliance with national standards**

- The IEB has complied fully with the implementation of Life Orientation in all its schools.
- The portfolios included all the tasks completed from Grades 10 to 12 over the three-year cycle.
- Evidence of the five tasks, certificate tasks, and community service were found in the learners' files. The completion of the two latter tasks has made the IEB's Life Orientation programme particularly meaningful.
- Evidence of Physical Education Tasks (PETs) was also found, albeit limited.

### **(ii) Quality of assessment tasks**

- **Other tasks**
  - The tasks were self-developed by the schools and ranged from good to excellent. All the tasks had been pitched at an appropriate level for Grade 12 purposes and had combined both factual and application skills.
  - The learners had also responded to the tasks in a meaningful and practical way. The quality of the learners' responses was, in most cases, excellent. The tasks were well-researched and presented in professional manner.
  - Some of the notable tasks observed in certain IEB schools are as follows:
    - a. Excellent tasks on 'unfair labour practices' and on 'stress';
    - b. Good tasks on 'the world of Work' and on 'conflict';
    - c. Good tasks on 'marriage' and 'pre-marital sex' using a religious approach balanced with the LOs and Assessment Standards (ASs) of Life Orientation;
    - d. Good tasks on 'what shapes me?' and 'life style diseases';
    - e. Excellent tasks on 'analysis of CVs to appoint a candidate' and on 'stress'. The PET was also aligned with the 'stress' task.
- **Question papers**
  - Evidence of at least one exam / test task was found in the provided sample. Some schools had two exam tasks and these had been written in March and June. These tasks were self-developed and the quality thereof varied from school to school.
  - The question papers posed a number of challenges, inter alia:
    - a. Each school had a different understanding of how to design the test / exam. In other words, the structure of the question papers differed from school to school (and was not in line with the SAG).

- b. The question papers did not include Section A (short questions) and Section C (essay / paragraph questions).
- c. The mark allocation differed from school to school.
- d. The quality of the questions also differed.

- **PET**

- The interpretation of the PETs varied from school to school. While some schools had a theoretical approach to PETs, others had a combination between a theoretical and practical approach.
- At some schools it seemed as if PET was not part of the formal Life Orientation programme and learners were expected to engage in Physical Education in their spare time and to report their progress in their logbooks.

**(iii) Internal moderation**

- Moderation was conducted at the cluster, regional, and national levels and was detailed. All the schools that were found to have challenges during the regional moderation were further subjected to national moderation to ensure compliance.
- Detailed moderation reports per learners' files moderated and per school were found in the educators' and national file. The evidence provided shows continuous monitoring and moderation of tasks.

## 3. MONITORING OF EXAMINATIONS

The following phases were monitored:

- State of readiness;
- Writing of the exam; and
- Marking of scripts.

### 3.1 Monitoring of the state of readiness

The self-evaluation instruments completed by the assessment bodies looked at the level of compliance with each of the criteria listed below. The IEB reported compliance in many respects with most of the criteria. Where limited compliance was reported it was because monitoring took place prior to the actual dates when those processes were due to be completed. Aspects such as the capturing of internal assessment, the appointment and training of markers, the appointment and training of centre managers, and the editing and printing of question papers usually take place after monitoring has been conducted. However, the assessment bodies provided evidence relating to management plans that gave an indication of when those aspects were scheduled to take place.

#### (i) Capturing of SBA marks

At the time of monitoring, the assessment bodies had not yet captured the SBA marks. This was to be done during the fourth term.

#### (ii) Appointment and training of markers

The IEB had already appointed markers as per the criteria. The training of the IEB markers was scheduled for the first day of marking when markers reported.

#### (iii) Appointment and training of centre managers

The centre managers were already appointed and trained at the time of monitoring. The IEB used only one marking centre.

#### (iv) Editing and printing of question papers set internally

At the time of monitoring the IEB question papers had already been edited and signed-off as print-ready.

### 3.2 Monitoring of the writing

#### (i) General management of the examination

Generally, the management of the examination was well conducted at all the centres visited by Umalusi. All the centres had the following documents available: examination time-tables, invigilation time-tables, seating plans, and examination manuals.

## **(ii) Storage of examination papers**

The IEB delivered their question papers and answer books directly to all their centres in Gauteng on a two-weekly basis. The centres received the question papers and immediately stored them in their strong rooms. The Chief invigilators, and sometimes their deputies, were the only ones who had access to the question papers. They were also responsible for the issuance, control, storage, and return of the examination material. The IEB kept proper control of all the stationery used, unused, and spoilt on a specific form.

Candidates with special needs had obtained special concessions and were given proper attention.

