

EDUCATION ASSESSMENT examination
 MODERATION ASSESSMENT moderation
 graduate EXAMINATION learners
 SCHOOL REPORTS education
 ACADEMIC teacher
 DEGREE REPORT EXAM diploma
 assurance SCHOOL learners



**Technical report on the
 Quality Assurance of the
 Examinations and Assessment of the
 National Senior Certificate (NSC) 2012**

QUA ASSURA. REPORTS SCHOOL

U MALUSI



Council for Quality Assurance in
 General and Further Education and Training

A TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE 2012 NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE 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.

Contents

ACRONYMS.....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	vi
CHAPTER 1	
QUESTION PAPER MODERATION.....	1
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Scope.....	2
3 Findings.....	12
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	14
5 Challenges.....	15
6 Recommendations.....	15
7 Conclusion.....	16
CHAPTER 2	
MODERATION AND VERIFICATION OF GRADE 12 SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT.....	17
1 Introduction.....	17
2 Scope.....	18
3 Summary of Findings.....	20
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	21
5 Challenges.....	22
6 Recommendations.....	22
7 Conclusion.....	30
CHAPTER 3	
APPROVAL OF FINAL MEMORANDA: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSION MEETINGS.....	31
1 Introduction.....	31
2 Scope.....	31
3 Summary of Results.....	35
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	40
5 Challenges.....	40
6 Recommendations.....	41
8 Conclusion.....	41

CHAPTER 4	
VERIFICATION OF MARKING.....	42
1 Introduction.....	42
2 Scope.....	42
3 Summary of Findings.....	45
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	46
5 Challenges.....	47
6 Recommendations.....	47
7 Conclusion.....	47
 CHAPTER 5	
MONITORING OF THE CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS.....	48
1 Introduction.....	48
2 Scope.....	48
3 Summary of Findings.....	49
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	54
5 Challenges.....	56
6 Recommendations.....	57
7 Conclusion.....	58
 CHAPTER 6	
STANDARDISATION AND VERIFICATION OF RESULTS.....	61
1 Scope Of The Standardisation.....	61
2 General Findings.....	61
3 Areas for Improvement.....	61
4 2012 Standardisation Decisions.....	62
5 Verification of the Resulting Processes and Data.....	62
6 Conclusion.....	63
 CHAPTER 7	
CONCLUSION.....	64
 ADDENDA.....	66
Addendum 1: QUESTION PAPER MODERATION (NOVEMBER 2012/MARCH 2013).....	66
Addendum 2A: MODERATION AND VERIFICATION OF GRADE 12 SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT.....	180
Addendum 2B: MODERATION AND VERIFICATION OF GRADE 12 SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT.....	199
Addendum 3: APPROVAL OF FINAL MEMORANDA: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSION MEETINGS.....	274
Addendum 4: VERIFICATION OF MARKING.....	301
Addendum 5: MONITORING OF THE CONDUCT OF THE EXAMINATION.....	350
 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	382

Acronyms

ASs	Assessment Standards
CAT	Computer Applications Technology
DBE	Department of Basic Education
EC	Eastern Cape
EGD	Engineering, Graphics and Design
FAL	First Additional Language
FS	Free State
HL	Home Language
IM	Internal Moderator
IT	Information Technology
KZN	KwaZulu-Natal
LOs	Learning Outcomes
NC	Northern Cape
NCS	National Curriculum Statement
NSC	National Senior Certificate
NW	North West
P1, P2, P3	Paper 1, Paper 2, Paper 3
PAT	Practical Assessment Task
PE	Physical Education
PI(s)	Practical Investigation(s)
PDE	Provincial Department of Basic Education
SAG	Subject Assessment Guidelines
SAL	Second Additional Language
SAG	Site-based assessment
Umalusi	Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training
WC	Western Cape

Executive Summary

The General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Act (Act No. 58 of 2001, amended in 2008) mandates Umalusi to assure the quality of all exit point assessment practices for all registered and accredited assessment bodies, including the Department of Basic Education (DBE) and its Provincial Departments of Basic Education (PDEs). The annual summative assessment of Grade 12 candidates registered for the NSC examination has come to an end, and Umalusi has conducted quality assurance on the assessment practices of both the DBE and the PDEs.

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of the quality assurance exercise. The report serves to inform Umalusi Council as to whether Umalusi would be justified in accepting and ratifying the DBE results. To this end, six aspects of assessment have been moderated and monitored by Umalusi's external moderators and monitors respectively. These aspects are the examination question papers and memoranda set by DBE panels of examiners and internally moderated by their internal moderators (Chapter 1); the school-based assessment (SBA) moderated internally by the DBE and externally by Umalusi (Chapter 2); the memorandum discussions and the final memoranda approved by Umalusi (Chapter 3); on-site and centralised verification of the marking of candidates' scripts (Chapter 4); monitoring of the conduct of examinations (Chapter 5); and the standardisation of marks and verification of capturing (Chapter 6). Reports on each aspect were submitted by external moderators and monitors, and appear in this report in six chapters, as well as a seventh chapter which draws the final report together. The information extracted from the reports is reported in detail in addenda included at the end of this report. Summaries and interpretations of the findings are included in the chapters.

The annual moderation of question papers by Umalusi is aimed at ensuring that the question papers for the NSC examination to be written at the end of the year and those written at the beginning of the following year as the supplementary examination, are comparable, and that the two sets of question papers are correct, fair, valid and reliable, comply with the appropriate curriculum and examination policies, and are of appropriate rigour. Moderation also aims to ensure that question papers are of a standard comparable to question papers of previous years so that learners of different years are not unduly advantaged or disadvantaged.

The memoranda of these question papers are treated with equal seriousness. The focus is on correctness, fairness, validity and reliability. They should also be user-friendly so that markers are able to maintain consistency across the marking of scripts at the various centres in the provinces. Sufficient provision is made for alternative answers so that a candidate who approaches a question or topic from a different, original, but valid, perspective is not disadvantaged.

There were 132 question papers for the end-of-year examination and 130 for the supplementary examination, encompassing 62 subjects. These subjects include the 11 official languages. Each language is divided into three subjects, Home Language, First Additional Language, and Second Additional Language. The question papers are therefore set on 33 language and 29 other subjects.

In general terms, the setting and moderation of question papers and memoranda were successful, with 79,6% of the November 2012 and 72,3% of the March 2013 question papers being approved after the first and second moderation. Two papers required a fourth moderation (Business Studies March 2013 and Physical Sciences P2 March 2013), and four papers a fifth moderation before approval (Afrikaans FAL P1 March 2013, Afrikaans SAL P2 Nov 2012 and March 2013, and Afrikaans SAL P2 March 2013).

The SBA undertaken in the various provinces of the country was the next aspect to be subjected to scrutiny and moderation by Umalusi's external moderators. Unfortunately, this moderation exercise produced a different picture, which emphasised once again that the standard of education in a country does not depend in the first place on the quality of its examinations, but rather on the quality of its teachers, that is, their knowledge and commitment, and the work they do in the classroom, whether in an urban or deep rural context. The selection of schools was admittedly made from the poorest performing districts in the country, and there would certainly be schools and districts where better work was being done, but there were obviously thousands of Grade 12 learners who, at this stage, were being deprived of the quality education that was theirs by right. Two moderation exercises were undertaken independently (August 2012 and October 2012) and reported separately. These are captured in two parts (A and B) in addenda to Chapter 2. The purpose of moderation at all levels is verification and quality assurance. This year, the moderation/verification of SBA was focused on the presence/absence and quality of internal moderation and to this end the DBE's moderators were shadowed and the evidence that they had moderated was re-moderated by Umalusi. The findings were then compared to establish the status of SBA in the schools, and of moderation. The reports submitted by external moderators were analysed according to the criteria described in Umalusi's "Instrument for the Moderation of School-based Assessment". The areas of good practice and the most serious challenges were identified, and solutions suggested.

An analysis of the reports on the Phase 1 moderation (August 2012) of 16 subjects yielded ambiguous findings. Some of the provinces designed acceptable common tasks, but almost without exception there was too much reliance on previous national question papers. In Mathematics, for example, the Fort Beaufort district in the Eastern Cape showed significant improvement over the previous year, but even there it was found that there was over-reliance on previous question papers. Regarding most of the common tasks and the tasks set at school level, external moderators pointed out that almost all questions were pitched at the lower cognitive levels, which meant that there was no comparison between the SBA assessment and the final examination. This negative impression was probably exacerbated by the fact that the lowest-performing districts in each province were pre-selected, but there was no doubt that a large number of teachers in the country were unable to cope with the rigorous implementation of the SAG relevant to their subjects. Judging from the comments of the external moderators, the SBA tests were not pitched at the cognitive levels expected in Grade 12. Candidates were not being appropriately prepared for the final examinations.

The findings of the verification of marking, on-site and centralised, were far more positive. The on-site verification of marking was experienced as very positive and important by external moderators. They mentioned that it was far more meaningful to visit the marking centres and be able to interact with markers and make a difference where problems were experienced. With centralised moderation they were not sure about how much window-dressing had gone into preparing the sample for submission, whereas with on-site verification a far better understanding of the reality was possible. It was also clear that the increased focus at memorandum discussions on the training of chief markers and internal moderators was bearing fruit in the form of improved marking and internal moderation. Regarding the monitoring of the conduct of marking, improvement was also to be seen. PDEs have by now streamlined the conduct of examinations and marking, and there were no major problems. Although in some of the rural areas of KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo, chief invigilators did not go through the question papers with candidates to ensure that they had the correct papers and that there were no blank pages, no major problems were reported. The marking centres were well organised. Some laxity was reported from KwaZulu-Natal regarding access control at the gates; however, this was not the only security, and the guards at the centre were doing their jobs. Access control should be improved, but the lack of strict access control did not put the process at risk.

From the findings in the external moderators' and external monitors' reports, it appears that the examination was conducted successfully. The effective setting of question papers and memoranda resulted in question papers without errors, except for some printing glitches in the provinces. Before the final memoranda were approved, the memorandum discussions ensured that the final marking memoranda made provision for alternative answers so that no candidates would be disadvantaged. This was the result of lively participation in the discussions by representatives of the PDEs, in what was increasingly becoming a participative exercise in which no representative had cause to feel disempowered. The on-site verification of marking was a highly satisfactory exercise, and should be continued and extended in future. The conduct of the writing of the examination and the marking proceeded well, with only minor problems that could be ironed out. The weakest link in the entire process is undoubtedly SBA, and an improvement on this front will need a concerted effort.

CHAPTER 1

QUESTION PAPER MODERATION

1 INTRODUCTION

The moderation of question papers by Umalusi is aimed at ensuring that the question papers for the NSC examination to be written at the end of the year and at the beginning of the following year as a supplementary examination are comparable, and that the two sets of question papers are correct, fair, valid and reliable, comply with the appropriate policies, and are of appropriate rigour. Moderation also aims to ensure that question papers are of a standard comparable to question papers of previous years so that learners in the different years are not unduly advantaged or disadvantaged.

The end-of-year and the supplementary question papers and memoranda are set simultaneously to ensure that they are of a comparable standard. The supplementary question papers also serve as back-up papers should anything go wrong during the end-of-year examination.

The memoranda for these question papers are treated with equal seriousness, with the focus being on correctness, fairness, validity and reliability. Memoranda should also be user-friendly so that markers are able to maintain consistency across the marking of scripts at various centres across the country. Sufficient provision is made for alternative answers so that a candidate who approaches a question or topic from a different, original, but valid, perspective is not disadvantaged.

The reports have been captured in Addendum 1, and a summary and findings are presented in this chapter. Capturing the findings of the question paper moderation was not without its challenges, however. It was singularly difficult to access all reports. Because of the stringent security maintained around the setting of question papers at the DBE, Umalusi moderators are not permitted to email any reports to Umalusi. The reports have to be accessed after the examination has been written. In some cases it was not possible to access any reports at all, and in other instances it was only possible to capture the final moderation report.

For 2012, 62 subjects were examined, represented by 132 question papers and memoranda that were set and moderated for the November examination and 130

question papers for March 2013 (excluding two practical papers for Design and Visual Arts).

2 SCOPE

The table below provides an overview of the moderation process of the question papers and memoranda set for both the November 2012 and the March 2013 supplementary examinations.

Table 1.1: Dates for first and final moderation of question papers

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
Accounting	05.03.12 07.03.12	First Final	05.03.12	Only
Afrikaans FAL P1	28.04.12 29.07.12	First Final	28.04.12	First Final
Afrikaans FAL P2	04.08.12 08.09.12	First Final	04.07.12 04.10.12	First Final
Afrikaans FAL P3	23.04.12 20.05.12	First Final	23.04.12	First Final
Afrikaans HL P1	03.04.12 30.05.12	First Final	05.04.12 30.05.12	First Final
Afrikaans HL P2	30.05.12 10.06.12	First Final	31.05.12 11.06.12	First Final
Afrikaans HL P3	15.03.12 01.04.12	First Final	15.03.12 04.05.12	First Final
Afrikaans SAL P1	30.06.12 08.09.12	First Final	03.07.12	First Final
Afrikaans SAL P2	28.04.12 24.06.12	First Final	28.04.12 04.07.12	First Final
Agricultural Management Practices	14.04.12 13.05.12	First Final	14.04.12 13.05.12	First Final
Agricultural Sciences P1	04.04.12 29.04.12	First Final	04.04.12 29.04.12	First Final
Agricultural Sciences P2	29.04.12	Only	29.04.12	Only
Agricultural Technology	22.03.12 26.05.12	First Final	22.05.12 25.05.12	First Final
Business Studies	04.06.12 10.06.12	First Final	10.06.12 12.08.12	First Final

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
Civil Technology	24.04.12	First	24.04.12	First
	18.05.12	Final	18.05.12	Final
Computer Applications Technology P1	30.05.12	First Final	24.04.12	First Final
Computer Applications Technology P2	30.05.12	First	24.04.12	First
	12.06.12	Final		Final
Consumer Studies	13.03.12	First	13.03.12	First
	24.04.12	Final	25.04.12	Final
Dance Studies	23.03.12	Only	23.03.12	Only
Design P1	30.03.12	Only	30.03.12	Only
Design P2	30.03.12	Only	N/A	
Dramatic Arts	11.03.12	First	11.03.12	First
	12.05.12	Final	12.05.12	Final
Economics	11.03.12	First	22.04.12	First
	22.04.12	Final	23.04.12	Final
Electrical Technology	09.03.12	Only	09.03.12	Only
Engineering Graphics & Design P1	11.03.12	Only	09.03.12	Only
Engineering Graphics & Design P2	11.03.12	Only	09.03.12	Only
English FAL P1	11.03.12	First	11.03.12	First
	01.06.12	Final	26.04.12	Final
English FAL P2	26.05.12	First	25.05.12	First
	02.06.12	Final	03.06.12	Final
English FAL P3	09.03.12	First	09.03.12	First
	25.04.12	Final	25.04.12	Final
English HL P1	21.05.12	First	22.05.12	First
	24.08.12	Final	24.08.12	Final
English HL P2	23.06.12	First	28.08.12	Only
	31.08.12	Final		
English HL P3	22.05.12	First	22.05.12	First
	24.08.12	Final	23.08.12	Final
English SAL P1	20.07.12	First	20.07.12	First
	21.07.12	Final	21.07.12	Final
English SAL P2	20.07.12	Only	20.07.12	First Final
Geography P1	04.04.12	First	05.04.12	First
	11.06.12	Final	12.06.12	Final
Geography P2	03.04.12	First	04.04.12	First
	11.06.12	Final	11.06.12	Final
History P1	02.04.12	First	02.04.12	First
	03.04.12	Final	22.05.12	Final

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
History P2	03.04.12	First	03.04.12	First
	04.04.12	Final	22.05.12	Final
Hospitality Studies	20.03.12	First	21.03.12	First
	20.03.12	Final	22.03.12	Final
Information Technology P1	12.07.12	First	25.07.12	First
	24.07.12	Final	31.07.12	Final
Information Technology P2	24.05.12	First		First
	14.06.12	Final	13.06.12	Final
IsiNdebele FAL P1	25.07.12	Only	25.07.12	First Final
IsiNdebele FAL P2	08.09.12	Only	25.07.12	First Final
IsiNdebele FAL P3	25.07.12	Only	25.07.12	First Final
IsiNdebele HL P1	25.04.12	Only	25.04.12	Only
IsiNdebele HL P2	15.03.12	Only	15.03.12	Only
IsiNdebele HL P3	25.04.12	Only	25.04.12	Only
IsiNdebele SAL P1	25.07.12	Only	25.07.12	Only
IsiNdebele SAL P2	25.07.12	Only	25.07.12	Only
IsiXhosa FAL P1	No date	First	18.05.12	First
	26.06.12	Final	26.06.12	Final
IsiXhosa FAL P2		First		First
	28.06.12	Final	23.06.12	Final
IsiXhosa FAL P3	13.04.12	First		First
	29.06.12	Final	29.06.12	Final
IsiXhosa HL P1	20.05.12	First	21.05.12	First
	23.05.12	Final	23.05.12	Final
IsiXhosa HL P2	02.07.12	First	03.07.12	First
	04.07.12	Final	04.07.12	Final
IsiXhosa HL P3	18.05.12	First	18.05.12	First
	23.05.12	Final	23.05.12	Final
IsiXhosa SAL P1	23.03.12	First		First
	23.03.12	Final	20.05.12	Final
IsiXhosa SAL P2	No date	First		First
	25.03.12	Final	21.05.12	Final
IsiZulu FAL P1	18.05.12	First		First
	19.05.12	Final	24.06.12	Final
IsiZulu FAL P2	24.06.12	Only	04.07.12	Only
IsiZulu FAL P3	20.12.11	First Final	21.12.11	Only

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
IsiZulu HL P1	21.12.11	First Final	22.12.11	First Final
IsiZulu HL P2	04.04.12	First Final	05.04.12	First Final
IsiZulu HL P3	04.04.12	Only	04.04.12	Only
IsiZulu SAL P1	14.07.12	First Final	14.07.12	First Final
IsiZulu SAL P2	16.07.12	Only	24.03.12	Only
Life Sciences P1 Version 1	24.04.12 31.05.12	First Final	26.04.12 01.06.12	First Final
Life Sciences P2 Version 1	25.04.12 01.06.12	First Final	30.05.12 01.06.12	First Final
Life Sciences P1 Version 2	11.06.12 23.07.12	First Final	11.06.12 24.07.12	First Final
Life Sciences P2 Version 2	11.06.12 24.07.12	First Final	11.06.12 23.07.12	First Final
Mathematical Literacy P1	02.04.12 17.06.12	First Final	24.06.12 11.08.12	First Final
Mathematical Literacy P2	04.04.12 22.06.12	First Final	11.08.12 16.09.12	First Final
Mathematics P1	05.04.12 10.07.12	First Final	05.04.12 10.07.12	First Final
Mathematics P2	04.04.12 10.07.12	First Final	04.04.12 20.07.12	First Final
Mathematics P3	12.07.12	Only	12.07.12	Only
Mechanical Technology	16.03.12	Only	18.03.12	Only
Music P1	12.04.12 02.06.12	First Final	11.04.12 02.06.12	First Final
Music P2	12.04.12 02.06.12	First Final	12.04.12 06.06.12	First Final
Physical Sciences P1	14.04.12 18.06.12	First Final	15.04.12 15.07.12	First Final
Physical Sciences P2	12.05.12 16.06.12	First Final	12.05.12 14.07.12	First Final
Religion Studies P1	15.06.12 15.06.12	First Final	20.07.12 20.07.12	First Final
Religion Studies P2	15.06.12 15.06.12	First Final	21.07.12 21.07.12	First Final
Sepedi FAL P1	16.03.12 23.03.12	First Final	17.03.12 23.03.12	First Final

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
Sepedi FAL P2	26.06.12	First	27.06.12	First
	27.06.12	Final		Final
Sepedi FAL P3	16.03.12	First	23.03.12	First
	23.03.12	Final	23.03.12	Final
Sepedi HL P1	16.03.12	First	17.03.12	First
	24.03.12	Final	23.03.12	Final
Sepedi HL P2	17.04.12	First		First
		Final		Final
Sepedi HL P3	24.03.12	First	23.03.12	First
	24.03.12	Final	16.04.12	Final
Sepedi SAL P1	18.07.12	First	27.07.12	First
	20.07.12	Final		Final
Sepedi SAL P2	27.06.12	First		First
	28.06.12	Final		Final
Sesotho FAL P1	30.03.12	First		First
		Final		Final
Sesotho FAL P2	04.04.12	First		First
		Final		Final
Sesotho FAL P3	22.04.12	First	21.04.12	First
	05.05.12	Final	06.05.12	Final
Sesotho HL P1	01.06.12	First	03.06.12	First
	04.06.12	Final	04.06.12	Final
Sesotho HL P2	13.06.12	First	14.06.12	First
	18.06.12	Final	18.06.12	Final
Sesotho HL P3	01.03.12	First	01.03.12	First
	08.03.12	Final	08.03.12	Final
Sesotho SAL P1		First		First
		Final		Final
Sesotho SAL P2		First		First
		Final		Final
Setswana FAL P1	30.03.12	First	30.03.12	First
		Final		Final
Setswana FAL P2	01.04.12	First	02.04.12	First
	04.04.12	Final	04.04.12	Final
Setswana FAL P3	29.03.12	First	29.03.12	First
		Final		Final
Setswana HL P1	28.03.12	First	28.03.12	First
		Final	14.05.12	Final
Setswana HL P2		First		First
		Final		Final

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
Setswana HL P3		First Final	28.03.12 03.04.12	First Final
Setswana SAL P1	10.05.12	First Final	10.05.12	First Final
Setswana SAL P2	10.03.12	Only	10.03.12	Only
Siswati FAL P1	14.07.12	First Final	14.07.12	First Final
Siswati FAL P2	15.07.12	First Final	15.07.12	First Final
Siswati FAL P3	19.05.12 14.07.12	First Final	19.05.12 14.07.12	First Final
Siswati HL P1	15.07.12	First Final	15.07.12	First Final
Siswati HL P2	15.07.12	First Final	15.07.12	First Final
Siswati HL P3	20.05.12	First Final	20.05.12	First Final
Siswati SAL P1	15.07.12	First Final	15.07.12	First Final
Siswati SAL P2	20.05.12 15.07.12	First Final	20.05.12 15.07.12	First Final
Tourism	05.03.12 19.05.12	First Final	06.03.12	Only
Tshivenda FAL P1	26.05.12	Only	26.05.12	Only
Tshivenda FAL P2	No date	Only	No date	Only
Tshivenda FAL P3	26.05.12	Only	26.05.12	Only
Tshivenda HL P1	No date 26.05.12	First Final	24.05.12 26.05.12	First Final
Tshivenda HL P2	No date	Only	No date	Only
Tshivenda HL P3	26.05.12	Only	26.05.12	Only
Tshivenda SAL P1	No date	First Final	No date	Only
Tshivenda SAL P2	26.05.12	Only	26.05.12	Only
Visual Arts P1	22.04.12	Only	22.04.12	Only
Visual Arts P2	22.04.12	Only	N/A	
Xitsonga FAL P1	28.06.12	First Final	29.06.12	First Final
Xitsonga FAL P2	14.07.12	First Final	14.07.12	First Final

Question papers and memoranda received	Approval dates			
	November 2012		March 2013	
	Date	Moderation	Date	Moderation
Xitsonga FAL P3	29.05.12	First Final	29.05.12	First Final
Xitsonga HL P1	14.07.12	First Final	21.07.12	First Final
Xitsonga HL P2	14.07.12	First Final	15.07.12	First Final
Xitsonga HL P3	15.07.12	First Final	15.07.12	First Final
Xitsonga SAL P1	14.07.12	First Final	29.07.12	First Final
Xitsonga SAL P2	17.03.12	First Final	17.03.12	First Final

Table 1.2: Number of moderations before approval of question papers

Question papers and memoranda received	Number of moderations conducted before approval							
	November 2012				March 2013			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Accounting		√			√			
Afrikaans FAL P1			√					√(5)
Afrikaans FAL P2			√				√	
Afrikaans FAL P3			√				√	
Afrikaans HL P1			√				√	
Afrikaans HL P2		√				√		
Afrikaans HL P3		√					√	
Afrikaans SAL P1				√(5)				√(5)
Afrikaans SAL P2			√					√(5)
Agricultural Management Practices		√				√		
Agricultural Sciences P1		√				√		
Agricultural Sciences P2	√				√			
Agricultural Technology		√				√		
Business Studies			√					√
Civil Technology		√				√		
Computer Applications Technology P1		√					√	
Computer Applications Technology P2			√				√	
Consumer Studies		√				√		
Dance Studies	√				√			
Design P1	√				√			
Design P2	√				-	-	-	-

Question papers and memoranda received	Number of moderations conducted before approval							
	November 2012				March 2013			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Dramatic Arts		√				√		
Economics		√				√		
Electrical Technology	√				√			
Engineering Graphics & Design P1	√				√			
Engineering Graphics & Design P2	√				√			
English FAL P1		√				√		
English FAL P2			√				√	
English FAL P3		√				√		
English HL P1			√				√	
English HL P2			√		√			
English HL P3			√				√	
English SAL P1		√				√		
English SAL P2	√				√			
Geography P1		√				√		
Geography P2		√				√		
History P1			√				√	
History P2			√				√	
Hospitality Studies		√				√		
Information Technology P1	√					√		
Information Technology P2		√				√		
IsiNdebele FAL P1	√				√			
IsiNdebele FAL P2	√				√			
IsiNdebele FAL P3	√				√			
IsiNdebele HL P1	√				√			
IsiNdebele HL P2	√				√			
IsiNdebele HL P3	√				√			
IsiNdebele SAL P1	√				√			
IsiNdebele SAL P2	√				√			
IsiXhosa FAL P1			√				√	
IsiXhosa FAL P2		√				√		
IsiXhosa FAL P3			√				√	
IsiXhosa HL P1		√				√		
IsiXhosa HL P2		√				√		
IsiXhosa HL P3		√				√		
IsiXhosa SAL P1		√				√		
IsiXhosa SAL P2		√				√		
IsiZulu FAL P1		√				√		
IsiZulu FAL P2	√				√			

Question papers and memoranda received	Number of moderations conducted before approval							
	November 2012				March 2013			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
IsiZulu FAL P3		√			√			
IsiZulu HL P1								
IsiZulu HL P2		√						
IsiZulu HL P3	√				√			
IsiZulu SAL P1		√				√		
IsiZulu SAL P2	√				√			
Life Sciences P1 Version 1			√				√	
Life Sciences P2 Version 1			√				√	
Life Sciences P1 Version 2			√				√	
Life Sciences P2 Version 2		√					√	
Mathematical Literacy P1		√				√		
Mathematical Literacy P2		√				√		
Mathematics P1		√				√		
Mathematics P2		√				√		
Mathematics P3	√				√			
Mechanical Technology	√				√			
Music P1		√				√		
Music P2		√				√		
Physical Sciences P1			√				√	
Physical Sciences P2			√					√
Religion Studies P1		√				√		
Religion Studies P2		√				√		
Sepedi FAL P1		√				√		
Sepedi FAL P2		√				√		
Sepedi FAL P3		√				√		
Sepedi HL P1		√				√		
Sepedi HL P2		√						
Sepedi HL P3		√				√		
Sepedi SAL P1		√				√		
Sepedi SAL P2		√				√		
Sesotho FAL P1		√						
Sesotho FAL P2		√						
Sesotho FAL P3		√				√		
Sesotho HL P1		√				√		
Sesotho HL P2		√				√		
Sesotho HL P3		√				√		
Sesotho SAL P1		√						
Sesotho SAL P2	√							

Question papers and memoranda received	Number of moderations conducted before approval							
	November 2012				March 2013			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Setswana FAL P1		√				√		
Setswana FAL P2		√				√		
Setswana FAL P3		√				√		
Setswana HL P1		√				√		
Setswana HL P2								
Setswana HL P3		√				√		
Setswana SAL P1						√		
Setswana SAL P2					√			
Siswati FAL P1		√						
Siswati FAL P2		√						
Siswati FAL P3	√					√		
Siswati HL P1		√				√		
Siswati HL P2		√				√		
Siswati HL P3	√				√			
Siswati SAL P1		√				√		
Siswati SAL P2		√				√		
Tourism		√			√			
Tshivenda FAL P1	√				√			
Tshivenda FAL P2	√				√			
Tshivenda FAL P3	√				√			
Tshivenda HL P1		√				√		
Tshivenda HL P2	√				√			
Tshivenda HL P3	√				√			
Tshivenda SAL P1	√				√			
Tshivenda SAL P2	√				√			
Visual Arts P1	√				√			
Visual Arts P2	√				-	-	-	-
Xitsonga FAL P1		√				√		
Xitsonga FAL P2		√				√		
Xitsonga FAL P3		√				√		
Xitsonga HL P1		√				√		
Xitsonga HL P2		√				√		
Xitsonga HL P3		√				√		
Xitsonga SAL P1		√				√		
Xitsonga SAL P2		√				√		

3 FINDINGS

In general, it appeared that the setting and moderation of question papers and memoranda went quite well.

It should be noted that this chapter presents findings based on the first moderation of question papers. The reasoning behind this kind of reporting is to provide the DBE with the status of the question papers submitted at first moderation, with a view to these concerns being addressed before the setting of the next cycle of question papers. The concerns and problematic areas identified at first moderation were all corrected during subsequent moderations before the question papers were finally approved.

Of the 262 question papers that were set for November 2012 and March 2013, the findings were as follows:

	Approved at 1st mod		Approved at 2nd mod		Approved at 3rd mod		Approved at 4th& 5th mod		Total reported
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Nov '12	36	27,3	75	56,8	20	15,2	1	0,7	132
Mar '13	36	27,7	71	54,6	18	13,9	5	3,8	130

The following table gives some idea of the external moderators' findings at the first moderation, which was based on the Umalusi criteria for the moderation of question papers.

Umalusi criteria for the moderation of question papers:

1. Technical criteria
2. Internal moderation
3. Content coverage
4. Cognitive skills
5. Marking memorandum
6. Language and bias
7. Adherence to policies/guidelines
8. Predictability

Table 1.3: Number of question papers in which the criteria were not satisfied at first moderation

Exam	Criteria for moderation							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Nov '12	58	18	43	37	47	31	2	10
%	43,9	13,6	32,6	28,0	35,6	23,5	1,5	7,6
Mar '13	57	24	38	36	49	30	7	14
%	43,8	18,5	28,8	27,7	37,7	23,1	5,4	10,8

Please note: The numbers 1 - 8 are linked to Umalusi criteria on page 12.

It is clear from Table 1.3 that very similar problems were experienced in the two sets of question papers – November 2012 and March 2013. This is elaborated on below.

Technical criteria

The technical criteria were generally not met (43,9% and 43,8% for November and March respectively). In a way this finding reflects on the quality of internal moderation, as one would not expect so many errors to escape the notice of the internal moderators.

Marking memorandum

Many external moderators (35,6% and 37,7% respectively) were dissatisfied with the quality of the marking memorandum. Errors were identified, and a common problem was that few alternative answers were provided. There were several complaints about the number of alternative textbooks in the field, not all of which were equally suitable, and this gave rise to arguments at memo discussions.

Content coverage

In the November question papers 32,6% did not satisfy the external moderators' expectations of content coverage, which meant in effect that they did not satisfy the SAG. In the March papers the percentage was reduced to 28,8%.

Cognitive skills

Of the November and March question papers, 28% and 27,7% respectively did not satisfy the norms for the distribution of questions across the cognitive levels. This might have been partly due to the incorrect use of the analysis grid. The DBE should ensure that all chief examiners and internal moderators are familiar with the use of the relevant taxonomies and analysis grids.

Internal moderation

Problematic internal moderation issues were identified in 13,6% of November and 18,5% of March question papers. A common complaint was the lack of rigour in internal moderation. This relatively low finding might be misleading, however. Problems with technical criteria, content coverage, marking memoranda, and language and bias all point to inadequate internal moderation. Most of these problems should be sorted out before external moderation, as an external moderator should not still be picking up language and vocabulary errors, or technical failings.

Language and bias

There was a surprisingly high percentage of language and bias problems, 23,5% and 23,1% respectively. There were many remarks about inaccessible language and various kinds of bias – in favour of a certain type of music, presenting a negative view of a particular area of employment, discrimination against certain religions etc.

Adherence to policies/guidelines

These criteria elicited the least negative findings, 1,5% and 5,4% respectively.

Predictability

This was not a huge problem, 7,6% and 10,8% respectively, but it was a matter for concern that some external moderators found that questions had been lifted from the question papers of the previous two years. Others complained that without copies of the previous three years' question papers in the file, this was impossible to judge.

4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

Emanating from the reports, it appeared that the moderation process had run fairly smoothly, with six question papers and memoranda going into fourth and fifth moderations. In fact, in respect of the November examination, 79,6% of the question papers and memoranda were approved after the first and second external moderation, while 72,3% of the March papers were also approved after the first and second external moderation. This is supported by the findings in Chapter 3, which show that at the memo discussions few errors were corrected, but that after pre-marking additional alternative answers were included.

5 CHALLENGES

- The inaccessibility of reports on the moderation of question papers and memoranda has a negative effect on Umalusi's reporting function.
- Afrikaans FAL and SAL: Four question papers went to five moderations, with the result that the final papers were approved very late. The FAL P2 was signed off on 14 September 2012.
- If moderation has to continue right up to September month of the year in which the question papers have to be written, it indicates that the process is being started too late. One of the problems appears to be the late appointment of new examining panels.
- There are still examiners and internal moderators who experience problems with the cognitive analysis of their question papers and with drawing up an accurate analysis grid.
- Some of Umalusi external moderators reported that they are drawn slowly into the setting of question papers just to ensure that question papers of good quality and standard are set and approved.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The method of reporting to Umalusi at each stage of the external moderation process should be streamlined to enable Umalusi to fulfil its function optimally. The most preferable method is electronic submission of reports to Umalusi.

The reason for the inability of the DBE examination panel and the external moderators to arrive at a common understanding of the requirements for Afrikaans FAL and SAL should be looked into. It should not be necessary to moderate any question paper five times.

The dates for the setting of question papers and the external moderation thereof should be planned for early in the previous year. Umalusi has given the DBE a directive to follow an 18-month cycle. The DBE is urged to ensure that it adheres to the following deadlines for submission of question papers: 30 April for first moderation of all question papers, and 30 July for approval and signing off of all question papers.

The DBE should ensure that its examining panels and internal moderators are familiar with the relevant taxonomies and are able to analyse the cognitive levels of questions.

There should be minimal interaction between the DBE panels and Umalusi external moderators so as to eliminate cases where external moderators find themselves setting the question papers.

7 CONCLUSION

For the credibility of the NSC examination it is vitally important that every effort be made to adhere to the agreed deadlines for the setting and moderation of question papers. Any delays affect Umalusi in its quality assurance exercise. Added to this, every effort should be made to set question papers of an appropriate quality and standard so that they can be ideally approved at first moderation.

(Please refer to Addenda 1 on page 66 for more details on this chapter)

CHAPTER 2

MODERATION AND VERIFICATION OF GRADE 12 SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

1 INTRODUCTION

School-based assessment (SBA) is a fundamental component in the calculation of the final assessment results that learners are awarded at the end of Grade 12.

In keeping with its mandate, Umalusi undertook the verification of the quality assurance processes for SBA for the National Senior Certificate (NSC) in 2012. The plans were linked directly to the DBE plans for quality assurance of SBA. Umalusi employed a two-pronged quality assurance process: monitoring of the DBE moderation processes and verification of the moderation conducted by the DBE moderators.

The purpose of the moderation of SBA was to ensure that internal moderation was conducted at all levels within provinces. It also aimed to verify that DBE moderation had taken place, and to ascertain the level of DBE input. The standard of assessment tasks was also looked into to verify that assessment was fair, reliable and valid, and consistent with the national standards.

In Phase 1 (June/July 2012), Umalusi external moderators were deployed to monitor the DBE process of evaluation of the assessment instruments (in the teachers' files), and to verify (moderate) the teachers' files that the DBE SBA moderators had moderated.

In Phase 2 (October/November 2012), Umalusi external moderators verified samples of learner evidence files and teachers' files that the DBE SBA moderators had already moderated. This exercise gave Umalusi external moderators the opportunity to verify the quality of DBE moderation and the quality of SBA in the schools.

Life Orientation was moderated throughout all nine provinces. The Life Orientation question paper written on 7 September 2012 represented a watershed moment in the history of the subject when learners in all provinces sat simultaneously for a common assessment task (CAT) that was set by the DBE and moderated externally by Umalusi. The marking of this task was not centralised, but carried out at the schools. It was the first time that this type of assessment had taken place, and the aim was to ensure that Life

Orientation marks could be standardised by means of a common benchmark in the form of an externally assessed task.

2 SCOPE

PHASE 1: VERIFICATION OF TEACHERS' FILES

Verification of the DBE-moderated teachers' files was conducted in four selected PEDs, and in eight subjects as indicated below. Consolidated reports on the following were received:

Provincial Education Department	Subject	Date
Eastern Cape	English First Additional Language	27 & 28 June 2012
	Physical Sciences	
	Life Orientation	4 & 5 July 2012
KwaZulu-Natal	Accounting	2 & 3 July 2012
	Mathematics	
	History	
	Life Orientation	6 & 7 July 2012
Limpopo	Accounting	5 & 6 July 2012
	Life Sciences	
	Life Orientation	4 & 5 July 2012
Mpumalanga	Geography	12 & 13 July 2012
	Life Sciences	
	Life Orientation	6 & 7 July 2012

A total of 10 schools from two under-performing districts in each of the PEDs were pre-selected by the DBE. Each selected district was expected to submit 10 teachers' files.

All the findings have been captured in Addendum 2A of the main technical report. A summary of the findings is presented below.

PHASE 2: QUALITY ASSURANCE OF LEARNERS' FILES

In October 2012, the second phase focused on the moderation carried out by the DBE and the learners' performance. Two districts from each of the nine provinces were targeted. Five schools per district were selected, and 20 learners' files per school and per moderated subject (8 subjects) as well as the teachers' files were submitted. Most districts and schools complied with these requirements in spite of the fact that the moderation was done at a difficult time of the year, just before the final examinations.

A blank moderation tool was provided to Umalusi by the DBE. The tool was appropriate and made provision for the following criteria:

- Compliance with the National Curriculum and Assessment Policies (NSC and SAG):
 - Content coverage
 - Cognitive skills
 - Quality of individual questions

Consolidated reports on the following subjects were submitted by Umalusi's external moderators:

Provincial Education Department	Subject	Scope (Districts)
Eastern Cape	History	Fort Beaufort
	Life Orientation	Mbizana
	Mathematics	
	Physical Sciences	
Free State	Accounting	FezileDabi
	English FAL	Motheo
	Life Orientation	
	Life Sciences	
	Physical Sciences	
Gauteng	Accounting	D4 (Tshwane South)
	Life Orientation	D8 (Sedibeng West)
	Life Sciences	
KwaZulu-Natal	Geography	Umlazi
	History	Uthungulu
	Life Orientation	
	Mathematics	
	Physical Sciences	
Limpopo	Accounting	Capricorn
	Agricultural Sciences	Sekhukhune
	English FAL	
	Life Orientation	
	Life Sciences	
Mpumalanga	Accounting	Bohlabelo
	Agricultural Sciences	Gert Sibanda
	Life Orientation	(Nkangala)
	Life Sciences	
Northern Cape	Geography	JT Gaetswe
	History	PixleykaSeme
	Life Orientation	

Provincial Education Department	Subject	Scope (Districts)
	Life Sciences	
North West	Accounting	Dr Ruth MogomotsiMompoti
	Geography	Dr Kenneth Kaunda
	History	
	Life Orientation	
Western Cape	Geography	Metropolitan North
	Life Orientation	Metropolitan South
	Mathematics	

The findings of these 37 reports on nine subjects in nine provinces are captured at the end of this document in Addendum 2B. A summary of the results is presented below.

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Very little difference was found among the various PEDs and subjects, and the results can quite easily be presented in a general summary of the findings, which is to be found in Addendum 2A.

PHASE 1: VERIFICATION OF TEACHERS' FILES

3.1 QUALITY AND STANDARD OF ASSESSED TASKS

In several instances the content coverage and relevance of tasks were appropriate. The constant reuse of previous examination material, while ensuring a certain standard in some cases, has given rise to technical and cognitive-level problems where the material has been used inappropriately.

Some tasks were standardised and were pitched at an acceptable level. Many of the standardised tasks revealed lack of moderation, however, and they contained technical and content errors. Where schools were setting their own tasks, the standard was variable. Most tasks were pitched at the lower cognitive levels, levels 1 and 2 on Barrett's or Bloom's taxonomy, and were low on problem solving. In some instances the rubrics and other marking tools were appropriate, but mostly they were not in line with the SAG, and not applied consistently.

Practical investigations (e.g. in Physical Sciences), assignments and research projects were mostly inappropriate and did not require any investigation or research. Moreover, the

tasks were far too easy. The historical enquiry in the subject History, which extended over three years, showed no signs of monitoring.

3.2 INTERNAL MODERATION ACROSS DIFFERENT LEVELS

There was some evidence of moderation of teachers' files, but upon closer scrutiny it came to light that they were merely checked for compliance using a tick-box approach, and no attention appeared to have been paid to qualitative moderation. What had happened in most cases was monitoring and not moderation.

Common tasks appeared not to have been moderated because most of them revealed errors and inadequacies that had not been picked up. Compliance was checked, while quality and cognitive demand were neglected.

3.3 FEEDBACK AND SUPPORT

While there was evidence of general support by subject advisors and school hierarchies in some cases, this was not common and very little feedback was evident. Where there was feedback, it had to do with compliance and not qualitative issues. Compliance is obviously very important, but moderation has to do with qualitative issues. Very little developmental feedback was found, and nothing on standards. Moreover, internal (in-school) moderation was seriously neglected.

4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- The system of files/portfolios generally worked well. They were well organised and managed, and easily accessible.
- The use of common tasks, which was happening in most provinces, led to a certain level of standardisation.
- There were pockets of good common tests and June examinations set at school level.
- Diagnostic analysis was being implemented to good effect in some provinces, for example Limpopo.
- At some schools there was evidence of support for Life Orientation. Marking had stabilised and question papers were appropriate.
- All schools had completed the required tasks for Terms 1 and 2.

5 CHALLENGES

- Umalusi external moderators were provided with a blank DBE moderation tool. While the tool was judged as appropriate, it did not assist in providing external moderators with a picture of the quality of moderation conducted by the DBE moderators.
- There was a lack of rigorous moderation of teachers' files and feedback to them for support and improvement.
- In some instances there was no distinction between monitoring and moderation.
- The standard of question papers/tasks was pitched at lower cognitive levels, mainly in school-designed tasks, but also in some common examinations/tasks. There was little variety in questions. Teachers and examiners did not make use of analysis grids.
- Projects and written reports were not cognitively balanced and were often irrelevant and based on theory, not practice. Tasks often did not have clear instructions and were inaccurately marked. Practical Investigations were not properly planned and were not spread across cognitive levels.
- There was over-reliance on previous question papers, which were being used over and over again. This practice deprives teachers of the opportunity to develop their own creativity.
- Rubrics were not used correctly, resulting in generalised marking. Inappropriate and outdated rubrics were also in use at some schools. Vague and subjective criteria were often seen. This problem is also observed during marking at marking centres where candidates are disadvantaged by markers not being able to use rubrics.
- Teachers' subject knowledge was often inadequate.
- The Physical Education Task (PET) was generally inappropriately assessed.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

- In future the DBE should provide Umalusi external moderators with copies of the completed moderation tool. This would enable Umalusi external moderators to see how the criteria had been interpreted.
- All moderation should be thorough and developmental and should provide detailed feedback to improve practice. Moderation has to include qualitative issues, otherwise it is merely verification or monitoring.
- The difference between monitoring and moderation should be stressed, as moderation should have a qualitative component and not focus on compliance only. To this end an appropriate moderation instrument should be designed and used.

- Teachers should be trained and encouraged to design their own assessment tasks in line with and similar to the standards set for the final examination. This would give teachers valuable exposure. Accordingly, they need to be orientated on the various forms of assessment, especially extended writing, and the proper administration and use of a rubric for this section.
- The prescribed cognitive weightings should be adhered to and the inclusion of higher-order questions should be encouraged. This will ensure that learners of different capabilities are accommodated.
- Tasks such as projects should be designed in such a way that they cover a range of assessment standards. When designing tasks, educators should consult the relevant policies.
- Over-reliance on previous question papers should be discouraged as it compromises the reliability of assessment tasks. Previous question papers should simply be used as a framework or model to develop new tasks for a particular year. Schools could work together to produce good, standardised tasks.
- Teachers should be trained in the use and interpretation of rubrics. Regular in-service training on content should take place to ensure that teachers are au fait with the subject matter.
- The PET mark compromises the authenticity of the Life Orientation final mark. Workshops need to be held to bring PET up to standard, while educators need guidance on how to assess PET. Assessment tools should be developed according to the nature of the task and the tools should be quality assured at both district and provincial levels.

PHASE 2: FINAL TERM MODERATION

PART 1: VERIFICATION OF EDUCATOR FILES

6.1 SIZE OF THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Generally, the DBE and Umalusi requirements were complied with. Two districts in each province were pre-selected, and these were supposed to be the worst-performing districts. Subsequently, five schools from each district were selected, and each school had to present 20 files per subject. It was found that the latter requirement was not complied with in all instances, as some schools submitted fewer files. However, enough files were submitted so that the process was not adversely affected. In one or two cases an additional school from another district was included in the sample.

6.2 QUALITY OF THE DBE MODERATION INSTRUMENTS

Some of the external moderators had seen a blank copy of the DBE moderation instrument and found it to be of good quality, making provision for all aspects of moderation, including the qualitative aspect. In most cases, however, no instrument was available, and the DBE did not make any reports available. The result was that most external moderators could not comment on this aspect.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS' FILES

6.3 MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE actual moderation of learners' evidence

The reports on the quality and standard of the DBE moderation of learners' evidence were mixed.