## **(iii) The examination room**

The examination rooms were generally conducive for the writing of examinations. The rooms were clearly marked and clean with adequate light and good ventilation. There was no noise in and around the examination centres.

The seating of the candidates was generally well organized according to the seating plans.

In all the centres, the time was clearly displayed either through a clock at the front of the room, or by indicating time intervals on the board.

## **(iv) Proceedings before commencement of the examination**

The invigilator - candidate ratio was well observed. No specific invigilator registers were signed. The invigilators would sign the mark sheets as an indication that they were present during writing. The instructions were read to the candidates prior to the writing of the examinations and the ten minutes reading time was allocated.

The candidates carried admission letters and/or identity documents for identification purposes..

Cell-phones and programmable calculators were not allowed in the examination rooms.

## **(v) Proceedings during the writing of the examination**

The invigilators were punctual, vigilant, and aware of their duties and responsibilities. They were also aware of the procedures to be followed in the event of an irregularity.

The policy regarding the procedures to be followed when candidates arrive late and complete the examination before the actual allocated time was understood and well observed.

## **(vi) Packing and transmission of scripts**

The packing was done at each centre by the Chief invigilator with the help of the invigilators after the scripts had been checked, counted, and arranged according to the mark sheets.

After packing the scripts in the sealed envelopes the Chief invigilator then completed the dispatch register and locked the script envelopes in the strong room until the courier collected them.



### **(vii) Irregularities**

There was one major reported irregularity – Physical Science P1, question 1.1, the critical value of 12m/s was missing on the graph. This resulted in learners not being able to answer other related parts of question 1. The matter was addressed during the standardization process to ensure that no learners were disadvantaged as a result of this error in printing.

## **3.3 Monitoring of marking**

Umalusi visited the IEB marking centre located at St Stithians College.

### **(i) General conditions of the marking centre**

On the whole, the conditions at the marking centre were good. Communication facilities in the form of telephone, cell phones, fax, and e-mail were available.

The ablution facilities were clean and sufficient. The food was also of an acceptable standard and catered for different dietary requirements.

### **(ii) Security issues**

Security was very tight. The college has its own security personnel, and the IEB hired extra guards for the duration of the marking. Access to the marking centre was afforded only to the IEB staff and the monitoring officials. The centre kept video records of the areas that were monitored by CCTV.

### **(iii) Appointment of markers and examination assistants**

The markers and examination assistants were appointed according to the prescribed criteria. The examination assistants were students at tertiary institutions, and had no criminal records.

### **(iv) Training of markers**

The IEB markers are trained at a National Conference; they go through the previous examination papers in workshops. The Chief markers are trained by the examination panel on the day prior to the commencement of marking, and on the day of marking all the other markers are trained. The standardization of the marking guidelines takes place, all the markers engage in discussions, and common understanding is reached.

### **(v) Marking procedure**

Generally, the approach was question-by-question marking. Some subjects marked section-by-section. In cases where candidates answered both optional questions, only the first response was marked.

### **(vi) Internal moderation of marking**

Internal moderation was conducted by the senior markers, Chief markers, and the internal moderators, in that order. On average, a minimum sample of 10% of the completed scripts is moderated through all the above-mentioned levels of moderation.

**(vii) Handling of irregularities**

The markers were informed at the initial training of what constitutes an irregularity and they were aware of the procedures to be followed should an irregularity be detected. No irregularity register was kept by the IEB.

## 4. VERIFICATION OF MARKING

2009 marks the first year in which IEB scripts were also part of the centralized verification of marking. This exercise has in the past years only focused on the provincial education departments.

Generally, the standard of the marking was very good. The following points were observed:

Criteria	Findings
Adherence to the memorandum	No problems of non-adherence to the memorandum were reported in the IEB.
Provision of alternate answers	The IEB's marking guidelines extensively made provision for alternate answers.
Consistency and accuracy in the allocation of marks	Generally, the marking of the IEB papers was of an exceptionally high standard. One candidate in Business Studies P2 had 49 marks instead of 39. This was the only case in the sample. There was one instance where marks were allocated to an incorrect answer by one of the internal moderators in Mathematical Literacy P1.
Markers' performance	No problems were reported. The marking was generally considered to be of a high standard.
Internal moderation	The internal moderation was vigorously done.
Candidates' performance	In Accounting, candidates battled in the question on creditors, reconciliation and stock valuation, cash flow statement and ratios, financial statements, and production cost statement. In Mathematics P3 the candidates performed best in Questions 1, 2, and 3, however, for Questions 4 ( <i>standard deviation and ogive curve</i> ), 3, 6.2, 8(b), 9(b) and (c) and 10(a), (b), (c) ( <i>geometry</i> ) the performance was poor. In Mathematical Literacy P2 Question 1.1.1 was generally not well answered.