- It was not clear what the DBE moderators' brief was. From the external moderators' point of view it appeared that the brief was to check the accuracy of marking only, as the tasks and memoranda themselves were not moderated. In some cases the DBE moderators used memoranda containing errors.
- No DBE reports were available at the moderation sites, and this complicated Umalusi's task.
- Not all DBE moderators delivered work of equal thoroughness, rigour and quality.
- In some cases the DBE moderators did excellent, thorough and professional work, and their comments were developmental.
- In some files re-marking had been done, and in others compliance checked. In some cases the re-marking was shadow-marking and comprised monitoring, not moderating.
- Some external moderators made mention of excellent feedback, but these were in the minority. Most reports mentioned few or no comments and no recommendations in the learners' files. Some had, however, been moderated in detail.
- Some DBE moderators made mistakes like giving full marks for an incomplete answer (Life Orientation, Gauteng).
- In Mathematics (Eastern Cape), seven errors were found in the memorandum which had not been picked up by any of the previous moderators, not even by the DBE.
- Where the DBE moderators had changed marks, and some of the changes were substantial, up to 23 marks, the changes had not been recorded on the mark sheets.

Marking of the tasks

The findings under this heading were mixed:

- In some provinces/subjects the rubrics and guidelines were in line with the NCS policy documents and the marking was good.
- Some memoranda and rubrics did not always reflect the cognitive demands of the question.
- There appeared to be a general lack of understanding regarding the use of rubrics. In one school in the Free State orals were assessed using a writing rubric. Writing rubrics were used to mark literature.
- Some rubrics were inadequate and very vague which made consistency and inter-rater reliability difficult to achieve.
- Marking tools were not always applied consistently.
- The DBE moderators followed memoranda slavishly without checking or noticing that some of them were incorrect.
- Markers tended to be too generous.
- In some subjects marking was very poor (Maths Eastern Cape). A teacher awarded 0 for an answer that deserved full marks according to the memorandum.
- At another school marks out of 35 were recorded out of 30 without conversion.
- In Life Orientation, markers had problems marking sections B and C of the common assessment task (CAT).
- Still in Life Orientation, PET marks were unrealistically high, with school after school awarding 100% for attendance, implying that there were never any absentees, which is rather unlikely.
- The marking of extended writing was consistently inconsistent.
- In many cases marking was weak and nothing distinguished weaker from stronger learners because all marks were bunched in the safe middle range.
- In Accounting there was little understanding of the application of method marks and penalisation for inclusion of foreign items.
- Research projects were generally very poorly marked.

Overall impression of learner performance

- Learners generally coped with lower-order questions, but struggled with higher-order questions.
- The ability to express themselves in English was a determining factor in all subjects where answers had to be provided in the form of essays or paragraphs, such as History.
- Learners could write straightforward information, but not challenge, criticise or defend.
- Marks awarded for tasks and assignments were generally inflated, followed by very poor marks in the common examinations or tests.

- Performance in Mathematics was disastrously low in most cases. In Fort Beaufort (Eastern Cape) not a single Grade 12 learner in the district had passed the June examination.
- Performance in Life Orientation CAT was also generally low, particularly in sections B and C.
- Learners had not yet come to terms with the idea that Life Orientation was a subject that required study and research, and that they could not expect to do well on general knowledge alone.
- In Accounting, learners struggled with core sections of the work.
- Learners had difficulty interpreting the requirements of questions – explain, describe, discuss, etc.
- In some cases performance was negatively influenced by poor rubrics.
- In Life Sciences the marks for assignments and tasks were also high, followed by very low marks in the June and September examinations.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

- In a few cases there was a well-developed moderation system in place in a province, or in a subject in a province.
- There were isolated reports of good and effective moderation at district level.
- The quality of moderation varied, from being done well to none at all.
- The entire process of internal moderation needs overhauling. There was very little moderation of learners' work to be seen.
- There was very little formative feedback.
- There was little evidence that any pre-moderation of tasks had taken place.
- Script moderation was not rigorous enough.
- In some instances shadow-marking had been done by an HOD.
- There were often compliance checks, but no moderation.
- At Bizana (Eastern Cape) there was a marked improvement in Mathematics over the previous year, mainly due to the efforts of a conscientious subject advisor/moderator.

6.4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

PART 1: VERIFICATION OF TEACHERS' FILES

- The portfolio system was well organised and managed, and easily accessible.
- In Life Orientation evidence of district support was reflected in all files (KZN).
- The use of common tasks meant that candidates' work could be assessed accurately and schools in the area were likely to benefit.

- The use of diagnostic analysis sheets gave the educator a detailed overview of the learners' performance in a test.
- Some moderation was done at various levels, that is, school, cluster/district and provincial. There were completed school moderation forms indicating compliance, as well as a curriculum specialist tool with comments.
- There was some evidence of re-marking and monitoring.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS' FILES

- In some subjects across provinces the SBA process was managed appropriately and its scope could be seen.
- A provincial and internal moderation process was in place in some instances and at some schools there was evidence of re-marking, feedback and monitoring at school, cluster and district levels.
- Some of the HODs and subject advisors were providing their teachers with good and constructive advice
- The files were fairly complete and well managed, and presented a picture of the status of SBA in the province. The SBA policies were available.
- The attempt to standardise tasks was commended.
- All required tasks had been completed.
- The provincial trial examination papers were generally well developed.
- Common papers were written in June as well.
- District-level moderation had been thorough in some cases.
- National moderation had been stringent and fully compliant with the memorandum in most instances.
- The standard of tasks in Mathematics had improved since the previous external moderation (Fort Beaufort, Eastern Cape).
- The September examinations were generally of a good standard and were internally moderated.
- There was evidence of re-marking/moderation at various levels.
- The recording of marks was generally accurate.
- There were some innovative ideas for research and surveys.

6.5 CHALLENGES

PHASE 1: VERIFICATION OF TEACHERS' FILES

- Content coverage was generally of a very low standard; assignments were theoretical and often irrelevant. The cognitive level norms according to the SAG were not adhered to.
- Teachers appeared not to understand the SAG and SBA requirements.

- Administered and planned assessment tasks, and even common tasks and question papers, lacked evidence of moderation.
- There was evidence of over-reliance on previous years' papers. The setting of tasks lacked creativity and originality.
- Teachers generally lacked the ability to set meaningful tasks and questions.
- The marking memoranda and project rubrics were often vague, inappropriate and outdated. Rubrics were not used accurately, resulting in generalised marking. Some schools were using outdated rubrics.
- Recording of marks was often inaccurate or incomplete.
- There was a lack of rigorous internal moderation and constructive feedback. School-level moderation was rare.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS' FILES

- Some files were presented in a manner that made it difficult for external moderators to work through.
- There was little evidence of quality assurance of tasks.
- There was a lack of thorough school-level moderation.
- There were no comments by teachers in the learners' files.
- The SAG norms for cognitive levels were not always adhered to.
- Guidance on the nature of the heritage assignment (History) as a provincial initiative needs attention.
- There appeared to be a lack of content teaching particularly in Life Orientation. Learners' conceptual knowledge and critical thinking were poor.
- Learners had a poor grasp of question analysis and the provision of responses.
- There was a poor grasp of basic examination writing skills.
- At most schools marking was too lenient.
- In Life Orientation there was a huge discrepancy between the internal assessment and the CAT marks.
- The PET marks remain suspect and impact negatively on the authenticity of the final Life Orientation mark.
- While in general files have mark sheets, marks were recorded incorrectly.
- Some files did not have recording sheets.
- Evidence suggested that very little teaching was occurring in most of the classrooms. Teaching needs a great deal of attention.
- There was an urgent need for proper monitoring of teachers.
- There appeared to be a critical shortage of appropriately qualified teachers especially in the case of Mathematics in the Eastern Cape.
- The two DBE Life Orientation moderators in the Eastern Cape appeared to apply two different standards of marking.

6.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

PART 1: VERIFICATION OF TEACHERS' FILES

- More effort should be made in training teachers on content.
- Workshops should be arranged so that teachers are familiarised with the SAG and SBA requirements.
- Rigorous moderation at all levels should be the norm, with the focus on quality.
- Although previous questions and question papers may be used, they should be used as models and not rehashed from year to year. There should be a concerted effort to build capacity among teachers to set tasks and questions, as this is an essential skill.
- There should also be training in the design and use of rubrics.
- Meaningful feedback to teachers and learners is very important.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS' FILES

- Efforts should be made to ensure that learners' files are presentable.
- Tasks should be moderated and of an appropriate quality before they are written.
- Moderation at school level has to be improved and taken more seriously. HOD training in moderation processes and practices needs to be conducted to ensure that school managers understand the processes and their importance. The moderation process of scripts at school level should be rigorous.
- Feedback to learners by teachers is crucial to ensure improvement in learning.
- There should be a focus on the development of higher thinking skills so that learners can be critical thinkers.
- The setting of good common tasks is recommended. This should be done by panels, but should be limited to one task per subject just to provide a standard for the teachers. The ultimate goal is to have the SBA tasks sets by teachers, provided all teachers are adequately qualified to set such tasks.
- Teachers need to be guided in the setting of the heritage assignment (History) according to a single key question and the application of an appropriate rubric to assess these tasks. This also entails guidance on the proper selection of authentic and personal sources to address the key question.
- Higher thinking skills must be taught so that learners can solve problems, and critically analyse, evaluate and synthesise information.
- Teaching of Life Orientation content is vital.
- All assessment tasks should be accompanied by a completed taxonomy grid.
- Teachers should be trained in the application and development of rubrics.
- Teachers need to be guided in the marking of graphs and essays.

- Uniformity in approach on the part of DBE moderators is essential. They should operate as a team and be equally stringent.

7 CONCLUSION

The findings of the SBA moderation were quite disappointing, and it is trusted that the findings will be taken seriously and remedial action implemented. There may be several plausible reasons for the poor quality of SBA in the PEDs and the eight subjects that were moderated, but it is clear that there is too little control over the work that is done. The only way to impose some control is through rigorous and regular moderation at all levels, and where weaknesses are identified, efforts should be made to remedy them by means of training and further moderation.

(Please refer to Addenda 2A and 2B on page 180 for more details on this chapter)

CHAPTER 3

APPROVAL OF FINAL MEMORANDA: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1 INTRODUCTION

Moderation of the marking memoranda for all 132 question papers was done during memorandum discussion meetings. Representatives from the PEDs (internal moderators and/or chief markers) were invited to attend the discussions and were expected to arrive at the venues having drawn up their own memoranda in order to detect any possible problems with interpretation. They were also expected to have pre-marked a sample of scripts to get a feel for the type of responses candidates were writing.

The purpose of this moderation was firstly to ensure that there was a common understanding of the memorandum. This was essential as marking was decentralised. The pre-marking of scripts and the preparation of a memorandum would provide possible answers, which had not been included in the memorandum, for discussion. Consensus had to be reached without compromising the cognitive level of the questions or memorandum, and the latter was Umalusi's external moderators' chief task. Chief markers in the provinces then had the task of training markers and ensuring that the various memoranda were adhered to in order to ensure uniformity of standards across the provinces. The moderation of this process is the topic of the following chapter. Once the memoranda had been signed off at the memorandum discussions, they had to be adhered to without any changes being made at the provincial marking centres.

2 SCOPE

Memorandum discussions were held for 132 memoranda and Umalusi moderators attended all the meetings for all subjects.

Subject	Date of Examination	Date of memorandum discussion
Accounting	23.10.12	29-30.10.12
Afrikaans FAL P1	01.11.12	09.11.12
Afrikaans FAL P2	11.11.12	21-22.11.12
Afrikaans FAL P3	23.11.12	26-27.11.12

Subject	Date of Examination	Date of memorandum discussion
Afrikaans HL P1	11.11.12	9-10.11.12
Afrikaans HL P2	15.11.12	21-22.11.12
Afrikaans HL P3	23.11.12	26-27.11.12
Afrikaans SAL P1	11.11.12	
Afrikaans SAL P2	23.11.12	
Agricultural Management Practices	11.11.12	24-25.11.12
Agricultural Sciences P1	11.11.12	8-9.11.12
Agricultural Sciences P2	11.11.12	14-15.11.12
Agricultural Technology	11.11.12	26.11.12
Business Studies	11.11.12	21-22.11.12
Civil Technology P1	26.11.12	28.11.12
Computer Applications Technology P1	24.10.12	02.11.12
Computer Applications Technology P2	31.10.12	03.11.12
Consumer Studies	27.11.12	29.11.12
Dance Studies	28.11.12	28-29.11.12
Design Studies P1	11.11.12	20-21.11.12
Design Studies P2		
Dramatic Arts	22.10.12	
Economics		
Electrical Technology	28.11.12	29.11.12
Engineering Graphics & Design P1	12.11.12	23.11.12
Engineering Graphics & Design P2	20.11.12	24.11.12
English FAL P1		
English FAL P2	22.10.12	28-29.10.12
English FAL P3	26.11.12	28-29.11.12
English HL P1	11.12	28-29.11.12
English HL P2	08.11.12	16-17.11.12
English HL P3	26.11.12	28-29.11.12
English SAL P1 & 2	10 & 11.12	13.11.12
Geography P1	19.11.12	23.11.12
Geography P2	19.11.12	25.11.12
History P1	07.11.12	15-16.11.12
History P2	16.11.12	21-22.11.12
Hospitality Studies	27.11.12	29.11.12
Information Technology P1	11.11.12	30.10.12
Information Technology P2	11.11.12	04.11.12
IsiNdebele FAL P1	16.11.12	16.11.12
IsiNdebele FAL P2	20.11.12	20.11.12
IsiNdebele FAL P3	26.11.12	26.11.12

Subject	Date of Examination	Date of memorandum discussion
IsiNdebele HL P1	16.11.12	16.11.12
IsiNdebele HL P2	20.11.12	20.11.12
IsiNdebele HL P3	26.11.12	26.11.12
IsiNdebele SAL P1	16.11.12	16.11.12
IsiNdebele SAL P2	26.11.12	26.11.12
IsiXhosa FAL P1	07.11.12	14.11.12
IsiXhosa FAL P2	14.11.12	20.11.12
IsiXhosa FAL P3	22.11.12	25.11.12
IsiXhosa HL P1	07.11.12	15.11.12
IsiXhosa HL P2	14.11.12	20.11.12
IsiXhosa HL P3	22.11.12	26.11.12
IsiXhosa SAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
IsiXhosa SAL P2	11.11.12	19.11.12
IsiZulu FAL P1		
IsiZulu FAL P2		
IsiZulu FAL P3		
IsiZulu HL P1	07.11.12	15.11.12
IsiZulu HL P2	14.11.12	20.11.12
IsiZulu HL P3	22.11.12	26.11.12
IsiZulu SAL P1		
IsiZulu SAL P2		
Life Sciences P1 Version 1	09.11.12	19-20.11.12
Life Sciences P2 Version 1	12.11.12	21-22.11.12
Life Sciences P1 & P2 Version 2	09.11.12	19-20.11.12
	12.11.12	21-22.11.12
√ 29. Mathematical Literacy P1	02.11.12	12-13.11.12
√ 30. Mathematical Literacy P2	05.11.12	14-15.11.12
Mathematics P1	02.11.12	12-15.11.12
Mathematics P2	05.11.12	
Mathematics P3		16-17.11.12
Mechanical Technology	16.11.12	22.11.12
Music P1	30.10.12	07.11.12
Music P2	02.11.12	09.11.12
Physical Sciences P1	25.11.12	29.11.12
Physical Sciences P2	05.11.12	29.11.12
Religion Studies P1		
Religion Studies P2		
Sepedi FAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Sepedi FAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12

Subject	Date of Examination	Date of memorandum discussion
Sepedi FAL P3	11.11.12	29.11.12
Sepedi HL P1	06.11.12	14.11.12
Sepedi HL P2	22.11.12	26.11.12
Sepedi HL P3	27.11.12	29.11.12
Sepedi SAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Sepedi SAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12
Sesotho FAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Sesotho FAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12
Sesotho FAL P3	27.11.12	29.11.12
Sesotho HL P1	06.11.12	14.11.12
Sesotho HL P2	14.11.12	26.11.12
Sesotho HL P3	23.11.12	26.11.12
Sesotho SAL P1		14.11.12
Sesotho SAL P2		26.11.12
Setswana FAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Setswana FAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12
Setswana FAL P3	27.11.12	29.11.12
Setswana HL P1	06.11.12	14.11.12
Setswana HL P2	22.11.12	26.11.12
Setswana HL P3	27.11.12	29.11.12
Setswana SAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Setswana SAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12
Siswati FAL P1		
Siswati FAL P2	11.11.12	20.11.12
Siswati FAL P3	11.11.12	20.11.12
Siswati HL P1	07.11.12	15.11.12
Siswati HL P2	11.11.12	15.11.12
Siswati HL P3	11.11.12	26.11.12
Siswati SAL P1	07.11.12	15.11.12
Siswati SAL P2	11.11.12	20.11.12
Tourism	17.11.12	25-27.11.12
Tshivenda FAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Tshivenda FAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12
Tshivenda FAL P3	11.11.12	29.11.12
Tshivenda HL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Tshivenda HL P2	22.11.12	26.11.12
Tshivenda HL P3	11.11.12	3.12.12
Tshivenda SAL P1	9.11.12	14.11.12
Tshivenda SAL P2	11.11.12	26.11.12

Subject	Date of Examination	Date of memorandum discussion
Visual Arts P1		
Visual Arts P2		
Xitsonga FAL P1	11.11.12	14.11.12
Xitsonga FAL P2		26.11.12
Xitsonga FAL P3		29.11.12
Xitsonga HL P1		14.11.12
Xitsonga HL P2		26.11.12
Xitsonga HL P3		
Xitsonga SAL P1		14.11.12
Xitsonga SAL P2		

3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

For the purpose of this report the criteria listed in the moderation instrument were reduced to four main categories, namely, Process, procedures and attendance; Qualitative issues; Areas/problems that were not appropriately addressed during the setting and moderation process; and Comments and Recommendations.

3.1 PROCESS, PROCEDURES AND ATTENDANCE

A particular process and procedure has been established over the past few years. The individual memorandum discussions are generally chaired by the national internal moderator. A senior official from the DBE attended the meeting on the first day to address the internal moderators and chief markers, to remind them of the importance of the meeting, to provide any information that the DBE wished to convey and, generally, to set the tone for the memo discussions.

The discussions then proceeded. Provincial chief markers/internal moderators submitted their written reports on pre-marking and made a brief verbal presentation. These reports formed the basis of the discussion, as any changes to the memoranda depended on what the provincial representatives had found in their pre-marked scripts. The discussion followed the memorandum question by question. A scribe captured all decisions on computer, which in most cases projected the memorandum onto a screen so that everyone could follow what was being done.

When the process was complete, the next step was practice marking and training. Dummy scripts were provided, and each chief marker/internal moderator marked the same scripts. The decisions made and the mark allocation were then discussed until consensus was reached on how to mark every answer. This is becoming an extremely important part of the memo discussion, because the Umalusi external moderators have almost all reported an improvement in marking; an improvement that has been linked directly to the training that the chief markers and internal moderators have undergone, which has improved their understanding of the memorandum and given them confidence.

The task of the external moderators was mainly to observe and to maintain the integrity of the memorandum, while allowing improvements to it. The smaller the group, the more likely the external moderator was inclined to become part of the discussion.

The following findings were reported under the general heading:

Table 3.1: Process, procedures and attendance

Finding	Frequency /132	%
Innovative diagnostic methods were being put in place by the DBE to ensure that the teaching and assessment of the subject in the PEDs were improved. The use of the Rausch model analysis instrument has been introduced to analyse results.	2	1,5
The pre-memo discussion meeting was very valuable.	1	0,8
Dummy scripts were prepared for practice marking which the delegates could take back to the provinces with them (Accounting).	1	0,8
The selection of scripts for practice marking was inappropriate.	1	0,8
Subjects for which provincial representatives did not attend the memo discussion.	15	11,4
The time between the exam and the memo discussion was too short for pre-marking.	11	8,3
The DBE team caused a delay in starting by arriving late/not informing of venue.	2	1,5
Provincial reports were not handed in (Mpumalanga, English FAL P1), Limpopo, and Free State did not hand in reports.	2	1,5
Internal moderator/chief marker could not attend due to a clash with another subject/paper.	8	6,1

As can be seen from the above, few problems were experienced. The major problems that emerged were the provincial internal moderators and chief markers who did not attend the memo discussions. The provinces involved are named in Addendum 3. This was very serious as it was bound to have major repercussions for the standard of marking in the provinces. Various reasons were provided for non-attendance. In some cases the PDEs did not make it possible for representatives to attend for financial reasons, and in others, notably the languages, various question papers were discussed in the same time slot, and

as they were sometimes placed at different venues, the representatives had to choose which memo discussion to attend.

The second problem was that the time between the writing of the examination and the memo discussion was too short, and pre-marking could not be done. Sometimes the discussion was the very next day. This prevented provincial chief markers and internal moderators from meeting their obligations and had a serious impact on the discussions as delegates had not had any time to collect scripts for pre-marking, and discussion was of necessity somewhat theoretical.

3.2 QUALITATIVE ISSUES

In this section it would seem that nearly all memoranda underwent some changes. There were a few in which incorrect answers were identified that had to be corrected, such as spelling mistakes, but by far the majority of the changes were the addition of alternative answers to questions. In fact, these were not really changes, but rather extensions to refine the memorandum and to accommodate other views and possible interpretations.

All changes were substantiated and approved under the watchful eye of the Umalusi moderators, who contributed to the discussions when required and sometimes had to take a decision when consensus could not be reached. They also had to ensure that the changes would not have an impact on the cognitive levels of the question papers and memoranda.

Over and above the nature of the changes to the memoranda, it should be noted that all changes were substantiated and approved, that there was no impact of the cognitive levels of question papers, and that the changes served to simplify and refine the memorandum. The following findings were gleaned from the reports on the memorandum discussions.

Table 3.2: Qualitative issues

Finding	Frequency/132	%
Too many textbooks in use in schools complicated the memo discussions; there were too many options.	1	0,8
A question was difficult (comprehension test) and some candidates could not finish.	1	0,8
There was a plea not to engage in whole-paper marking as this disadvantaged some candidates.	2	1,5
Incorrect Afrikaans translations resulted in changes to the memorandum to accommodate the disadvantaged candidates.	2	1,5

One editorial error invalidated a question and compensation had to be built in.	1	0,8
The rubrics were extensively edited (Sesotho HL).	1	0,8
The marking of the summary was changed on the instruction of the DBE (Tshivenda HL).	1	0,8
There was a typing error in a poem, and a word that differed in three different publications used in the schools (Tshivenda HL).	1	0,8
Learners did not prepare for the examinations (Xitsonga).	1	0,8

As can be seen, there were no major problems and the few remarks above that were gleaned from the external moderators reports serve to highlight some aspects without pointing to major problems.

The third area on which external moderators reported was the following

Table 3.3: Areas/problems that were not appropriately addressed during the setting and moderation process

Finding	Frequency/ 132	%
More alternatives should have been included.	1	0,8
Some questions could have been formulated more carefully to avoid so many alternatives.	2	1,5
The marking grid needed clarification.	1	0,8
Translation into Afrikaans caused problems.	2	1,5
Simpler language should be used.	1	0,8
A prescribed textbook was unavailable.	1	0,8
Aligning essay questions with the alternative answers was a problem.	1	0,8
A procedure should be developed to deal with different versions of question papers (Information Technology [IT]).	2	1,5
The setting of question papers should start earlier.	2	1,5
Better provision should be made for differently-abled persons. Blind candidates could not interpret graphics.	2	1,5
Guidelines are required on how to deal with a candidate's corrupted CD.	2	1,5
Printing in the provinces caused problems with graphics.	8	6,1
Inexplicable changes were made to provincial question papers. Were these being tampered with by local editors?	1	0,8
Markers should be properly skilled and knowledgeable regarding the subject content.	1	0,8
If chief markers and internal moderators do not attend the memo discussion they should not be in charge of marking.	2	1,5
The examination panel should be enlarged (IT).	1	0,8
Provinces do not take SAL seriously and do not send representatives.	1	0,8

Finding	Frequency/ 132	%
Some unusual terminology appeared in the papers (editing?).	1	0,8
The awarding of language marks in the summary should be reconsidered.	1	0,8

Comments and recommendations

The comments and recommendations are captured in detail in Addendum 3 of the main technical report. The most important/common were the following:

- The pre-discussion meetings are extremely useful and streamlined the following days' discussions. Unfortunately the discussion did not take place in all subjects, often because travel arrangements do not take these meetings into account and people arrive late or do not turn up at all. Return flights are also arranged so early that people have to leave before the end of the discussion.
- The SAG (first additional languages) guidelines on summary marking should be reconsidered.
- The programme for memo discussion should take into account when the papers were written to avoid a situation where it is impossible to collect scripts and pre-mark them in time for the discussion. Memo discussions are a costly exercise, and they should be planned so as to provide the best outcomes.
- The marking rubrics for languages need to be reviewed.
- One cannot have a chief marker who does not know the subject (Dance).
- Umalusi should make reports on the moderation of marking available to chief markers and internal moderators to enable them to learn from mistakes.
- The DBE should act strictly against provinces that do not send chief markers and internal moderators to memo discussions. Such individuals should not be allowed to supervise the marking, and officials from those provinces that did attend should replace them, or the marking should be allocated to another province.
- There is great unhappiness in the Business Studies team. A senior DBE official joined the memo discussion and addressed the team and provincial representatives. During this address, she severely criticised the 2011 paper for being too easy. Consequently, the team felt that it had been unfairly criticised, as the effect of too lenient and poor marking had not been considered. The relationship between the DBE and this team should be addressed.
- Additional software programs are required at the DBE for setting Computer Applications Technology question papers in order to accommodate the variety of software programs in use at schools.
- Printing in the provinces has led to problems, mainly with graphics. The problem had serious consequences in Mpumalanga where part of a diagram inexplicably disappeared from the Mathematics P2 question paper, and 11 marks had to be compensated for in some way.

4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- The memorandum discussions presented an opportunity for provincial chief markers and internal moderators to iron out any problems that might arise in respect of the memorandum, and encouraged them to take ownership of and responsibility for the memoranda.
- The arrangements were generally good and most representatives could attend without major problems.
- The practice marking and training incorporated in the memorandum discussions are beginning to bear fruit and many external moderators reported an improvement in the standard of marking.

5 CHALLENGES

- The programme for memorandum discussions did not take the provincial representatives' preparation for the discussions into account: some representatives arrived without having seen a single script or memorandum. This had a very negative impact on the discussions and meant that optimal benefit was not derived from the undoubtedly expensive exercise.
- Some provincial representatives were sent for the shortest possible time, which prevented them from attending pre-memo discussion meetings and forced them to leave before the training had been completed.
- Provincial officials were also unwilling to make a range of scripts (copies) available to facilitate the pre-marking and memorandum discussions. It is important to access a range of scripts representing various levels of performance; however, representatives often had to make do with a few scripts from one centre, which did not offer a good basis from which to launch meaningful discussions.
- Memo discussion meetings of the HL, FAL and SAL were held at the same time, causing problems for the chief markers, internal moderators and even some Umalusi external moderators who are often responsible for the question papers of all these level.
- Equipment such as printers and projectors were not always available at the venues and this led to frustrating delays.
- Printing in the provinces was not always up to the required standard, particularly regarding the printing of visuals and graphics. This disadvantaged some candidates.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

As much time as possible should be planned between the writing of a question paper and the memorandum discussion.

Provinces should acknowledge the importance and qualitative impact of knowledgeable chief markers and internal moderators, and should therefore budget time and money for them to attend the memorandum discussions from beginning to end.

The provision of copies of a memorandum and a range of scripts to chief markers and internal moderators immediately after the examinations should be written into the examination guidelines for provinces.

The programme for the memo discussions of the HL, FAL and SAL question papers should be designed in such a way that it allows the chief markers, internal moderators and external moderators to be able to attend all the meetings.

Provision should be made for the necessary equipment at the memo discussion venues. Printing in the provinces should satisfy the norms and standards for printing, and the printers should be subjected to monitoring and quality control.

7 CONCLUSION

Memorandum discussions have come a long way and have become extremely useful interactive exercises serving to clarify memoranda to the advantage of candidates. The practice marking/training that has now become a part of the memorandum discussion has proved to be extremely valuable and has brought about some improvement in the quality of marking throughout the country.

Having said this, the challenges highlighted above indicate that there is definitely still room for improvement.

(Please refer to Addenda 3 on page 274 for more details on this chapter)

CHAPTER 4

VERIFICATION OF MARKING

1 INTRODUCTION

Marking is the culmination of the examination process. Verification of marking is therefore the final step in the quality assurance of the final examination for the NSC. If the marking is not properly controlled and carried out, it has the potential to nullify all the effort and expense that has gone into the preparation of a credible examination.

In 2012, Umalusi followed a different approach to the verification of marking and on a larger scale than in previous years: a combination of on-site and centralised verification of marking. From 5–7 December 2012, a substantial amount of on-site verification was done.

This was a very valuable exercise as on the one hand it exposed external moderators to the conditions at the coal-face, so to speak, and on the other hand, it created an opportunity for problems and misunderstandings to be addressed at the very beginning of the marking session. The external moderators could provide guidance on moderation to the internal moderators and chief markers, and interact with individual markers to clarify any issues that appeared to be causing problems.

Extensive centralised verification followed directly after the on-site verification from 8 to 11 December 2012. This exercise took place at Umalusi's offices in Pretoria. Certain subjects were identified, and provinces were required to send in 20 scripts per question paper, selected according to achievement (poor, average and good performance), and the relevant memorandum. The two forms of verification eventually presented a reliable picture of the standard of marking in the country.

2 SCOPE

Reports were submitted by Umalusi's external moderators on conclusion of the on-site and centralised moderation of marking.

2.1 ON-SITE VERIFICATION

Five provinces were selected for on-site verification in 13 subjects from 5–7 December 2012:

Provinces	Subjects
Eastern Cape	Accounting Afrikaans FAL Business Studies English FAL
Gauteng	Agricultural Sciences Business Studies Accounting
KwaZulu-Natal	Accounting Economics English FAL
Limpopo	Accounting English HL Geography
Northern Cape	Accounting History Life Sciences (Versions 1 & 2) Mathematical Literacy Mathematics (Only P1 & P2) Physical Sciences

The details of the on-site verification are captured in Addendum 4A at the end of this document, and a summary of the findings are presented below.

2.2 CENTRALISED VERIFICATION OF MARKING

Centralised verification was held at Umalusi between Saturday 8 December and Tuesday 11 December. The submission of scripts for the moderation of marking (gateway subjects and four others) was planned as follows:

Provinces	Gateway and other subjects
Eastern Cape	Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Tourism
Free State	Accounting

Provinces	Gateway and other subjects
	Afrikaans FAL Agricultural Science Business Studies Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Tourism
Gauteng	Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Tourism
KwaZulu-Natal	Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Tourism
Limpopo	Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Tourism
Mpumalanga	Accounting Economics Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design English FAL English HL Tourism
Northern Cape	Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Tourism
North West	Accounting Computer Applications Technology Geography History Life Sciences
Western Cape	Accounting Computer Applications Technology Consumer Studies Engineering Graphics & Design Mathematical Literacy Mathematics (P1 & P2) Physical Sciences Tourism

Scripts for all African Languages also had to be submitted for verification of marking. The detailed information is captured in Addendum 4 under the criteria used in the verification instrument. Summaries of the most important findings are provided below.

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

3.1 ADHERENCE TO MARKING MEMORANDUM

It was found that markers had adhered to the marking memorandum throughout. This can be attributed at least in part to the fact that training forms a major part of the various memorandum discussions. This was mentioned by the majority of external moderators. At the memorandum discussions alternatives were added to accommodate different views and insights. The only problem was that some markers had difficulty recognising correct answers phrased differently to the answer in the memorandum.

3.2 CONSISTENCY AND ACCURACY

Marking was generally accurate, although markers tended to inflate essay marks. This was something that internal moderators and chief markers had to watch. The examination assistants played an important role in assuring the accuracy of totalling, transferring and recording marks. Based on the sample of scripts verified it can be concluded that memoranda were not changed at the marking centres.

3.3 QUALITY AND STANDARD OF MARKING

The quality of marking varied from fair to excellent. Question-by-question marking helped to maintain consistency. Verification of marking revealed a few serious discrepancies like the ones mentioned above where some markers were unable to recognise alternative responses provided by candidates.

3.4 INTERNAL MODERATION

Where the standard of marking was fair and not excellent, errors were picked up by the internal moderators, and markers were guided to better understanding. Improvement in marking was reported after initial problems had been dealt with.

3.5 UNFAIR QUESTIONS

There were no unfair questions as the question papers had been competently moderated, and the memorandum discussions had taken care of any possible ambiguities.

3.6 CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE

The spread of marks confirmed that the question papers were fair, but it was also clear that many candidates could not cope with the higher-order questions. This can be traced to inadequate preparation throughout the year, as it was clear that SBA does not adhere to the required cognitive levels.

3.7 FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

Most of the findings were positive, and suggestions contained mostly injunctions for chief markers and internal moderators to continue to maintain standards.

3.8 ADJUSTMENT OF MARKS

With very few exceptions moderators proposed that raw marks be accepted, as there was no evidence that question papers were unfair. In Life Sciences Paper 2, a small upward adjustment was proposed due to the preponderance of paragraph-type questions in the paper that might have disadvantaged some candidates.

There was a problem with Sesotho HL P1, where in some way the alternatives agreed upon at the memorandum discussion had not been captured in the memorandum that was sent to the marking centres. This led to some confusion until the improved memorandum had been furnished.

4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- The training of chief markers and internal moderators at memorandum discussions is having a positive impact on the marking of scripts.
- From the reports of the external moderators on on-site verification of marking, it is clear that a fair amount of time was being spent on the training of markers.

5 CHALLENGES

- Markers did not always display the requisite competence for marking, or the in-depth knowledge of the subject required to recognise answers expressed in different words. This applied mainly to open-ended questions and paragraph/essay questions.
- Markers still had difficulty working with rubrics, and tended to inflate marks because they did not understand the descriptors.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

- The appointment of markers is extremely important, and it is imperative that PEDs should ensure that the markers they appoint have the required competence and subject knowledge to be able to recognise correct answers expressed in different words.
- In light of the point made above, the use of competency tests would assist in ensuring that suitable markers are appointed.
- Teachers in general should be trained to use rubrics, as it was not only at the marking centres that they experienced problems, but also in their assessment of learners' tests and tasks during the year.
- Training of markers, chief markers and internal moderators should be a priority to ensure a continuously improving corps of markers.

7 CONCLUSION

It is evident that progress has been made over the years. There is, however, much room for improvement in the selection and training of markers and chief markers. Competency tests will go a long way in the identification of competent and suitable markers.

(Please refer to Addenda 4 on page 301 for more details on this chapter)

CHAPTER 5

MONITORING OF THE CONDUCT OF EXAMINATIONS

1 INTRODUCTION

Umalusi undertook a series of external moderation and monitoring exercises to assess the writing phase of the examination and the administration of the marking centres.

The purpose of the external monitoring of the writing phase was not only to identify good practice, but also to identify challenges encountered in the writing and marking phase of the examination, as identified by Umalusi monitors. Areas for improvement are suggested, based on the findings and recommendations that are made. This was quite an extensive operation, and external monitors were deployed at examination centres and marking centres throughout the provinces.

2 SCOPE

Table 5.1: Examination (writing) centres

Dates	Province	No. of monitors	No. of examination centres
22.10.12 - 23.11.12	Eastern Cape	3	21
24.10.12 – 19.11.12	Free State	5	21
22.10.12 – 28.11.12	Gauteng	5	23
23.10.12 – 23.11.12	KwaZulu-Natal	4	18
22.10.12 – 22.11.12	Limpopo	4	27
	Mpumalanga	4	18
22.10.12 – 27.11.12	Northern Cape	4	40
23.10.12 – 23.11.12	North West	3	14
22.10.12 – 24.11.12	Western Cape	4	25
TOTAL	9	36	207

Table 5.2: Marking centres

Dates	Province	No. of monitors	No. of marking centres
05.12.12 – 07.12.12	Eastern Cape	3	11
03.12.12 – 06.12.12	Free State	5	14
26.11.12 – 11.12.12	Gauteng	5	10
02.12.12 – 06.12.12	KwaZulu-Natal	4	12
01.12.12 – 07.12.12	Limpopo	4	14
	Mpumalanga	4	14
04.12.12 – 13.12.12	Northern Cape	3	3
03.12.12 – 06.12.12	North West	3	8
05.12.12 – 14.12.12	Western Cape	1	1
TOTAL	9	32	87

Monitors were deployed to the above centres with monitoring instruments, and the essence of their reports has been captured in Addendum 5, with a summary of the findings provided below.

3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

3.1 EXAMINATION CENTRES

In general the examination centres were well run. Very few weaknesses were noted. In the Western Cape examination timetables were prominently displayed.

General management of the examination

- In the Free State there were some centres where the question papers were kept in steel cabinets in the admin block, which was not secure enough. In addition, at a few centres too many people had access to the storage space where question papers were kept, for example the chief invigilator and admin staff. Some of the centres did not have clear contingency plans in place. In Gauteng not all centres could produce letters of appointment for the chief invigilators. At one centre in KwaZulu-Natal there was no access control, and in general there were no clear contingency plans.
- In Limpopo the plastic satchels for packaging scripts had not been received in the first week of the examination, and the centres also failed to have contingency plans in place.
- Few of the examination centres across the country had contingency plans in place. In the Northern Cape and North West security was tight, and contingency plans were

in place at most of the examination centres in the Northern Cape. These plans were not available, however, at most North West centres.

- All chief invigilators in the Western Cape were trained in September and an updated manual was in use across the province. In the Eastern Cape, Limpopo, KZN and Mpumalanga, question papers were delivered daily to avoid having question papers in the examination centres. These were collected and delivered at "nodal points".

The examination room – general

- At some centres in the Free State, Gauteng and KZN, the location of the examination venues were not indicated. At two centres in the Free State high noise levels at the end of the school day were reported, while several centres did not display the start-finish times and centre numbers. In Limpopo there was a very bad smell in one examination room owing to something in the roof.
- There was a lack of consistency in the identification of candidates in the Northern Cape. In the Western Cape, the examination was very well run, with notices indicating that an examination was in progress prominently displayed. Most centres were in order. In one Eastern Cape school the clock was very small.

The examination room – seating of candidates

- At one school in KZN the computers were far too close together, and the group should have written in two sessions for greater security. No other problems were reported.
- In some rural areas of North West the examination rooms were in a state of disrepair and not conducive to the writing of examinations.
- Seating was generally in order, with candidates arranged numerically or alphabetically.

Before commencement of the examination

- In the Free State IDs and permit letters were not checked at every centre, probably because the candidates were known to the invigilators. In the Western Cape IDs were consistently checked. There was also a fixed policy for cell phones.
- In Gauteng the issue of cell phones was treated differently at various schools.
- At many of the schools in Limpopo, Mpumalanga and KZN, the candidates did not check whether they had been given the right question papers, and the question papers were not checked to make sure that there were no blank pages or pages missing.
- Pre-examination procedures were adhered to, although the standardisation of some procedures across the country was required, for example the policy regarding cell phones and the identification of candidates.

Writing of the examination

- In the Free State the reading time before commencement of the examination was not consistent, and varied from 5 to 23 minutes. At some centres daily reports were not submitted, and at others irregularity registers were not kept.
- In Gauteng there appeared to be some technical irregularities that were not reported, pending a meeting on 18.12.2012, when an electronic report would be submitted to Umalusi.

Packaging and transmission of answer scripts

In the Free State there appeared to be no consistency in the handling of examination stationery. No other provinces reported any problems.

Monitoring

At some examination centres in the Free State there was no evidence that any provincial monitoring had taken place. In the Northern Cape, however, there were several visits by monitors at the various schools. In the Western Cape monitoring was more regular in some areas than in others.

3.2 MARKING CENTRES

Planning for marking

Planning was appropriate and detailed in all provinces. In the Northern Cape, at all three centres, the marking plan was set out in a comprehensive "Markers Guide" hand-out.

Marking centre

- Most marking centres fulfilled the requirements. In Mpumalanga, one centre, Dr CN Mahlangu, was not suitable, as it had stood unused for some time, and taps and geysers were a problem. All centres in North West were well equipped and had excellent marking centre plans in place.
- In the Western Cape marking was centralised at one point, a university campus, which was an appropriate venue.
- Very good communication facilities were available in almost all the centres visited, for example fax, copying and printing machines and telephones.

3.3 SECURITY

In most provinces security was appropriate. In KZN it was reported that there was not stringent enough access control at the gates, and at two centres the search procedures were not thorough. In Limpopo visitors were admitted at one centre without being searched.

At the Western Cape centre security was particularly tight and only accredited officials could enter the campus. Additional security was put in place due to expected unrest on the part of some unions.

Security at the three Northern Cape marking centres was not that convincing. The centres are manned by young women who had been recently appointed by a new security company, and did not seem to have been thoroughly trained. At two marking centres, Kimberley Girls High and Northern Cape High, the Umalusi monitor and one Umalusi staff member were not checked at the main gate. At another marking centre, Northern Cape High, one entrance door was unmanned and there was free access to the marking venues.

Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants

- The appointment of markers and administrative assistants was in order, and their appointment had been confirmed in writing. At one centre in Limpopo markers arrived late because they had not received their letters of appointment. It was not envisaged that this would affect the date on which marking would be completed.
- In Mpumalanga the requirements for the appointment of markers and examination assistants were adhered to.
- In North West, tertiary students and unemployed teachers were appointed as examination assistants.
- In the Eastern Cape, examination assistants were required to write an aptitude test before being appointed.

Training of markers

- The markers were all trained in marking procedures and methodology a day before the marking commenced. The training was of six to eight hours' duration and took the form of memo discussions and practice marking. In Mpumalanga a great deal of time (up to two days) was spent on practice marking. In the Western Cape training was undertaken on 4 and 5 December. The Western Cape has also developed a detailed manual for markers.
- In the Northern Cape it was reported that all the markers attended a general training session during the opening ceremony. Various topics, for example reports, mark sheets, script management and irregularities, were discussed by senior officials from Head Office. Thereafter, all markers at the marking centres were trained in their subject groups by the relevant chief markers and internal moderators.
- In North West markers were trained on arrival for periods ranging from two hours to a full day.

Marking procedure

Satisfactory marking procedures were documented in each province. No deviation from these procedures was tolerated or reported.

Internal moderation

Internal moderation was satisfactory. Internal moderators spent the whole day at the marking centres, from the first to the last day of marking. This was a little problematic in Limpopo where an internal moderator was responsible for several question papers, and these papers were marked at different centres, up to 30 kilometres apart. This entailed travelling back and forth, and the internal moderator not being available at all centres at all times. This was a waste of time.

In the Western Cape internal moderators were expected to spend eight hours of every day at the marking centre moderating scripts. Internal moderation was done at all levels in North West to ensure that the maximum number of scripts was covered.

External moderation

External moderation of selected subjects was undertaken by Umalusi's external moderators. Apart from the on-site moderation that was undertaken, packages of 20 scripts per paper were dispatched to Umalusi for centralised moderation. The scripts were selected according to predetermined criteria.

Monitoring of marking

The chief markers and the deputy centre manager monitored the performance of markers during the marking process, and the procedures for dealing with under-performers were in place. A report was prepared on the performance of each marker. Underperforming markers were not dismissed but rather subjected to further training after discussions, and moved to other sections if their poor performance continued.

Handling of irregularities

- The handling of irregularities was discussed during training. Most centres had irregularities registers and committees. Most technical irregularities were solved at the centre, and more serious irregularities were referred to the provincial irregularities committee. A summary of irregularities is presented at the end of this chapter.
- In the Eastern Cape one irregularity officer was appointed for every two marking centres to exercise control over the reporting of irregularities. In the Western Cape there were strict procedures for dealing with irregularities. An irregularities meeting was held on 12 December at the marking centre.
- All markers were fully informed about dealing with irregularities.

Quality assurance procedures

- All scripts were checked by examination assistants and the chief markers to ensure that every question was marked and that there were no calculation and transfer errors. Everything possible was done to prevent the loss of mark sheets, but if one was lost a provisional one would be completed. The completed mark sheets were

photocopied and one remained with the batch while the other was taken to the capturing centre by departmental officials.

- Multi-levels of moderation at all the marking centres visited were maintained in the interests of quality assurance.

Reports

- Reporting differed from province to province. In some cases reports were completed daily, but in most cases reports by the internal moderators and chief markers were completed at the end of the marking process, and not every day. The chief markers had to complete qualitative reports.
- In most provinces interim reports were only submitted when an irregularity occurred. In North West, qualitative reports were submitted at the end of the marking session.

Electronic capturing of marks

The capturing of marks was done at provincial data-capturing centres. The mark sheets were delivered to the centre daily by departmental officials. The systems were set up to flag any irregularities such as marks left out or absent candidates not indicated as such. In Gauteng, marks were scanned in, which eliminated mistakes to a large extent. In all centres the capturing of marks was taken very seriously and correctness was ensured as far as possible.

Packing and transmission of documentation

The examination assistants and the chief markers counted and recorded the scripts. The mark sheets and reports were collected by departmental officials, and a dispatch register was completed.

4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

4.1 EXAMINATION CENTRES

- In almost all centres the security measures for the safekeeping of examination materials were very tight.
- Most centres kept examination files that were up to date and that provided guidelines for the management of the examinations.
- Twenty percent of the examination centres visited in the Eastern Cape did not have their examination files in order.
- Most examination venues were conducive to the writing of examinations.
- In Mpumalanga, the examination venues were often cordoned off or located in the more remote areas of the centre to reduce the level of disruption.