## 5. STANDARDISATION OF MARKS

The 2009 NSC Standardisation meeting was the second meeting for the new qualification, which was first assessed and standardised in 2008. The 2009 results were standardised based on 2008 and 2009 raw data and decisions, as well as the qualitative information emanating from the IEB examiners and the Umalusi external moderators.

### 5.1 Purpose of Standardisation

The purpose of standardisation is to ensure consistency over time and across assessment bodies. Marks are adjusted where it is found that learners have been unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged in the examination of that subject.

### 5.2 Scope of the Standardisation

A total of 38 content subjects and official languages, as well as 20 non-official languages were standardized.

### 5.3 Umalusi's Approach to Standardisation of the National Senior Certificate

Umalusi utilizes a combination of a statistical and an evidence-based approach to standardization. The decisions are based on thorough consideration of historical and situational factors, and careful and systematic reasoning.

Umalusi put the following measures in place to ensure that the standardization decisions were systematic, appropriate, and fair:

- (i) The 2008 raw and adjusted scores were used to inform the 2009 standardization decisions;
- (ii) Pairs analysis was used to indicate correlations between the average performance of learners in the subject being standardized and that in other subjects, e.g., the learners' performance in schools that offer both English HL and Visual Arts are compared in both subjects; and
- (iii) Detailed Umalusi external moderator reports provided information on the quality of the question papers written.

The following principles were applied in the standardization of the 2009 examination results:

- No adjustments upwards or downwards will exceed 10% or the historical average.
- In the case of individual candidates, the adjustment effected should not exceed 50% of the marks obtained by the candidate.
- If the distribution of raw marks is above or below the historical average, the marks may be adjusted upwards or downwards, respectively.
- Computer adjustments are calculated on the principles outlined in the bullet points immediately above;
- Umalusi retains the right to amend these principles as deemed necessary based on sound evidence and educational principles.

## 5.4 Procedures for the 2009 NSC Standardisation

A Pre-Standardisation Meeting was held by Umalusi on the 18<sup>th</sup> December 2009. This meeting was used to consider the raw marks in relation to all the evidence accumulated relating to the examination results. The Standardization Meeting was held at Umalusi on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2009.

The final outcome of the Standardization Meeting for the 58 NSC subjects is as follows:

<b>Subjects</b>	<b>Adjustments made</b>
Content subjects and official languages	Raw : 23
	Upward adjustments : 8
	Downward adjustments : 7
	<b>Sub Total : 38</b>
Non-official languages	Raw : 16
	Upward adjustment : 1
	Downward adjustments : 3
	<b>Sub Total : 20</b>
Total	58

# Chapter 4

---

## Recommendations and conclusion

### 1. AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- The IEB papers are to be commended for their strength in the testing of cognitive abilities. The majority of the papers were of a high standard, comprising intellectually stimulating questions.
- The completion of the Certificate Tasks and Community Work was beneficial to the learners and enriched their Life Orientation experience
- The specific attention given to candidates with special needs is commendable and encouraged.
- The provision of memoranda with a wide range of alternative answers and the guidance given to markers on the allocation in the case of diagrams and open-ended questions are to be commended.

### 2. AREAS OF CONCERN

- The fact that in Life Orientation all tasks from Grade 10-12 were included in the files made navigation through the files cumbersome.
- The inclusion of work covered from Grade 10 in the constitution of the final mark for Life Orientation is concerning.
- The standardization data is presented in a format that is not compatible with the Umalusi system.

### 3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- An irregularity register must be kept at the exam and marking centres to keep a concise record of all irregularities.
- The IEB should not include work covered in Grade 10 and 11 in the constitution of the final Life Orientation mark.
- The standardization data should be presented in a format compatible with the Umalusi system.
- The data should be submitted to Umalusi for verification before the release of the results every year.

### 4. CONCLUSION

Generally, the IEB has conducted its assessment and examination in a manner that renders them fair, valid, and reliable. The technical irregularity in Physical Science P1 was addressed through the standardization process to ensure that the credibility of the exam was not compromised.

The IEB is encouraged to look into policy issues particularly with regard to the constitution of the final pass mark in Life Orientation, just to ensure consistency with the national policy requirements.

The IEB needs to be commended for their continued striving towards excellence. This was displayed in the quality of their question papers, and the manner in which the examinations were administered and managed.

To this end, Umalusi has not found anything untoward through the quality assurance processes undertaken, that would hamper the approval of the IEB results.

Umalusi takes this opportunity to express gratitude to the IEB for their continued support in ensuring that quality education is upheld in South Africa.









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



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training