- The Gauteng Department of Education officials train chief invigilators on a regular basis, that is, before the commencement of every examination.
- In the Western Cape training was good and no one was left in any doubt regarding their duties.
- Centres had adequate security measures except at Dr WF Nkomo (Gauteng) where there were no guards.
- Some centres were willing to share facilities like IT facilities during the IT practicals.
- Educators took responsibility for ensuring a quiet environment in the vicinity of the examination rooms.
- All centres had clocks in the examination rooms.

4.2 MARKING CENTRES

- Security of the answer scripts was tight at all the marking centres visited.
- Monitoring by assessment body officials was done properly in Gauteng.
- Centre managers managed the affairs of their centres well.
- In the Northern Cape each of the three marking centres had two deputy centre managers; one being responsible for the professional side (markers) and the other one for administration. They played a major role in the supervision of the marking process.
- In Gauteng the scanning of scripts was a good innovation.
- Most venues were suitably chosen and had proper facilities.
- The relationship between the management, staff and the chief markers/examiners was generally good and no stumbling blocks were reported.
- Assessment body officials used strict criteria to ensure that markers and examination assistants were properly appointed and in good time.
- Preparations for marking and accommodation were done well in most of the centres.
- There were effective systems in place for the control of scripts.
- Ten to 40% of markers in North West were novice markers. This practice will eventually provide a pool of competent markers for the province.

5 CHALLENGES

5.1 EXAMINATION CENTRES

- There were centres where more than one person had access to question papers.
- Not all centres had seating plans and implemented them for all examinations.
- Monitors of the assessment bodies did not visit all the examination centres for the purpose of monitoring.
- Candidates' identification documents were not displayed at all times by all candidates during the writing of examinations. In Mpumalanga the rule was not rigorously applied.
- Unused examination material/stationery was not sent back from all centres to the assessment bodies after the examinations.
- The first part of invigilation just before writing commenced needs to be improved. In many cases the invigilators did not go through all the steps, such as checking the paper with candidates, and were not consistent in allowing sufficient reading time.
- The location of the examination rooms was not indicated in some centres.
- At Nhlosokuhle in KZN, candidates started writing late because a package containing 10 question papers had been misdirected to another examination centre.
- At some centres the candidates were accommodated in several classrooms, and this tended to delay the start of the examination.
- Examination stationery was not dealt with securely and economically at all centres.

5.2 MARKING CENTRES

- In the Eastern Cape it was discovered that one marking centre, Byletts Combined, was very isolated and this put examination assistants at risk as they had to travel quite long distances to the nearest township/village. At Phandulwazi the area was very confined with up to 40 markers being crammed into a classroom.
- Not all centres had irregularity committees on site.
- In the Free State there was no evidence of visits by monitors from the PED.
- In Gauteng security needed to be improved at President High and Krugersdorp High. The same concern was observed at two KZN marking centres, Eshowe High and UmlaziComtech, on the days of the visits.
- Accommodation for females at Port Shepstone Primary; Eastern Cape, was not in an acceptable condition.
- In Limpopo some internal moderators had to travel between two to three centres for the purpose of moderation of marking at different centres.

- It was reported that in the Northern Cape examination assistants found many errors relating to the totalling and transferring of marks. Markers did not seem to double check these areas.
- A serious irregularity was reported in the Northern Cape, where it was reported that some chief markers and internal moderators were called back to re-check marked scripts in order to “quality assure” borderline scripts and level-one marks.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 EXAMINATION CENTRES

- While the examinations are being conducted fairly well at schools, it is important that everyone involved at an examination centre should familiarise themselves with the guidelines before every examination, and ensure that procedures are followed meticulously.
- Procedures that are prescribed for the running of examinations should be followed and applied without fail. This will address inconsistencies relating to issues like the presentation of ID books, seating plans, the handling of unused stationery, etc.
- Generally, the centres visited maintained a good standard when conducting examinations and this practice should be encouraged and maintained.
- Security at the three Northern Cape marking centres needs to be improved. Security guards need to be trained in all aspects of security controls at the marking centres.

6.2 MARKING CENTRES

- Irregularity committees should be formed at all the marking centres.
- The PEDs should ensure that the marking centres are visited regularly by monitors from the PEDs.
- Access control needs to be improved at some centres.
- Security at the gates of every centre should keep registers of visitors entering and leaving the venues. Krugersdorp High School in the North West venue did not have such a register; nor did Northern Cape High in the Northern Cape.
- Where there is one moderator for more than one paper, the marking should be accommodated at adjacent centres to allow the internal moderator to move easily from one to the other.
- The Northern Cape PED should put stricter measures in place to ensure that markers add marks accurately.

- The issue reported in the Northern Cape of remarking borderline scripts is viewed in a serious light by Umalusi. This practice should be eradicated completely. The DBE should ensure that not only does this practice not happen in the Northern Cape, but also in all the other provinces.

7 CONCLUSION

- The examinations were generally conducted in a manner that would not call credibility of the NSC exam into question. Over the years an appropriate system has evolved.
- Attention should however be paid to the challenges reported in this report. The issue of tampering with marks, that is, the re-marking borderline cases, as was done in the Northern Cape, requires urgent attention.
- Irregularities reported to Umalusi

Table 5.3: Summary of irregularities reported to Umalusi

Nature of irregularity	Detail/example of irregularity	Province implicated
Unregistered candidates	German, Hebrew, Portuguese, Physical Science, Agricultural Sciences, History, English, Mathematics, Life Sciences, Engineering Graphics and Design, Geography 20 wrote Maths P3 without being registered for it.	Gauteng Limpopo
Candidates without proper identification	Candidate wrote the examination with no identification.	Gauteng
Candidates caught with illegal objects	Crib notes Cell phone/unauthorised material (Economics)	ECape/KZN/NWest Gauteng/WCape
Late start of examinations	Heavy rains and flooding Motivational speaker at school Community protest/ accident Late delivery of question papers	E Cape/KZN/WCape Gauteng Mpumalanga NCape
Candidates arriving late	Candidate did not have admission letter Problems with transport Candidates arrived late for CAT exam	Gauteng KZN/WCape NCape
Administrative irregularities	Mark sheet missing	Limpopo/Mpumalanga

Nature of irregularity	Detail/example of irregularity	Province implicated
	Invigilator misplaced strong room key for Geography P2	NCape
Computer-related problems (CAT and IT)	Power outages/ files missing/ question 2.1 would not open/ folders missing/ computer virus were picked at some centres Educators on strike during the writing of CAT. Invigilators were sent from districts.	Free State/ECape/ KZN/Mpumalanga/NCape/NWest/ WCape Gauteng Gauteng
Candidates denied permission to write	Candidate wearing necklace (beads) Textbooks not handed in prior to exam Farmers strike – Business Studies could not be written	Free State WCape
Candidate writing wrong paper or wrong level	Afrikaans FAL instead of HL English P2/ Mathematics P3 / Afrikaans P2 / Design (theory) Urdu HL P1 / Life Sciences P2 Wrote English HL instead of FAL	ECape Gauteng Limpopo Mpumalanga
Insufficient answer books/question papers	Nodal point short of answer books 10 question papers short (Tourism) Tourism Shortage of Life Sciences Version 2.	Gauteng Limpopo NCape NWest
Outside influences on the exam	Noise from neighbouring area Community members stormed exam venue	Gauteng WCape
Ill during exam or in hospital	Candidate pregnant and in hospital/ fell ill while writing the paper Candidate collapsed Three candidates pregnant Candidates fell ill Candidate gave birth	Gauteng KZN Limpopo Mpumalanga NCape
Omission of subject on timetable	History P2	Gauteng
Candidate left venue with answer book	Civil Technology	Gauteng
Candidates drunk	Consumer Studies, Hospitality Studies and Nautical Sciences P2	Gauteng

Nature of irregularity	Detail/example of irregularity	Province implicated
Candidates arrested or in prison	Arrested day before exam/ wrote in prison Candidates arrested before exams started	KZN Mpumalanga
Incorrect setworks studied	ERCO/SACAI Afrikaans	Limpopo
Illegible information/ errors on the question paper	Economics (Afrikaans version) Maths P2 – error with the diagram.	Mpumalanga Mpumalanga
Wrong question papers opened	CAT P2 opened instead of Physical Sciences P2. Afrikaans SAL on label but Afrikaans HL question papers	NCape

It should be noted that most of these irregularities were dealt with at the exam centres in order to ensure minimal or no disruption of the examination process. The serious irregularities that could not be resolved immediately were recorded as such, and were addressed at the National Examinations Irregularities Committee (NEIC) meeting where Umalusi was represented.

A serious irregularity in the form of a possible leakage of question papers was reported in KZN where it was alleged that learners were found in possession of question papers. The matter was investigated by the DBE and Umalusi. The results of the learner(s) implicated will be withheld pending the outcome of the on-going investigations.

(Please refer to Addenda 5 on page 350 for more details on this chapter)

CHAPTER 6

STANDARDISATION AND VERIFICATION OF RESULTS

1 SCOPE OF THE STANDARDISATION

A total of 58 subjects, including the non-official languages set by the Independent Examinations Board (IEB), were subjected to the standardisation process at the DBE Standardisation Meeting.

2 GENERAL FINDINGS

The DBE standardisation data was presented in a manner that was acceptable to Umalusi. Generally, the DBE recommendations for adjustments were in line with Umalusi recommendations. In subjects where there was no agreement, both Umalusi and the DBE initially presented their motivating factors and agreement was reached cordially. A general improvement was observed in the overall learner performance.

3 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The DBE was alerted to the problem observed with the Life Orientation marks where learners were awarded 80% and it was evident that some tampering and lenience had taken place. The DBE was requested to send a message to all provinces, indicating that should this problem persist in the future all learners with 80% would be adjusted downwards. Unfortunately, this would affect even the innocent learners who deserve the 80% mark.

Languages: The high performance in the Home Languages in relation to all the other subjects continues to be a problem.

4 2012 STANDARDISATION DECISIONS

The final outcome of the standardisation of the 58 NSC subjects is as follows:

Raw marks	:41 subjects
Moderated upward	: 5 subjects
Moderated downward	: 12 subjects

Umalusi is pleased with the fact that for 71% of the subjects raw marks were accepted. This is an indication that the qualification is stabilising and that the assessment instruments are in general being pitched at the correct levels. It should also be noted that for the subjects where upward adjustments were effected, no subject was adjusted to the maximum 10%.

5 VERIFICATION OF THE RESULTING PROCESSES AND DATA

Umalusi has developed standardisation, moderation and results modules to verify and certify candidate results. Umalusi has also issued directives for certification as well as setting requirements for standardisation and results for the NSC so that there are standards against which assessment bodies are able to develop systems and submit data annually. These standards are used to verify the resulting datasets (standardisation, subject and candidate data) generated by the assessment bodies using their examination administration systems for the NSC.

5.1 FINDINGS

- The administration and results systems of the DBE have been monitored and been found to be compliant.
- The system was found to be compliant in respect of the requirements for awarding the NSC or a subject statement.
- The adjustments approved at the standardisation meeting held on Wednesday 18 December, and in the statistical moderation process, have been verified as correct.

6 CONCLUSION

Given the fact that the candidate data (i.e. results) submitted for verification for the 2012 NSC examinations complies with the policies and directives governing the qualification, it is recommended that the NSC results for the DBE be approved, should the Council find the overall credibility of the NSC examination to be in order.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The findings of the quality assurance processes have indicated that there has been a steady process of refinement and stabilisation in the implementation of the National Senior Certificate examinations.

The process started with the setting of question papers and memoranda for the November 2012 examination and for the supplementary examination early in 2013. A total of 262 question papers were set and these were moderated until they were approved by Umalusi. The ideal is that this process should start earlier, preferably the previous year, in order to avoid bottlenecks towards the end of the year when question papers have to be approved and distributed by certain due dates.

A form of reporting to Umalusi has been suggested to keep Umalusi informed about the progress of the setting and moderation process without running the risk of leaking details about the content of question papers to anyone outside the National Examinations and Assessment Directorate of the DBE.

The one area in which performance has given rise to serious concern is SBA. This includes Life Orientation, in which Grade 12 learners across the country wrote a CAT in September. The results of the task revealed that this subject had been under-estimated by learners and teachers alike, and that there was a significant discrepancy between the results achieved in school-based tasks and assessment, and the results of the CAT, with candidates achieving much lower marks in the latter.

An improvement has been observed in the running of memo discussion meetings with specific reference to the practice marking that was conducted at the end of these meetings. A cause for concern is that not all PEDs were represented at all the discussions. In some instances some of the representatives had to leave the meetings before they ended. This should be investigated and remedied. Attendance at these memorandum discussions is essential for a successful marking session.

This year a different approach to the verification of marking was taken, with on-site verification and centralised verification being done. The on-site verification was a very fruitful exercise as it allowed the external moderators to interact with internal moderators, chief markers, senior markers and markers. It was thus possible to identify potential problem areas and alert internal moderators to them. The verification took place at the

very beginning of the marking session. It was therefore possible to be proactive and solve problems before they had accumulated. The on-site verification also gave external moderators a better perspective on the scripts that were submitted for centralised verification. Various concerns were raised with the quality of marking, and the appointment and training of markers. These issues require urgent attention to ensure that the quality of marking improves in the future.

The conduct of the writing of the examination and the marking went fairly well. The two major irregularities reported in the Northern Cape and KZN had the potential to jeopardise the integrity of the examination; however, it is pleasing to report that thorough investigations were conducted and measures were put in place to ensure that the exam was not compromised.

Standardisation of exam results was conducted in line with the set principles. Verification of capturing of the standardisation decision was conducted to ensure correct capturing.

Apart from the various challenges reported in this report, it can be said that the NSC examination was conducted in a credible manner, and that at the time of the approval of results Umalusi was not aware of anything that might have had potential to compromise the credibility of the NSC examination.

ADDENDUM 1

QUESTION PAPER MODERATION (NOVEMBER 2012/MARCH 2013)

(To be read in conjunction with chapter one of the main report)

1. ACCOUNTING NOV' 12

Technical criteria:

Concerns were raised about the time allocation for Q4 in view of all the details that have to be written out. As some of the questions involved calculations, the marks allocated were too few.

Content coverage:

Coverage of Learning Outcome (LO) 3 was too low, as shown in the table below. In addition, mark allocation and time allocation were not compatible in Question 4.

	LO1	LO2	LO3
Norm (marks)	150–180	60–75	60–75
Examiner (marks)	163	75	62

Cognitive skills/level of difficulty:

The paper was too heavily weighted with challenging questions, as shown in the table below.

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	27	38	35

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was user-friendly and made provision for alternative responses.

Overall impression:

The assessment of a balance sheet this year would make the paper complicated; however, as an income statement was asked last year, it is appropriate that a balance sheet be asked this year, as it was not possible to ask both statements. The external

moderators' view was that the paper was too difficult and that some of the questions needed to be reviewed. More questions were also still required for LO3.

Second moderation:

Technical criteria:

There were a few typos that needed to be attended to.

Content coverage:

LO3 figure of 62 marks was now acceptable.

Cognitive skills/Level of difficulty

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	34	39	27

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation.

2. ACCOUNTING MAR '13

The paper was of a good standard; errors are to be attended to by examiner.

Content coverage:

The paper adhered to the applicable policy.

	LO1	LO2	LO3
Norm (marks)	150–180	60–75	60–75
Examiner %	54	25	20
Examiner (marks)	161	79	60

Cognitive skills

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	32	40	28

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the first moderation.

3. AFRIKAANS FAL P1 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The picture in the advert was unclear.

Internal moderation:

While acknowledging that the internal moderator performed at her best, there was still room for critical consideration of contentious matters such as the style of and approach to Text A, the appropriateness of Text C and the suitability of Text D in the FAL paper.

Content coverage:

The cartoon was not suitable (drinking and smoking), and replacement was recommended. The panel did not replace the picture, and the objection still stood.

Cognitive skills:

Distribution in terms of cognitive skills was not appropriate. The marks were not correctly distributed.

First moderation

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	40	40	20
Examiner %	36	39	25

Second moderation

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	40	40	20
Examiner %	35	34	31

Almost all texts still needed to be reworked.

A number of questions needed to be refined and the marking memorandum had to correlate more accurately with the paper.

Third moderation

Content coverage:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

Finding:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. After reworking, the paper compared favourably with previous papers.

4. AFRIKAANS FAL P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The picture with karate characters might be too faint in certain provinces; the first instruction was ambiguous; numbering was incorrect; appropriate fonts were not used throughout the paper; paper could not be completed in the allocated time.

Internal moderation:

While acknowledging that the internal moderator performed at her best, there was still room for critical consideration of contentious matters such as the style of and approach to text A, the appropriateness of text C and the suitability of text D in the FAL paper.

Cognitive skills:

To start with the question paper was not properly balanced regarding cognitive levels, but this was corrected.

A	12	13	5
B	4	4	2
C	20	17	3
TOTAL	36	34	10
ACTUAL %	45	42	13
NORM %	40	40	20
Adjustment required %	+5	+2	-7

Second moderation

Content coverage:

Examples and illustrations were not suitable, appropriate, relevant or academically correct.

Cognitive levels:

The distribution in terms of cognitive skills was inappropriate and the distribution of marks was incorrect.

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	40	40	20
Examiner %	51	35	14

Marking memorandum:

The memo was not accurate and would not have facilitated marking. It did not make provision for alternative responses in respect of certain questions.

Language and bias:

Subject terminology was not used correctly; there were subtleties in grammar that might create confusion.

Predictability:

Text C was very closely related to a text in an existing paper.

Finding:

At the fifth external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The question paper had been substantially reworked, resulting in an improved distribution of cognitive levels and clearer formulation of questions. The memorandum had also been improved.

5. AFRIKAANS FAL P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Instructions in respect of certain questions had to be replaced.

Internal moderation:

The internal moderator revealed an improved ability to analyse the paper critically.

Content coverage:

There was no correlation between mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation. In Q2.19 there were too many facts for one mark.

Cognitive skills:

There was an imbalance in the distribution of cognitive skills, particularly within contextual questions. There was an over-concentration of level 2 questions.

Marking memorandum:

Not all answers in the memo were accurate. The marking memorandum did not correspond with the question paper in all respects and would not facilitate marking.

Language and bias:

There was ambiguity in several questions. The recommendation was made to reformulate or replace such questions.

Finding:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The question paper had been substantially reworked, resulting in an improved distribution of cognitive levels and clearer formulation of questions. The memorandum had also improved.

6. AFRIKAANS FAL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The marking memorandum was now more responsive to the question paper.

7. AFRIKAANS FAL P3 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified (Q1.2, 1.3 and 1.5). Fonts used were not appropriate (Q1.4) and candidates would have had difficulty reading the question. The quality of the picture needed to be improved (Q1.1 and 1.3). Certain topics needed to be reformulated and the memorandum was not accurate.

Cognitive skills:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in most respects.

Finding:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The paper was found to be compliant with the minimum standards in the Subject Assessment Guidelines (SAG).

8. AFRIKAANS FAL P3 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clear; appropriate fonts were not used throughout the paper; the quality of the picture in Q2.4 needed improvement.

Content coverage:

Examples and illustrations were not suitable, appropriate, relevant or academically correct.

Cognitive skills:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in most respects, but it was not possible to determine the cognitive levels. The distribution of cognitive levels was determined by the nature of the writing pieces. Choice question were not at an equal level of difficulty, but this was a writing paper, and the prescribed writing modes determined the level of difficulty. It was therefore not possible to set topics of equal difficulty.

Finding:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The paper consequently adhered to the prescribed subject guidelines. The topics should enable the candidates to demonstrate their ability to communicate in Afrikaans.

9. AFRIKAANS HL P1 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The quality of the cartoon needed attention. The examples and illustrations used were not suitable, appropriate or relevant.

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was not accurate. The boy's name in the cartoon showed a tendency towards bias, being race-insensitive.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third external moderation.

10. AFRIKAANS HL P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The visual text in Section A Text B was not clear.

Content coverage:

The illustrations and examples used were not suitable – Text B: visual.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was not accurate – Section A gave 29 marks instead of 30.

Second moderation

The text in Section B was too easy and would have to be replaced with one at an appropriate level for HL candidates.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

11. AFRIKAANS HL P2 NOV '12

Instructions were not clearly specified. The questions in Section C focused on a few Assessment Standards only. The questions in Section A and Section B were not of an equal level of difficulty. Terminology was not used correctly in some instances.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

12. AFRIKAANS HL P2 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The instructions were not clearly specified.

Content coverage:

Questions in Section C focused on just a few assessment standards.

Cognitive skills:

Questions in Section A and Section B were not of an equal level of difficulty.

Language and bias:

Terminology was not used correctly in some instances.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

13. AFRIKAANS HL P3 NOV '12

The illustration relating to Q1.6.2 was not clear. Choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty. Q3.1 and 3.3 were asked in the March 2011 paper.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

14. AFRIKAANS HL P3 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate.

Language and bias:

The language register not appropriate – the formulation of Q2.4 was not clear and could confuse candidates. The formulation of the instruction in Q3.2 could confuse candidates.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

Choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty. Q3.3 – advertisement – needed to be reformulated.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third external moderation.

15. AFRIKAANS SAL P1 NOV '12

Instructions to candidates needed to be reworked. Text B was recommended for replacement because it was not visual as required.

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LOs and ASs as prescribed. The weighting and spread of content across LOs and ASs was not appropriate.

Cognitive skills:

There was compliance with the requirements.

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	40	40	20
Examiner %	44	39	17

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was inaccurate and it did not correspond with the question paper.

Language and bias:

The language register was not appropriate for the level of candidates. There were subtleties in grammar that might create confusion.

Finding:

At the fifth external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The question paper would succeed in assessing the knowledge and skills of candidates comprehensively.

16. AFRIKAANS SAL P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions needed to be reworked; Text B needed to be replaced as it was not visual.

Internal moderation:

Reworking of texts, reformulation of questions and answers were still necessary although the internal moderator had recommended a substantial number of changes.

Content coverage:

Examples and illustrations were not suitable.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution was acceptable.

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	40	45	14
Examiner %	41	39	17

Finding:

The requested change of text was done and all other corrections were addressed. At the fifth external moderation the question paper and memorandum were approved.

17. AFRIKAANS SAL P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Amendments to the instructions were required (Q1.1, 1.2, 2.4, 3.3). Variation in font types and sizes needed to be considered in a creative writing paper. Certain visuals needed to be enlarged (Q1.1, 2.1, 3.3).

Content coverage:

At the final moderation Q3.6 had not been changed. Examples and illustrations used were not suitable, appropriate or relevant, for example the visual in Q1.5.4 fell outside the candidates' world of experience.

Cognitive skills:

Choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty, but this was a writing paper, and the prescribed writing modes determined the level of difficulty. It was therefore not possible to set topics of an equal level of difficulty.

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was not accurate.

Language and bias:

There were subtleties in the grammar that might create confusion.

Predictability:

The replacement of Q1.4 and 2.1 was recommended as these themes had appeared in recent papers.

Finding:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The paper would facilitate creative writing and allow candidates to demonstrate their writing skills. The paper was also compliant with the requirements stipulated in the SAG document.

18. AFRIKAANS SAL P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions needed to be amended (Q1.1, 1.2, 2.4). Variation in font types and sizes need to be considered in a creative writing question paper. The quality of the visuals needed to be improved (Q2.4).

Content coverage:

The content was well covered. Examples and illustrations were not suitable, appropriate or relevant – Q1.3 touched on sensitivities traumatic for children.

Cognitive skills:

Choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty, but it is not possible to set topics of an equal level of difficulty in a writing paper.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate.

Language and bias:

Subtleties in the grammar might create confusion – an idiomatic expression was not suitable as a heading (Q1.2); there was lack of coherence between first and second sentences (Q2.3); the situation was clumsily formulated (Q2.1).

Predictability:

Q1.4 and 2.1 needed to be replaced because the themes had appeared in recent papers.

Cognitive skills:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in most respects. Choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty, but this was a writing paper, and the prescribed writing modes determined the level of difficulty. It was therefore not possible to set topics of an equal level of difficulty.

Finding:

At the fifth external moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The requested change of text had been done and all other corrections had been appropriately addressed.

19. AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES NOV '12

Overall impression:

The question paper was unfair and invalid and not reliable for measuring the competency of the Agricultural Management Practices candidates. Accordingly, it did not meet the required minimum standard for the NSC Examination based on the following areas:

- Passages/paragraphs in the question paper were very long, which required candidates to spend more time on reading than answering the question paper.
- Some of the questions from Section A were repeated in Section B.
- A uniform font size was not used.
- Some instructions to candidates were ambiguous.

- There were incorrect calculations and totalling of marks in the memorandum

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

20. AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES MAR '13

Overall impression:

The question paper was unfair and invalid and was not reliable for measuring the competency of the Agricultural Management Practices candidates. Accordingly, it did not meet the required minimum standard for the NSC Examination based on the following areas:

- Passages/paragraphs in the question paper were very long, which required candidates to spend more time on reading than answering the question paper.
- Some of the questions from Section A were repeated in Section B.
- The font size in the question paper was not applied uniformly.
- Some instructions to candidates were ambiguous.
- Diagrams/pictures were not print-ready
- Some responses in the memorandum were not comprehensive enough.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the second moderation.

21. Agricultural Sciences P1 Nov '12

Technical criteria:

Marks in Q3.3.1 were not the same in the memorandum as in the question paper; the quality of illustrations in Q3.2 and 4.1 was poor and therefore not print-ready. Unclear diagrams and illustrations rendered the layout of the question paper unfriendly to candidates.

Internal moderation:

The question paper and the memorandum had a number of inconsistencies in terms of good quality moderation:

- Grammar in Q1.3.3, 2.2.3, 2.4, 3.1.1, 3.3.2, 4.4.
- Q3.1.4 was omitted in the question paper but appeared in the memorandum.
- Diagrams and illustrations in Q3.2 and 4.1, including labelling, were not clear.
- There were incorrect calculations in Q2.4.

- Q4.1.1 required labelling of A, B, C and I, but the memorandum labelled it J instead of I.
- The summary of the internal moderator's report under the headings, Marking memo, Technical criteria and Overall impression of the paper, suggested that this paper was not ready for external moderation. In this respect the internal moderator maintained that "Some final adjustments still need to be completed" and "There is still some polishing that needs to be done on this paper". These two remarks were made against the backdrop of the paper being fully approved.

Marking Memorandum:

Q3.1.4 appeared in the memorandum but not in the question paper. Calculations in Q2.4.1 were incorrect and therefore needed attention. The accuracy of the ranges in the graph in Q4.2.1 and 4.2.2 needed attention. Numbering and answers for Q3.4.2 and 3.4.3 needed to be checked against the question paper. One of the labels in Q4.1.1 was I but the memorandum labelled it J. This needed the examiners' attention.

Language and bias:

Grammar in Q1.3.3, 2.2.3, 2.4, 3.1.1, 3.3.2, and 4.4 needed the attention of the examiners.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

22. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES P1 MAR '13

Technical aspects:

Some sections of the Instructions and Information to candidates could be improved by the panel of examiners. Attention should be given to instructions 2, 3, 4 and 8.

- The quality of diagrams 1.1.5, 2.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1 and 4.4 could be improved by better labelling, making diagrams clearer and preventing the words from fading.
- The incorrect font was used in some sections of the memorandum

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum did not indicate the LOs and Ass, but these were clearly indicated in the analysis grid.

- Calculations in Q2.2.2 were incorrect and therefore needed attention.
- Incorrect fonts had been used in the answers to the following questions in the memorandum: Q3.2.3, 3.4.2, 4.1.2, 4.2.4, 4.3.4 and 4.4.3

- An incorrect caption appeared in the memorandum for Q3.2.1 in comparison with the question.
- Captions in the memorandum for answers to Q3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 4.2.2, 4.2.4 and 4.3.1 needed to be included for the sake of consistency.

Internal moderation:

The question paper and the memorandum had a number of inconsistencies in terms of good quality moderation with regard to incorrect calculations in Q2.2.2 and 2.1 required better labelling of E and Rectum. The quality of diagrams in Q3.4, 4.1 and 4.4 needed to be improved.

The summary of the internal moderator's report under Marking memo, Technical criteria and Overall impression of the paper suggested that this paper was not ready for external moderation.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the second external moderation.

23. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES P2 NOV '12

Finding:

This paper was approved at the first moderation.

24. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES P2 MAR '13

Finding:

This paper was approved at the first moderation.

25. AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY NOV '12

The overall impression was that the question paper was unfair and invalid and not reliable for measuring the competency of the Agricultural Technology candidates. Therefore, based on the following areas, it did not meet the required minimum standard for the NSC Examination:

- The pictures and illustrations were of poor quality which would have a negative impact on candidates' performance.

- Some of the questions from the 2011 question papers were repeated in the question paper and there was also repetition of some questions in the current paper.
- Some of the questions were still ambiguous and still needed to be rephrased/redone to make them clearer to candidates.
- An appropriate font needed to be applied correctly throughout the whole question paper (technical aspects).

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

26. AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY MAR '13

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation.

27. BUSINESS STUDIES NOV '12

Finding:

This paper was approved at the third moderation.

28. BUSINESS STUDIES MAR '13

- There were language and grammar errors in the question paper and memorandum. More alternative responses were required in the marking guideline.
- Errors were still found at the second and third moderations.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the fourth moderation.

29. CIVIL TECHNOLOGY NOV '12

Calculation errors were found in Q2.5.2 and 4.3 in the marking memorandum. Some questions needed to be changed and rephrased.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

30. CIVIL TECHNOLOGY MAR '13

Changes to some questions were recommended.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

31. COMPUTER APPLICATIONS TECHNOLOGY (CAT) P1 NOV 12

Content coverage:

The paper covered LO2 while only covering a small bit of LO1. The SAG for CAT does not provide guidance on the exact weighting.

	LO1	LO2	LO3
Norm%	Not prescribed		
Examiner %	3,5	96,5	0
Umalusi %	3,5	96,5	0

According to the external moderator, the combined weighting of the three components, that is, practical, theory and PAT, should correlate with the norm given in the table above. As the practical paper and PAT were almost aligned to LO2, the weighting for the theory paper would thus be biased towards LO1 and LO3. Individual papers might therefore not conform to the specified norm.

Cognitive skills:

The paper was found to be balanced in terms of cognitive skills.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	28,5	42	29,5
Umalusi %	30,5	40	29,5

Marking memorandum:

The majority of questions had accurate answers. However, in Q4.6 the external moderators did not concur with the answer provided.

Language and bias:

Some suggestions on rewording instructions and questions were made so as to improve the readability of the instructions/questions.

The questions in the paper could not be tested using open-source packages running in a Linux environment, as the DBE still does not provide the necessary equipment to check that the questions can be answered. Although there should be no problems, the external moderators were not prepared to guarantee that the questions could be adequately answered by those candidates using Linux and OpenOffice/LibreOffice.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the second external moderation.

32. COMPUTER APPLICATIONS TECHNOLOGY P1 MAR '13

Content coverage:

The paper covered LO2 with a small bit of coverage of LO1. The SAG for CAT does not provide guidance on the exact weighting.

	LO1	LO2	LO3
Norm %	Not prescribed		
Examiner %	2,5	97,5	0
Umalusi %	2,5	97,5	0

Cognitive skills:

The table shows that the weighting for the middle order was outside of the expected norm.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	30	43	27
Umalusi %	27	46	27

The SAG does not provide an expected norm.

Marking memorandum:

The majority of questions had accurate answers. There were, however, a few questions where external moderators did not concur with the panel on the answers provided. These were Q2.3, 3.3, 5.3 and 6.4.2. Answers to Q3.4 and 6.4.2 seemed not to answer the question asked correctly.

Overall impression:

The paper fell slightly outside the expected cognitive norms.

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved and had to be resubmitted for further moderation. It was approved at the third moderation.

33 & 34. COMPUTER APPLICATIONS TECHNOLOGY P2 NOV '12 & MAR '13

Content coverage:

The paper covered three LOs with greater emphasis on LO1.

	LO1	LO2	LO3
Norm %	Not prescribed		
Examiner %	81	18	1
Umalusi %	81	18	1

Cognitive skills:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner%	29,3	41,3	29,3
Umalusi %	29,3	41,3	29,3

Marking memorandum:

There were some cases in which the memorandum did not agree with the question paper. More alternatives should be added.

Finding:

At the first moderation the question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved, to be resubmitted for further moderation.

Although all the criteria had been met, there were a number of changes to questions and the memorandum that had been suggested, and they needed to be checked by the external moderator.

It would be appropriate for the second submission to be done after the translation of the paper into Afrikaans so that the Afrikaans and English papers could be compared and checked.

Second moderation

Content coverage:

The paper covered three LOs with greater emphasis on LO1.

	LO1	LO2	LO3
Norm %	Not prescribed		
Examiner %	81	18	1
Umalusi %	81	18	1

The practical paper and PAT were almost aligned to LO2 and LO3. The weighting for the theory paper would thus be biased towards LO1.

Cognitive skills:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	30	43	27
Umalusi %	29	44	27

- The SAG does not provide an expected norm.
- A few minor changes were suggested.
- Finding: The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

35. CONSUMER STUDIES NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The numbering was not correct, mark allocations were not clearly indicated and mark allocation in the paper was not the same as in the marking memorandum.

Internal moderation:

A more rigorous approach was suggested by the external moderators.

Content coverage:

There was no correlation among mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation.

Cognitive skills:

There were too many remembering questions in Q1 and too few in Q2, 4 and 5, which would put the weaker candidates at a disadvantage.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	50	20
Actual %	36,5	34	29,5

Deviation at all levels was greater than the norm.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was now within acceptable range.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	50	20
Actual %	31	47	22

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation.

36. CONSUMER STUDIES MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The numbering not correct; mark allocations were not clearly indicated; the mark allocation in the paper was not the same as in the memo.

Content coverage:

There was no correlation among mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation. There were too many remembering questions in Q1, too few in Q2, 4 and 5 – this would have put the weaker candidates at a disadvantage.

Cognitive skills:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	50	20
Actual %	32,5	50	17,5

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

37. DANCE STUDIES NOV '12

There were a few minor discrepancies that would have to be corrected. No Afrikaans translation was available. The question paper and memorandum were approved at the first moderation.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the first moderation. The English version complied in all respects, but the Afrikaans version still needed to be submitted for moderation and comparison.

38. DANCE STUDIES MAR '13

Finding:

At first moderation the question paper and memorandum were approved. The English version complied in all respects, but the Afrikaans version still needed to be submitted for moderation and comparison.

39 & 40. DESIGN P1 AND P2 NOV '12

Both papers were approved at the first moderation.

41. DESIGN P1 MAR '13

The question paper was approved at the first moderation.

42. DRAMATIC ARTS NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The paper was not candidate friendly: titles needed to be above the question rather than on a different page; the paper could not be completed in the allocated time; the quality of pictures needed attention; the pictures were compressed and as a result appeared distorted; details were fudged; and the dark background made it difficult to see the stage space.

Internal moderation:

There was limited compliance. There was disjuncture between the findings of the external moderators and those of the internal moderator. The report accepted questions which did not reflect balanced levels of difficulty and complexity in relation to the policy document. Rigorous guidance was absent regarding items and the overall standard of the items. There were errors in the grid and evidence of bias in the phrasing of certain items and in the marking memorandum, although these were approved by the internal moderator.

Content coverage:

There was limited compliance. There were also problems with the grid which proved difficult to read and had omissions. Although new grid format had been supplied to the panel in 2011 this was not implemented. Examiners were warned not to shift the focus of questions from Dramatic Arts to cultural studies.

Cognitive skills:

The external moderators were of the view that the spread of cognitive skills was uneven. It was difficult to identify the focus of some questions. In addition, the format of the grid made it difficult to check how the weighting was distributed.

Marking memorandum:

The rubrics, though focused on the quality of the answer, did not give sufficient content focus and they remained generic. Clues on how marks would be distributed were not indicated. Some answers did not relate to what was actually asked in the question.

Language and bias:

The phrasing of questions was sometimes confusing or dense. Some questions were too long or did not relate to the question. There was also evidence of proselytising and advocacy in questions related to IKS and cultural performance. This could exclude some candidates.

Overall impression:

The quality of the paper had been compromised by the reduction in the number of DBE panel members from 5 to 3. Selection of experienced and critical practitioners was recommended.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators at the first moderation had been addressed.

43. DRAMATIC ARTS MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria: The numbering, mark allocation and instructions lacked clarity. The quality of pictures needed attention. Details in one picture were fudged and the dark background made it difficult to see the stage space.

Internal moderation:

There was limited compliance. There was disjuncture between the findings of the external moderator's and the internal moderator's reports. The internal moderator accepted questions that did not reflect balanced levels of difficulty and complexity in relation to the policy document. There was no rigorous guidance regarding items and the overall standard of the items. There were errors and omissions in the grid. There was evidence of bias in the phrasing of certain items and in the memo, although these had been approved.

Second moderation

Content coverage:

There was compliance in most respects and there was better coverage in this paper. Suggestions to change the format of the grid were made.

Cognitive skills:

There was a better spread of cognitive levels and balance of difficulty and complexity.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

44. ECONOMICS NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The cartoon in Q2.3 needed to be revisited and shapes had to be inserted for clarity. Q1.2 needed to be revised.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not appropriate.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	30	42	28
Umalusi %	32	38	30

Marking memorandum: It did not correspond with the question paper.

Language and bias:

There were subtleties in grammar that might create confusion. The level and complexity of vocabulary was not appropriate.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators at the first moderation had been addressed.

45. ECONOMICS MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The labelling of graphs was incomplete in Q2.4.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not appropriate. Marks were not distributed correctly.

Marking memorandum:

The memo did not make adequate provision for additional/alternative responses.

Language and bias: There was limited compliance. Subject terminology was not used correctly; the language register was not appropriate for the level of candidates; there were subtleties in grammar that might create confusion.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

46. ELECTRICAL TECHNOLOGY NOV '12

Cognitive skills:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	50	20
Actual %	29,5	45,5	25

Finding:

This paper was approved at the first moderation.

47. ELECTRICAL TECHNOLOGY MAR '13

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	50	20
Actual %	29,5	50,5	20

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the first moderation.

48 & 49. ENGINEERING GRAPHICS & DESIGN P1 AND P2 NOV '12

The illustrations, graphs, tables, etc. were not print-ready.

Finding:

Both papers were conditionally approved. No resubmission was required. The internal moderator was required to ensure that concerns raised in the report were addressed.

50 & 51. ENGINEERING GRAPHICS & DESIGN P1 AND P2 MAR '13

Minor editorial corrections had to be made to both question papers.

Finding:

At first moderation the question papers were conditionally approved, but did not have to be resubmitted for further moderation.

52. ENGLISH FAL P1 NOV '12

Some questions needed to be revised or rephrased so that they were clearer. In two instances terminology might prove challenging for FAL candidates. A suggestion was made to either find simpler synonyms or provide a glossary at the end of the passages.

Cognitive skills:

Two taxonomies were used: Barrett's for Section A and B and Bloom's for Section C.

	A	B	C
Norm %	40	40	20
Section A %	43.3	36,7	20
Section B %	40	40	20
Section C %	40	37,5	22,5

The paper was balanced in terms of cognitive levels. In Q1.2.2 the cognitive level seemed to be pitched slightly higher due to the nature of the question.

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was generally compliant. However, there were a few instances where alternative responses needed to be considered.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

53. ENGLISH FAL P1 MAR '13**Technical criteria:**

The date on the cover page needed to be changed. Minor technicalities had to be attended to.

Content coverage:

Section A required one open-ended question.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

There was an appropriate distribution of cognitive levels.

	A	B	C
Norm %	40	40	20
Section A %	40	40	20
Section B %	40	40	20
Section C %	40	37,5	22,5

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

54. ENGLISH FAL P2 NOV '12

First moderation

Minor technical errors were picked up.

Second moderation

The layout of the paper was candidate-friendly and most technical problems were corrected, with just a few more still needing to be corrected. The grid needed reworking (section C).

The distribution of cognitive levels was acceptable. However, further suggestions were made to consider a few of the poetry questions in Section D and pull them up to a higher cognitive level.

The paper was generally of a good standard. A suggestion was made to consider changing some of the questions in Section D into evaluation and/or appreciation questions so that their cognitive demand was slightly elevated.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the third moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

55. ENGLISH FAL P2 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Minor technical errors were picked up.

Cognitive skills:

Not all choice questions were of an equal level of difficulty. There were a few cases where the distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not appropriate. Two of the contextual questions (novel) were too easy. A suggestion was made to reword the questions and pitch them at higher cognitive levels.

Marking memorandum:

There were a few instances where there was very little synergy between the question and responses in the memo.

Overall impression:

The question paper was not fair, valid or reliable in some respects.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

Q6.1.3 and Q6.1.4 were omitted on the question paper but were on the computer screen.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was not accurate and did not correspond with the question paper in some instances.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

56. ENGLISH FAL P3 NOV '12

There were some instances where the mark allocation was not correctly aligned with the question paper. Internal moderation was meticulous.

A few amendments to some of the questions were suggested. The visual in Q1.8.1 needed to be replaced because parts of it were unclear and could be confusing to candidates. Q2.2 might be misunderstood by candidates and could be confusing and misleading to some cultural groups.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

57. ENGLISH FAL P3 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were a few instances where the mark allocation was not aligned to the paper.

Internal moderation:

Meticulous internal moderation was acknowledged.

Content coverage:

Only a few amendments needed to be made to some of the questions. Q1.6 had to be rephrased as it was a bit confusing; Q2.3 needed to be revised; some minor technicalities had to be attended to in Q3.1.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was generally compliant, although a few corrections had to be made.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

58. ENGLISH HL P1 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Text D was not a suitable choice as it was not relevant to the candidates. Furthermore, the black and white advertisement did nothing to show the impact the advert had on the reader. Lower-order questions had been asked.

Internal moderation:

There was no evidence of qualitative moderation, that is, choice of texts, types of question and related matters. The quality, standard and relevance of the moderator's input were relevant in so far as technical and grammatical errors were concerned.

Content coverage:

There was compliance in most respects except for Q3.4 and 3.6 as a result of choice of texts that did not allow for creative responses. Questioning techniques resulted in a large majority of questions being in the lower order.

Cognitive skills:

The quality and strength of most of the questions were inappropriate for a home language paper/candidate. The quality of questions had been compromised by the choice of texts as well as the examiners' inability to vary questioning techniques.

Marking memorandum:

Certain answers did not correspond with the questions in the question paper. Answers to a few questions were not adequately provided in the memo.

Language and bias:

While passages were of the stipulated length, the level and complexity of the vocabulary was for the most part far too simplistic for HL candidates.

Predictability:

There was compliance in all respects except in Q8.3. The paper had exactly the same pattern of presentation as the last four years. Although the format was highly predictable it conformed to the requirements. It would be refreshing to have a change in the format while still adhering to the guidelines.

The following were recommended for the choice of texts:

- Depth of meaning the text offered.
- Whether texts conveyed bias and if deliberately included should provide for thought-provoking, higher-order questions.
- Whether vocabulary was appropriate for the HL candidate/paper.
- Sufficient content information and language complexities that lent themselves to a variety of questions addressing various cognitive levels.
- Original and innovative written and visual texts.

Overall impression:

There was limited compliance. The choice of texts and the resultant limitation in terms of asking good questions compromised the standard and quality of the paper.

Finding:

This paper was rejected at the first moderation, but approved at the third moderation.

59. ENGLISH HL P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Texts B and D were not clear in terms of either illustrations or in text and they both needed to be replaced. In Text B, the cartoon was misplaced as it did not relate in any way to the content of Text A and did not link up in meaning to Text A. Questions based on Text B were all language related, thus defeating the purpose of assessing comprehension skills. Text D: This was a reasonably good choice; however, the impact of the advert was lost in the shades of black and white. Lower-order questions had been asked.

Internal moderation:

There was no evidence of qualitative moderation, that is, choice of texts, types of question and related matters. The quality, standard and relevance of the moderator's input were relevant in so far as technical and grammatical errors were concerned.

Content coverage:

There was compliance in most respects except for Q3.4 and 3.6. The choice of texts did not allow for creative responses. Moreover, questioning techniques used resulted in a large majority of questions being in the lower order.

Cognitive skills:

The quality and strength of most of the questions were inappropriate for a HL paper/candidate. The quality of questions had been compromised by the choice of texts as well as inability to vary questioning techniques.

Language and bias:

While the passages were of the stipulated length, Texts B, D and E was far too simplistic for HL candidates.

Predictability:

The paper had exactly the same pattern of presentation as the last four years. Although the format was highly predictable, it conformed to the requirements. It would be refreshing to have a change in the format while still adhering to the guidelines.

The following were recommended for the choice of texts:

- Depth of meaning the text offers.
- Whether texts have bias and, if deliberately included, should provide for thought-provoking, higher-order questions.
- Vocabulary appropriate to the HL candidate/paper.
- Sufficient content information and language complexities that lend themselves to a variety of questions addressing various cognitive levels.
- Original and innovative written and visual texts.

Overall impression:

Limited compliance. Choice of texts and the resultant limitations in terms of asking good questions compromised the standard and quality of the paper.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

Text D – The original advertisement had to be presented, as adaptations created a degree of distortion.

Content coverage:

There were a few instances where there was no correlation between the mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation.

Marking memorandum:

There were a few instances of mismatch between question paper and memo. Summary points required review.

Predictability:

Some texts lacked innovation.

Overall impression:

A substantially improved paper in terms of choice of texts and level of complexity. Q1, 2 and 5 were of comparable standard, but Q3 and 4 compromised the standard.

Third moderation

All recommendations and changes were addressed; minor changes had to be attended to by the internal moderator.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the third moderation, and did not have to be submitted for further moderation.

60. ENGLISH HL P2 NOV '12

Content coverage:

There was limited compliance. Questions for Sections B & C did not address the variety of elements of literature study. Most questions covered plot and characterisation.

Cognitive skills:

There was limited compliance. The quality and strength of most of the questions were inappropriate for a home language paper and home language candidate. The quality of

the questions was compromised by choice of texts in certain books, but mostly the inability to vary the focus of questions.

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum required considerable revision owing to numerous changes that needed to be made to Sections B and C.

Predictability:

The essay question on Othello was predictable. The paper showed no innovation.

Overall impression:

There was no compliance. In view of the number of changes that had to be effected in the novel section, it was recommended that contextual questions for the three novels should be swapped. It was also recommended that essay questions for Pride and Prejudice, Othello and The Crucible be swapped.

Finding:

This paper was conditionally approved at the third moderation subject to the external moderators' recommendations being addressed.

61. ENGLISH HL P2 MAR '13

The question paper was fair and of a good standard. It was apparent that the comments made in the first report in November 2012 had positively influenced the internal moderation process and the final outcome of the paper.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation and did not need to be submitted for further moderation.

62. ENGLISH HL P3 NOV '12

The paper lacked the following:

- Original, unique, stimulating, creative and innovative topics
- A variety/range of visual texts and topics
- A good and varied range of texts that could elicit creative responses from candidates
- Topics that challenged the top 20% of candidates

- Topics of a higher cognitive order, and in Section B, topics on different genres.

Section A: Of the nine topics set, only two were accepted.

Section B: Of the four topics set, none were accepted.

Section C: All three topics were accepted although topic 3.2 could be changed.

Finding:

The major part of the paper was therefore not approved. The panel was requested to reset almost the entire paper. The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

63. ENGLISH HL P3 MAR '13

First moderation

The paper lacked the following:

- Original, unique, stimulating, creative and innovative topics
- Variety/range of visual texts and topics
- A good and varied range of texts that could elicit creative responses from candidates
- Topics that would challenge the top 20% of candidates
- Topics of a higher cognitive order, and in Section B, topics on different genres.

Section A: Of the nine topics set, only three were accepted.

Section B: Of the four topics set, none were accepted.

Section C: Of the three topics set, none were accepted.

The major part of the paper was therefore not approved. The panel was requested to reset almost the entire paper.

Second moderation

Q1.3, 1.5 and 3.1 had to be reset; while Q3.2 had to be drastically revised.

Third moderation

All recommendations had been implemented. New questions had been set where necessary. Some swaps in questions were made between the November and March papers.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the third moderation.

64. ENGLISH SAL P1 NOV '12

Spelling errors had to be corrected and questions had to be rephrased.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

65. ENGLISH SAL P1 MAR '13

Some corrections to the content were required.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

66. ENGLISH SAL P2 NOV '12

Finding:

This paper was approved at the first moderation.

67. ENGLISH SAL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

This question paper was approved at the first moderation.

68. GEOGRAPHY P1 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The photographs and some illustrations in the addendum were not clear nor were they print ready. Totals in the question paper did not correspond with those in the marking

memorandum, for example Q4. The total in the paper was 100 but 94 in the marking memorandum. Some photographs/illustrations were not suitable as many required enlargement and appropriate labelling.

Content coverage:

Question 3 was heavily weighted with Grade 10 content.

Cognitive skills:

Distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not appropriate, while distribution in terms of cognitive skills appeared to be in line with guidelines. However, there were too few higher-order questions.

	Lower order	Middle order	Higher order
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	34,5	48,5	17

The distribution of marks was not according to the norms and the mark distribution in the grid did not correspond with the marks in the question paper.

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was inaccurate. Alternative responses for certain questions were recommended.

Language and bias:

Certain questions needed to be rephrased. The panel was discouraged from using obscure words.

Predictability:

Two questions were found to be replicas of those in the November 2011 and March 2012 papers.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

Distribution in terms of cognitive skills was now within an acceptable range.

	Lower order	Middle order	Higher order
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	33,5	37,5	29

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation and no resubmission was required. However, the internal moderator was required to ensure that concerns raised in the report were addressed.

69. GEOGRAPHY P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The quality of photographs was not satisfactory or print-ready. Some required enlargement and some amendment.

Content coverage:

Q4.4 was heavily weighted with Grade 10 content.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution was not in line with the SAG.

	Lower order	Middle order	Higher order
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	29	48	23

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate. Some additional responses were recommended and some were recommended for replacement.

Language and bias:

The language register was inappropriate. Certain questions needed to be more direct and there was some gender bias in Q1.5.4.

Predictability:

There was repetition of questions from the past three years' question papers, for example Q1.3.6, which appeared in the 2011 paper.

Finding:

At the second moderation the cognitive levels had been corrected and the question paper was conditionally approved, but did not need to be resubmitted for further moderation.

70. GEOGRAPHY P2 NOV '12

First moderation:

Technical criteria:

The quality of photographs was not satisfactory or print-ready.

Content coverage: Photographs/illustrations were suitable, appropriate, relevant and academically correct, but were not technically reliable.

Cognitive skills:

Distribution in terms of cognitive levels was in line with the SAG.

	Lower order	Middle order	Higher order
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	29	39	32

Marking memorandum:

There was limited compliance. The marking memorandum was not accurate and it did not correspond with the questions in the question paper.

Predictability:

Basic map-work skills and standard calculations could in a sense be predicted as they had remained standard in the assessment of this section.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

There was compliance in respect of the distribution of the cognitive levels.

	Lower order	Middle order	Higher order
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	29	44	29

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation and no resubmission was required. The internal moderator was required to ensure that concerns raised in the report were addressed.

71. GEOGRAPHY P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The quality of photographs was not satisfactory or print-ready.

Content coverage:

Photographs/illustrations were suitable, appropriate, relevant and academically correct but were not technically reliable. The allocation of marks deviated from the exam guidelines.

Cognitive skills:

There was compliance in most respects.

	Lower order	Middle order	Higher order
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual%	29	39	32

The distribution of marks was, however, not in accordance with the norms in respect of Q1 and 2. Moreover, the distribution of marks in the grid did not correspond with the marks in the question paper.

Marking memorandum:

There was limited compliance. The memo was inaccurate and did not correspond with the questions in the question paper.

Language and bias:

The language register was not appropriate for the candidates' level and there were subtleties in grammar that might create confusion.

Adherence to policies/guidelines:

The current exam guidelines were not adhered to.

Predictability:

Basic map-work skills and standard calculations could in a sense be predicted as they remained standard for the assessment of this section.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation, but did not have to be resubmitted for further moderation.

72 & 73. HISTORY P1 AND P2 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The phrasing of questions, compilation of the marking guidelines and selection of specific sources still had to be addressed. Visual sources were not clear enough.

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LOs and ASs.

Cognitive skills:

Some source-based questions needed to be adapted to address various higher order skills.

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was not accurate and did not correspond with the question paper.

Language and bias:

The language register was not appropriate for the candidates' level. There were some difficult words that needed to be explained.

Second moderation

A few aspects such as phrasing of questions and compilation of marking guidelines still needed to be addressed. Some source-based questions and the grid had to be adapted, and the marking memorandum still needed adaptation.

Finding:

Both papers were approved at the third moderation after all the external moderators' concerns and suggestions had been addressed.

74. HISTORY P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The phrasing of questions, compilation of the marking guidelines and selection of specific sources had to be addressed. Visual sources need to be clear with not too many dark grey or black areas.

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LOs and ASs.

Cognitive skills:

Some source-based questions needed to be adapted to address various higher order skills.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate and did not correspond with the question paper.

Language and bias:

The language register was inappropriate and there were some difficult words which needed to be explained.

Adherence to policies/guidelines:

The paper did not reflect the prescribed LOs and ASs. Moreover, the weighting and spread of content were not appropriate

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

A few aspects such as phrasing of questions and compilation of marking guidelines had to be addressed.

Content coverage:

Some source-based questions had to be adapted and the grid also needed to be changed.

Marking memorandum:

The memo needed adaptation.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

75. HISTORY P2 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Some visual sources were not clear and needed to be reformatted. The phrasing of questions, compilation of the marking guidelines and selection of specific sources had to be addressed.

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LOs and ASs.

Cognitive skills:

Some source-based questions needed to be adapted to change the distribution of percentages of cognitive levels and address various higher-order skills.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was not accurate and did not correspond with the question paper.

Language and bias:

The language register was inappropriate and some difficult words were included.

Adherence to policies/guidelines

The paper did not reflect the prescribed LOs and ASs. The weighting and spread of content were not appropriate.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

A few aspects such as phrasing of questions and compilation of marking guidelines should be addressed.

Content coverage:

Some source-based questions had to be adapted and the grid also needed to be changed.

Marking memorandum:

The memo needed adaptation.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

76. HOSPITALITY STUDIES NOV '12

First moderation

One picture needed to be replaced with one of a better quality. There was a more than 5% deviation in the knowledge and application levels.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

There was now compliance in respect of the distribution of cognitive skills.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Norm %	30	20	30	20
Actual %	30,5	21,5	30	18

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation.

77. HOSPITALITY STUDIES MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clearly indicated. Certain questions needed to be rephrased

Internal moderation:

Internal moderation was not vigorous enough and a few errors were overlooked.

Cognitive skills:

There was some slight deviation in the cognitive levels (4.1)

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Norm%	30	20	30	20
Actual%	31	24	25,5	19,5

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate; and the mark allocation and mark distribution in questions were incomplete.

Predictability:

Q2.3 was found to have been used in a recent paper.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

78. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY P1 NOV '12

The paper covered LO4 while the theory paper covered LO1 to LO3.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	20	10	10	60
Actual %	0	0	0	100

According to the external moderator, the combined weighting of the three components, that is, practical, theory and PAT, should correlate with the norm given in the table above. The practical paper and the PAT were almost aligned to LO4. The weighting for the theory paper would thus be biased towards LO1 to LO3. Individual papers might therefore not conform to the specified norm.

Cognitive skills

Level	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm	30	40	30
Examiner	30	40,8	29,2
Umalusi	17,5	48,5	34,2

The external moderator mentioned that although, as the table above suggests, there was a difference between the analysis done by the examination panel and that of the

external moderators, there was general agreement that the distribution was satisfactory. The external moderators argued that the majority of questions in the practical examination would be Level 2 and Level 3 questions. A practical examination, by its very nature, asks questions that require candidates to apply the skills they have learnt. Language and bias: Some suggestions on the rewording of instructions and questions were made to improve the readability of these.

Finding:

The paper was well constructed. However, some provision would have to be made for Linux users. The paper was approved at the first moderation, although some minor alterations were still required. At the final moderation most of the corrections had been done, although a few minor adjustments still required attention.

79. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY P1 MAR '13

Finding:

There was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved, although there were still some minor errors to be corrected.

At the second moderation some minor errors were still found, although the question paper was approved.

80. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY P2 NOV '12

First moderation

Content coverage:

There was compliance in most respects. However, there were corrections to questions and issues of validity that needed to be addressed.

Marking memorandum:

There was compliance in most respects, although some corrections were required. Changes in questions would result in corresponding changes to the memo.

Adherence to policies/guidelines:

There was compliance in most respects, although ASs were not reflected.

Second moderation

Content coverage:

The paper covered LO4.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	20	10	10	60
Examiner %	0	0	0	100
Umalusi %	0	0	0	100

The combined weighting of the three components, that is, practical, theory and PAT, should correlate with the norm given in the table above. The practical paper and PAT were almost aligned to LO4. The weighting for the theory paper would thus be biased towards LO1 to LO3. Individual papers may, therefore, not conform to the specified norm.

Cognitive skills

Level	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	25	51,7	23,3
Umalusi %	25	51,7	23,3

Finding:

There was compliance in most respects. The question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved but to be resubmitted for a second moderation, as there were some suggestions that needed to be implemented and questions that needed rethinking and possibly to be replaced.

At the second moderation it was found that all corrections and suggestions had been implemented. The Afrikaans (translated) version still had to be submitted, however. For that reason the question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved, and had to be resubmitted for further moderation.

81. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY P2 MAR '13

First moderation

Content coverage

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	20%	10%	10%	60%

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Actual %	50%	8%	12%	31%

Cognitive skills

Level	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Norm %	30	40	30
Actual %	41	42	17

Technical criteria:

There was compliance in most respects, although a number of minor changes to format had to be made.

Marking memorandum:

There was compliance in most respects, although a few answers did not correspond with the question paper. Some questions needed to be reworded and coverage of LOs and ASs had to be reviewed and entered in the memorandum.

Finding:

There was compliance in most respects. The question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved, but had to be resubmitted for further moderation. The translated question paper should also had to be submitted for moderation.

The question paper was approved at second moderation.

82, 83 & 84. ISINDEBELE FAL P1, P2 AND P3 NOV '12

All three papers were approved at the first moderation.

85, 86 & 87. ISINDEBELE FAL P1, P2 AND P3 MAR '13

All three papers were approved at the first moderation.

88, 89 & 90. ISINDEBELE HL P1, P2 AND P3 NOV '12

All three papers were approved at the first moderation.

91, 92 & 93. ISINDEBELE HL P1, P2 AND P3 MAR '13

All three papers were approved at the first moderation.

94 & 95. ISINDEBELE SAL P1 AND P2 NOV '12

Both papers were approved at the first moderation.

96 & 97. ISINDEBELE SAL P1 AND P2 MAR '13

Both papers were approved at the first moderation.

98. ISIXHOSA FAL P1 NOV '12

First moderation

The cartoon in Question 4 was not clear. The number of multiple-choice questions as well as open-ended questions in each section was not as stipulated in the amended examination guidelines, as the paper had more questions on each type of question mentioned above than was prescribed. Answers provided for Q1.1.5 and 1.2.2 did not actually answer the questions asked. The answers to Q1.1.6 and 1.1.10 did not appear in the paragraph as directed.

Second moderation

The number of open-ended questions in each section exceeded the maximum prescribed in the amended examination guidelines. Answers provided for Q1.1.5 and 1.2.2 still did not answer the question.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the third moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

99. ISIXHOSA FAL P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The number of multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions in each section was not as stipulated in the amended examination guidelines, as the paper contained more of these questions than expected. The summary text needed to be corrected to suit the purpose of the question and Q4.2 needed to be rephrased.

Cognitive skills:

Marks were not allocated according to the prescribed norm.

Marking memorandum:

The answers given for Q 1.1.15 and 1.2.2 were incorrect. The memo did not correspond with the question paper in respect of Q1.2.4.

Overall impression:

The paper was not valid. Changes also needed to be made to the number of multiple-choice questions and open-ended questions so that they would comply with the examination guidelines.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

The instruction for Q3.3 was unclear and needed to be replaced.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate and would not facilitate marking.

Overall impression:

The paper was not valid, fair or reliable and was not of an appropriate standard.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

100. ISIXHOSA FAL P2 NOV '12

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

101. ISIXHOSA FAL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

102. ISIXHOSA FAL P3 NOV '12

First moderation:

The memorandum was incomplete and some questions had to be changed as they had appeared in the November 2011 question paper, while others were not in the assessment guidelines. This paper was rejected at the first moderation.

Second moderation:

The map in Q3.3 was unclear. The memorandum contained mistakes that needed to be corrected.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the third moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

103. ISIXHOSA FAL P3 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

104. ISIXHOSA HL P1 NOV '12

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified. The weighting and spread of content of LOs and ASs were not appropriate. There was limited compliance in respect of the marking memorandum, which was also inaccurate, did not correspond with the question

paper, did not make allowance for alternative responses and would not have facilitated marking.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

105. ISIXHOSA HL P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified. The quality of pictures was inappropriate

Content coverage:

The weighting and spread of content of LOs and ASs were not appropriate.

Marking memorandum:

There was limited compliance. The memo was also inaccurate, did not correspond with the question paper, did not make allowance for alternative responses, and would not have facilitated marking.

Adherence to policies/guidelines:

The question paper was not in line with current guideline documents.

Overall impression:

The paper was not fair, valid or reliable.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

106. ISIXHOSA HL P2 NOV '12

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified. The question paper was not fair, valid or reliable and was not of an appropriate standard.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

107. ISIXHOSA HL P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified.

Cognitive skills:

There was no appropriate distribution in terms of cognitive levels.

Marking memorandum:

There was limited compliance, with evidence of inaccuracies and instances where the memo did not correspond with the question paper. Moreover, it would not have facilitated marking and alternative responses were not accommodated.

Predictability:

The text used in Q8 was the same as in March 2010. The questions were also more or less the same.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

108. ISIXHOSA HL P3 NOV '12

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified. There was limited compliance in respect of the marking memorandum, which was also inaccurate, did not correspond with question paper, did not make allowance for alternative responses and would not have facilitated marking.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

109. ISIXHOSA HL P3 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified.

Marking memorandum:

Limited compliance – the memo was inaccurate and did not correspond with the question paper, did not make allowance for alternative responses and would not have facilitated marking.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

110. ISIXHOSA SAL P1 NOV '12

Cognitive skills:

The question paper and the memorandum needed to be corrected. There was no correlation between mark allocation, level of difficulty and time allocation.

Marking memorandum:

There was limited compliance in respect of the marking memorandum. The memorandum was inaccurate, did not correspond with the question paper, did not make allowance for alternative responses and would not have facilitated marking.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

111. ISIXHOSA SAL P1 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

112. ISIXHOSA SAL P2 NOV '12

Content coverage:

The picture in Q1.4 was not appropriate.

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was inaccurate, did not correspond with question paper and would not have facilitated marking. The external moderators argued that Q1.4 in the memo had been described as a bank robbery and this could mislead markers as there was no bank shown in the picture in the question paper, which just showed a robbery.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

113. ISIXHOSA SAL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation.

114. ISIZULU FAL P1 NOV '12

Cognitive skills:

The cognitive levels in the grid had to be aligned and the summary of the overall paper recalculated.

Language and bias:

The language register in Q1 and 2 needed to be toned down to the level of FAL candidates.

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation and no resubmission was required. However, the internal moderator was required to ensure that concerns raised in the report were addressed.

115. ISIZULU FAL P1 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

116. ISIZULU FAL P2 NOV '12

Cognitive skills:

The analysis grid needed to be recalculated.

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation and no resubmission was required. However, the internal moderator was required to ensure that concerns raised in the report were addressed.

117. ISIZULU FAL P2 MAR '13

Cognitive skills:

The analysis grid had to be adjusted.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first external moderation.

118. ISIZULU FAL P3 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

There was compliance in most respects. However, the quality of visuals needed to be improved and there were some technicalities that needed to be corrected.

Content coverage:

Some of the questions needed to be rephrased.

Marking memorandum:

The memo had to be aligned with the question paper to facilitate marking.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

119. ISIZULU FAL P3 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the first moderation.

120. ISIZULU HL P1 NOV '12

121. ISIZULU HL P1 MAR '13

122. ISIZULU HL P2 NOV '12

Content coverage:

There were questions that required rephrasing and replacement.

Cognitive skills:

The cognitive demand of some questions was not at the level of Grade 12.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the second moderation.

123. ISIZULU HL P2 MAR '13

124. ISIZULU HL P3 NOV '12

Finding:

This paper was approved at the first moderation.

125. ISIZULU HL P3 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the first moderation.

126. ISIZULU SAL P1 NOV '12

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

127. ISIZULU SAL P1 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation.

128. ISIZULU SAL P2 NOV '12

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation and no resubmission was required. However, the internal moderator was required to ensure that the concerns raised in the report were addressed.

129. ISIZULU SAL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation.

130. LIFE SCIENCES P1: VERSION 1 NOV '12

First moderation:

Technical criteria:

Rewording of instruction no. 10 was suggested. The mark allocation for Q2.2.3 was missing and several questions required rephrasing.

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LOs and ASs as prescribed and the weighting of LOs was also not appropriate. More questions were required for LO1 and too many marks were allocated to LO2.

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	34	98	18
Umalusi %	33,5	101	15,5

Cognitive skills:

There was compliance with requirements in respect of cognitive challenge. There was, however, a need to revisit some of the questions in order to meet the assessment requirements for the LOs.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	46	44	31	29
Umalusi %	45,5	47,5	30,5	25,5

Marking memorandum: There were some incorrect or incomplete answers in some of the questions.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

The diagram in Q1.1.3 was unclear. The source of the diagram in Q4.2 needed to be acknowledged.

Content coverage:

Requirements for the knowledge areas, Life at the molecular, cellular and tissue level and Diversity, change and continuity, were adequately addressed.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive skills was in keeping with the requirements.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	46	46	29	29
Umalusi %	46,5	46,5	31	26

Marking memorandum:

Some incomplete answers were identified in the marking memorandum.

Overall impression:

The paper still needed a little more work to bring it up to an acceptable level of quality.

Third moderation

Content coverage

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	41	91,5	18
Umalusi %	40,5	101	15,5

Cognitive skills

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	46	46	29	29
Umalusi %	46,5	46,5	31	26

Finding:

The paper was approved at the third moderation.

131. LIFE SCIENCES P1 VERSION 1 MAR 13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Rewording was suggested for instruction no. 10. Several questions required rephrasing. Fonts were not used consistently. Diagram B in Q2.4 needed attention.

Content coverage:

The weighting of LOs was very close to the norm.

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	46	91	13
Umalusi %	43	93	14

Cognitive skills:

Distribution in terms of cognitive levels was inappropriate.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	41	49	33	27
Umalusi %	34,5	52	31,5	32

There was a need to increase questions assessing level A and decrease those assessing level B.

Marking memorandum:

Some incorrect or incomplete answers were identified, and some alternative answers were included.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

Fonts were not used consistently. The quality of illustrations and diagrams was not appropriate.

Content coverage:

The weighting of LOs was very close to the norm.

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	44	93	13
Umalusi %	42	94	14

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was in close compliance with requirements.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	41	49	33	27
Umalusi %	35,5	51	32,5	31

Marking memorandum:

There were a few instances of inaccuracy in the memo.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

132. LIFE SCIENCES P2: VERSION 1 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Rewording of instruction no. 10 was suggested and several questions needed rephrasing. Diagram and labelling lines needed to be improved in certain questions.

Content coverage

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	38	95	17
Umalusi %	42,5	93,5	15,5

Cognitive skills

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	42	52	28	28
Umalusi %	45,5	47,5	24	32

According to the Umalusi moderators' analysis, the cognitive challenge was in keeping with the norm as indicated in the guideline documents.

Marking memorandum:

Some incorrect or incomplete answers for some questions were identified in the marking memorandum.

Language and bias:

Rephrasing of some of the questions was necessary.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

The quality of diagrams and illustrations was not appropriate and not print-ready. Some questions were incorrectly numbered in the weighting grid and changes were not appropriately effected.

Content coverage

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	43	91	16
Umalusi %	40	94	15

Cognitive skills

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	42	49	29	29
Umalusi %	45,5	47	23,5	34

While level C questions seemed low and level D higher than that set out in policy, when C and D were combined an acceptable weighting was obtained.

Marking memorandum:

Incorrect or incomplete answers were identified for some of the questions.

Third moderation

Content coverage

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	37	97	16
Umalusi %	39,5	94,5	16

Cognitive skills

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	43	52	29	33
Umalusi %	44,5	50,5	22,5	32,5

Finding:

The paper was approved at the third moderation.

133. LIFE SCIENCES P2 VERSION 1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The quality of diagrams and illustrations was not appropriate or print-ready – diagram and labelling lines needed to be improved in Q1.1.6, 1.1.10, 2.1 (memo) and 3.5. Certain questions needed attention.

Content coverage:

LO1 and LO2 had been adequately addressed. However LO3 was slightly under-assessed.

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	45	94	11
Umalusi %	46,5	95,5	10

Cognitive skills:

The cognitive challenge was in keeping with the norm.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	42	50	27	30
Umalusi %	45	46	29	30

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate in a few cases – some incorrect or incomplete answers were identified

Language and bias:

Some rephrasing of questions was necessary.

Second moderation

Technical criteria:

Several questions required rephrasing. The quality of illustrations and diagrams was not appropriate.

Content coverage:

	LO 1	LO 2	LO 3
Norm %	45	90	15
Examiner %	46	93	11
Umalusi %	46,5	93,5	10

Cognitive skills:

The cognitive challenge was in keeping with the norm.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	45	45	30	30
Examiner %	41	50	27	32
Umalusi %	44,5	45,5	29	31

Marking memorandum:

A few cases of inaccuracy were found in the memo; some alternative responses were included/suggested.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third external moderation.

134. LIFE SCIENCES P1: VERSION 2 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were typos, wording errors and missing labels in certain questions. Otherwise the paper was of a generally good standard.

Content coverage:

The science of certain words in some of the questions needed to be checked.

Cognitive skills:

The taxonomy that was used to classify cognitive demand was deemed loose. The external moderator cautioned examiners to make sure that they would be able to defend their classifications. External moderators' classification gave too few higher order questions in Level C.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	30	60	45	15
Examiner %	25	63	45	17
Umalusi %	38	63	34	15

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was not accurate in respect of certain questions.

Language and bias:

Some questions would not have been accessible to English second language speakers.

Overall impression:

The external moderators' impression was that the paper was more difficult than comparable papers owing to the fact that there was more to read and that questions were less predictable than in previous years.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

135. LIFE SCIENCES P1: VERSION 2 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were typos, wording problems and missing labels in certain questions, otherwise the paper was of a generally good standard.

Content coverage:

The science of certain words in Q1.3.3 needed to be checked. Q1.4 is outside of the syllabus. The mark allocation for graphs differed between the four papers.

Cognitive skills:

The taxonomy used to classify cognitive demand was deemed loose and examiners were cautioned to make sure that they would be able to defend their classifications. The external moderator's classification gave too few higher order questions in Level C.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	30	60	45	15
Examiner %	37	54	37	22
Umalusi %	37	72	30	11

Marking memorandum:

The memo inaccurate in respect of certain questions.

Language and bias:

Some sophisticated language was used.

Overall impression:

The paper was found to be harder than comparable papers owing to the fact that there was more to read and that questions were less predictable than in previous years.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	30	60	45	15
Examiner %	31	65	33	21
Umalusi %	31	75,5	33,5	10

The question paper was still not balanced. Cognitive demand had to be reconsidered when changing questions.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third external moderation.

136. LIFE SCIENCES P2: VERSION 2 NOV '12

First moderation:

Technical criteria:

There were typos, wording problems and missing labels in certain questions, otherwise the paper was of a generally good standard.

Content coverage:

The science of certain words in some of the questions needed to be checked. Q4.1.2 was found to be outside the syllabus.

Cognitive skills:

The taxonomy that was used to classify cognitive demand was deemed loose. The external moderator cautioned examiners to make sure that they would be able to defend their classifications. The external moderators' classification gave too few higher order questions in Level C.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	30	60	45	15
Examiner %	43	49	37	21
Umalusi %	40	72	20	18

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was inaccurate in respect of certain questions.

Language and bias:

Some questions would not be accessible to English second language speakers.

Overall impression:

The external moderators' impression was that the paper was more difficult than comparable papers owing to the fact that there was more to read and that questions were less predictable than in previous years. Although examiners had come up with some interesting new questions, there was a concern that the content could be out of reach for many, especially English second language learners.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

137. LIFE SCIENCES P2 VERSION 2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

There were typos, wording problems and missing labels in certain questions, otherwise the paper was of a generally good standard.

Content coverage:

The science of certain words in some of the questions needed to be checked. Q1.2.3, 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 were outside syllabus. Mark allocation for graphs differed among the four papers.

Cognitive skills:

The taxonomy used to classify cognitive demand was deemed loose and examiners were cautioned to make sure that they would be able to defend their classifications. The external moderators' classification gave too few higher order questions in Level D.

	A	B	C	D
Norm %	30	60	45	15
Examiner %	34	53	56	7
Umalusi %	37	58	54	1

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate in respect of certain questions.

Language and bias:

Some questions would not be accessible to English second language speakers.

Overall impression:

The external moderator's impression was that the paper was harder than comparable papers owing to the fact that there was more to read and that questions were less predictable than in previous years. Although examiners had come up with some interesting new questions, there was a concern that the content could be out of reach for many, especially English second language learners.

Second moderation

Cognitive skills:

The question paper was still not balanced.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the third moderation.

138. MATHEMATICAL LITERACY P1 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The paper was not print-ready as some tables and diagrams required attention.

Content coverage:

There was over-testing of some mathematical content, as well as the omission of some ASs. LO1 was over-assessed.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	25	25	25	25
Actual %	33	21	22	24

Cognitive skills:

The paper was not balanced in respect of cognitive levels.

	Level 1	Level 2
Norm %	60	40
Actual %	52	48

There were a few questions where alternative solutions could be provided.

Contexts were biased in favour of urban learners. Suggestions were made to remove superfluous statements and phrases in a number of questions.

Some questions were identified as being similar to those set in the November 2011 paper. There was some mathematical content that had been excluded. Moreover, the standard of the paper did not compare favourably with previous papers. In addition, the weighting of taxonomy levels did not adhere to the requirements.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

139. MATHEMATICAL LITERACY P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The numbering on the question paper required attention; some tables and diagrams required attention; and some instructions on the cover page required more detail to avoid confusion.

Internal moderation:

The quality, standard and relevance of input from the internal moderator were not appropriate.

Content coverage:

One incorrect formula was given in one question and there was over-testing of some mathematical skills. Some questions posed were too simplistic and not suitable for Grade 12 learners.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	25%	25%	25%	25%
Examiner %	25%	25%	25%	25%
Umalusi %	26%	25%	23%	26%

Cognitive skills:

The weighting of cognitive levels did not adhere to the prescribed minimum requirements.

	Level 1	Level 2
Norm %	60	40
Examiner %	60	40
Umalusi %	53	47

Marking memorandum:

Further alternative solutions were identified and recommended; at least four errors were found in the memo; and in some cases units of measure were omitted.

Language bias:

This was generally correct except for one question which contained an incorrect formula.

Overall impression:

There was limited compliance. The paper did not compare favourably with previous papers and contained many questions that assessed similar mathematical skills. Moreover, some questions were too simplistic and not suitable for a Grade 12 level.

Second moderation

Content coverage:

The paper adhered to the prescribed requirements.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	25	25	25	25
Examiner %	25	25	28	22
Umalusi %	25	25	28	22

Cognitive skills:

The range was acceptable.

	Level 1	Level 2
Norm %	60	40
Examiner %	58	42
Umalusi %	58	42

Finding:

At the third moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper and memorandum were approved. The Afrikaans version was also approved and the question paper was found to be of a good standard.

140. MATHEMATICAL LITERACY P2 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

The paper was not print-ready – some tables and diagrams still required attention.

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LOs and ASs. The weighting and spread of content were not appropriate, with too few LO2 questions. Level 1 questions were included even though not prescribed for this paper. Similar contexts were used in two questions and

there was overlapping of similar questions in Paper 1. There was also over-testing of some mathematical content. The phrasing of some of the questions was inappropriately done. Diagrams and tables required attention and, finally, the length of the paper was inappropriate.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	25	25	25	25
Examiner %	26	19	30	25

Cognitive skills:

The paper was not balanced in respect of the distribution of cognitive levels. Level 1 was not prescribed for this paper, Level 2 and 3 were too high, while Level 4 was too low.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Norm %	0	20	40	40
Examiner %	8	32	50	13

Second moderation

Content coverage

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	25	25	25	25
Examiner %	26	26	23	25

Cognitive skills

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Norm %	0	20	40	40
Examiner %	0	17	40	43

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation and no resubmission was required. The internal moderator was required to ensure that concerns raised in the report were addressed.

141. MATHEMATICAL LITERACY P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Some of the instructions preceding the questions had to be rephrased to avoid confusion. Some diagrams and maps required attention as the print quality was poor. The first question should be shifted to the last question as it was time-consuming and more difficult

than the other questions in the paper (exchange Q1 and 5). The paper seemed long as there was too much to read; consequently, suggestions regarding phrasing were made. Internal moderation: It was suggested that the internal moderator provide more qualitative feedback regarding certain shortcomings.

Content coverage:

The paper adhered to the prescribed requirements.

	LO1	LO2	LO3	LO4
Norm %	25	25	25	25
Examiner %	25	22	26	27
Umalusi %	25	22	26	27

Cognitive skills:

The questions fell within an acceptable range.

	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Norm %	20	40	40
Examiner %	16	44	41
Umalusi %	20	41	39

Marking memorandum:

Further alternative solutions were identified and recommended. The marking memo contained three errors and recommendations in this regard were accepted and implemented.

Language bias:

Suggestions regarding dubious information in the table in one question, as well as the phrasing of questions, were made to ensure that there was no confusion and, at the same time, unnecessary information was eliminated. Contradictory and misleading information was identified and recommendations regarding adaptations were made to avoid confusion.

Overall impression:

There was limited compliance. Some contexts did not reflect real-life situations accurately or realistically. Some maps and diagrams required attention. Some questions contained too much contradictory information and this might cause confusion – recommendations were made in this regard. This paper was not fair as it was long and contained some questions that could be misleading – recommendations for changes were made.

Finding:

At the second moderation there was compliance in all respects. The Afrikaans version had also been submitted and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

142. MATHEMATICS P1 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clear. Candidates would not have been able to complete the paper in the allocated time and the quality of illustrations, graphs and tables was inappropriate.

Content coverage:

Compliance was very close.

	Totals	Recommended
Algebraic manipulations	20	20
Calculus	37	35
Finance & annuities	15	15
Functions & graphs	34	35
Linear programming	15	15
Patterns & sequences	30	30
Totals	151	150

Cognitive skills:

Levels 1 and 2 together were close to requirements, as were levels 3 and 4. There were, however, not enough complex procedures and too much problem solving.

	Knowledge	Routine procedures	Complex procedures	Problem solving
Recommended	23	60	45	22
Actual	27	54	32	38

The external moderators recommended that more alternative solutions be included in the marking memorandum. Some beautifully innovative questions were included in this paper.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

143. MATHEMATICS P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clear; the paper could not be completed in the allocated time; and the quality of the illustrations, graphs etc. was not appropriate.

Content coverage:

Compliance was very close.

	Actual	Recommended
Algebraic manipulations	21	20
Calculus	36	35
Finance & annuities	16	15
Functions & graphs	34	35
Linear programming	12	15
Patterns & sequences	31	30
Totals	150	150

Cognitive skills:

There were not enough problem-solving procedures and too many complex procedures.

	Knowledge	Routine procedures	Complex procedures	Problem solving
Recommended	23	60	45	22
Actual	21	64	47	18

Marking memorandum:

The external moderators recommended more alternative solutions.

Language and bias:

Subject terminology/data was not used correctly. The language register was inappropriate for the level of the candidates.

Predictability:

There were not enough innovative questions.

Overall impression:

There was limited compliance. The question paper was not fair, valid or reliable; and it was not of an appropriate standard.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

144. MATHEMATICS P2 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clear. The paper would not have been completed in the allocated time and the quality of illustrations, graphs and tables was not appropriate.

Content coverage:

There was very close compliance with the requirements.

	Totals	Recommended
Data handling	27	25
Coordinate geometry	36	40
Transformation geometry	24	25
Trigonometry	63	60
Totals	150	150

Cognitive skills:

Levels 1 and 2 together were close to requirements, but there were not enough level 1 problems.

	Knowledge	Routine procedures	Complex procedures	Problem solving
Recommended	30	45	45	30
Actual	39	60	42	9

Marking memorandum:

The external moderators provided further alternative solutions in the marking memorandum.

Language and bias:

Subject terminology/data was not used correctly. The language register was not appropriate for the level of the candidates.

Overall impression:

There was limited compliance. The paper was not fair, valid or reliable, and was not of an appropriate standard.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

145. MATHEMATICS P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clear; the paper could not be completed within the allocated time; and the quality of illustrations, graphs etc. was not appropriate.

Content coverage:

Compliance was very close.

	Actual	Recommended
Data handling	25	25
Coordinate geometry	38	40
Transformation geometry	28	25
Trigonometry	59	60
Totals	150	150

Cognitive skills:

Levels 1 and 2 together were close to requirements, but there were not enough level-1 problems.

	Knowledge	Routine procedures	Complex procedures	Problem solving
Recommended	37.5	45	45	22.5
Actual	37	43	46	24

Marking memorandum:

The external moderators provided further alternative solutions.

Language and bias:

Subject terminology/data was not used correctly and the language register was not appropriate for the level of the candidates.

Second moderation

Content coverage:

Compliance was very close.

	Actual	Recommended
Data handling	25	25
Coordinate geometry	37	40
Transformation geometry	28	25
Trigonometry	60	60
Totals	150	150

Cognitive skills

	Knowledge	Routine procedures	Complex procedures	Problem solving
Recommended	37.5	45	45	22.5
Actual	33	51	45	21

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation.

146. MATHEMATICS P3 NOV '12

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the first moderation.

147. MATHEMATICS P3 MAR '13

Diagram and diagram sheets needed to be edited, otherwise the paper complied with all policy requirements.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation.

148. MECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY NOV '12

Cognitive skills

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	33.5	40	26.5

Finding:

This paper was approved at the first moderation.

149. MECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Mark allocations were not clearly indicated; mark allocation on the paper was not the same as on the memo; and the illustrations, graphs, tables, etc. were not print-ready.

Cognitive skills:

Minor changes to the grid were required.

	Low	Medium	High
Norm %	30	40	30
Examiner %	31	40.5	28.5

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation.

150. MUSIC P1 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Size and note spacing of the musical examples needed to be amended to help candidates to read and write on the question paper.

Internal moderation:

More rigorous and accurate moderation was required to avoid errors in both the paper and the marking memorandum.

Cognitive skills:

The paper lacked vigorous assessment of higher cognitive level questions, such as analytical or comparative description of how musical elements were utilised in different contexts. The panel was advised to analyse each question more carefully in order to place it correctly on the grid. Some questions were too easy for Grade 12. Moreover, the level of difficulty of choice questions was unequal, for example Q4 and 5.

The marking memorandum was inaccurate and there was a bias in favour of jazz candidates.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

151. MUSIC P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Size and note spacing of the musical examples needed to be amended so as to help candidates to read and write on the question paper.

Internal moderation:

More rigorous and accurate moderation was required to avoid errors in both the paper and the memo.

Cognitive skills:

The paper lacked vigorous assessment of higher cognitive questions, such as analytical or comparative description of the way musical elements were utilised in different contexts. The panel needed to analyse each question more carefully in order to place it correctly on the grid. Some questions were too easy for Grade 12 and the level of difficulty of choice questions should be the same, for example Q4 and 5.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate.

Language and bias:

There was a bias in favour of jazz candidates.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

152. MUSIC P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Some instructions needed to be clearer. In addition, some tracks on the CD had to be replaced.

Internal moderation:

More rigorous and accurate moderation was required to avoid errors in both the paper and the memo.

Cognitive skills:

The examples and illustrations used were not suitable. There was no appropriate distribution in terms of cognitive levels.

Marking memorandum:

The marking memorandum was inaccurate and it did not allow for alternative responses.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

153. MUSIC P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Some instructions needed to be clearer.

Internal moderation:

More rigorous and accurate moderation was required to avoid errors in both the paper and the memo.

Content coverage:

The examples and illustrations were not suitable. Q5 needed to be amended – the knowledge required in the question was not required in the LPG.

Cognitive skills:

There was no appropriate distribution in terms of cognitive levels.

Marking memorandum:

This was inaccurate and did not allow for alternative responses.

Overall impression:

Q2, 3, 4 and 5 and the memo all needed to be amended.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

154. PHYSICAL SCIENCES P1 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

A box containing all the previous question papers and internal moderators' reports was made available.

Marking memorandum:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in most respects although there were still some errors that had to be removed from the memorandum.

Content coverage:

All LOs and ASs were addressed except for LO3 AS1 and LO1 AS3. The external moderators had empathy in respect of LO3 AS1, owing to the shortage of documented evidence on indigenous knowledge, but not in the case of LO1 AS3.

	AS	Marks
LO1	AS1	4
	AS2	36
	AS3	13
	AS4	0
LO2	AS1	18
	AS2	12
	AS3	63
LO3	AS1	0
	AS2	4
	AS3	0

Exam Guidelines		Exam Paper	
LO	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
LO1	35–45	LO1	35.3
LO2	45–55	LO2	62.0
LO3	5–15	LO3	2.7

The weighting was only appropriate for LO1; the paper did not therefore adequately cover the LOs and ASs prescribed.

Cognitive skills:

There was full compliance.

Exam Guidelines 2009		Exam Paper	
Cognitive level	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
Level 1	15	Level 1	16
Level 2	30	Level 2	29.3
Level 3	45	Level 3	46.7
Level 4	10	Level 4	8

The memorandum was accurate except for Q3.3 and Q6.2.

Language and bias:

There were certain questions containing language and question formulation errors that made them either ambiguous or unclear and which could have created confusion. At the third external moderation there were still some errors to be corrected.

Overall impression:

At the third external moderation there was compliance in most respects. Although the paper assessed knowledge and skills appropriately, it was still thin on values.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the third moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed. All the corrections were done on site and checked by the Umalusi external moderators. The reason given by the internal moderator for the low coverage of LO3, namely, that it led to inconsistencies in marking, was noted and would be reported on.

155. PHYSICAL SCIENCES P1 MAR '13

There was compliance in all respects. The analysis grid not only gave an indication of the cognitive level of the questions, but also an illustration of the coverage of the curriculum. Innovative new questions were set.

Findings:

There was compliance in all respects, but a small number of corrections had to be made and the question paper had to be proofread again. The paper was, therefore, conditionally approved and had to be resubmitted for further moderation.

At the second moderation there were still a few errors to be corrected and the paper was once again conditionally approved, and had to be resubmitted for further moderation.

At the third moderation all changes had been addressed and both the question paper and memorandum were approved.

156. PHYSICAL SCIENCES P2 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

A box containing all previous question papers and internal moderators' reports, that is, the history of the paper, was made available.

Content coverage

LO	AS	Marks
LO1	AS1	3
	AS2	18
	AS3	25
	AS4	8
LO2	AS1	15
	AS2	37
	AS3	37
LO3	AS1	4
	AS2	3
	AS3	0

All LOs and ASs were addressed except for LO3 AS3. The weighting for this LO was thin and the weighting of marks per LO was appropriate only for LO1 and LO2. The paper therefore did not cover LO3 adequately.

Exam Guidelines		Exam Paper	
LO	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
LO1	30-40	LO1	36
LO2	50-60	LO2	59.3
LO3	5-15	LO3	4.7

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not appropriate.

Exam Guidelines 2009		Exam Paper	
Cognitive level	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
Level 1	15	Level 1	15.3
Level 2	40	Level 2	41.3
Level 3	35	Level 3	34.7
Level 4	10	Level 4	8.7

Language and bias:

There were certain questions containing language and question formulation errors that made them either ambiguous or unclear, which could create confusion.

Second moderation

LO3 was still thin, that is, 4,7% against a norm of a 5-15% range.

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not yet appropriate.

Exam Guidelines 2009		Exam Paper	
Cognitive level	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
Level 1	15	Level 1	15.3
Level 2	40	Level 2	43.3
Level 3	35	Level 3	33.7
Level 4	10	Level 4	6.7

Language and bias:

There were still certain questions containing language and question formulation errors that made them either ambiguous or unclear, which could create confusion.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were approved at the third moderation.

157. PHYSICAL SCIENCES P2 MAR '13

First moderation

Cognitive skills:

All LOs and ASs were addressed, except for LO3 AS3 and LO1 AS3. The weighting for LO3 was thin.

LO	AS	Marks
LO1	AS1	3
	AS2	18
	AS3	25
	AS4	8
LO2	AS1	15
	AS2	37
	AS3	37
LO3	AS1	4
	AS2	3
	AS3	0

Content coverage:

The paper did not adequately cover LO3 as prescribed.

Exam Guidelines		Exam Paper	
LO	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
LO1	30–40	LO1	36
LO2	50–60	LO2	59.3
LO3	5–15	LO3	4.7
Exam Guidelines		Exam Paper	
Cognitive level	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
Level 1	15	Level 1	15.3
Level 2	40	Level 2	41.3
Level 3	35	Level 3	34.7
Level 4	10	Level 4	8.7

Distribution in terms of the cognitive levels was appropriate.

Second moderation

Content coverage:

LO3 was still thin, that is, 4.7% against the norm of a 5-15% range.

Cognitive skills:

Exam Guidelines 2009		Exam Paper	
Cognitive level	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
Level 1	15	Level 1	15.3
Level 2	40	Level 2	43.3
Level 3	35	Level 3	33.3
Level 4	10	Level 4	6.7

Distribution in terms of cognitive levels was not yet appropriate.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was still not accurate with regard to certain questions.

Language and bias:

There were certain questions containing language and question formulation errors that made them either ambiguous or unclear and they could create confusion.

Third moderation

Content coverage:

The coverage of LO3 was still thin.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution of cognitive levels was not yet appropriate.

Language and bias:

There were a few language errors and some answers needed to be modified.

Fourth moderation

Cognitive skills

Exam Guidelines 2009		Exam Paper	
Cognitive level	Weighting %	LO	Weighting %
Level 1	15	Level 1	15.3
Level 2	40	Level 2	43.3
Level 3	35	Level 3	33.3
Level 4	10	Level 4	6.7

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the fourth moderation.

158. RELIGION STUDIES P1 NOV '12

Marking memorandum:

There was compliance in most respects and alternative answers were provided. Some adjustments to mark allocation had to be done, and answers in the memorandum did not always address the question effectively.

Language and bias:

Suggestions regarding the rewording of questions were made. It was also recommended that language in the memorandum be simplified.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved but had to be submitted for further moderation once the recommended adjustments had been made. The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

159. RELIGION STUDIES P1 MAR '13

Cognitive skills:

It was recommended that some instructions be changed – 'explain' rather than 'discuss' should be used, for example. At the second external moderation there was compliance in all respects.

Marking memorandum:

Some corrections to the memorandum were required. At the second external moderation there was compliance in all respects.

Language and bias:

There were some minor errors to be corrected. At second external moderation there was compliance in all respects, but there were still some minor errors to be corrected.

Adherence to policies/guidelines:

There were a few corrections to be attended to; however, at the second external moderation there was compliance in all respects.

Finding:

At the second external moderation the question paper and memorandum were both approved.

160. RELIGION STUDIES P2 NOV '12

Language and bias:

The wording in Q3.2 could be confusing.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved and had to be submitted for further moderation, pending a list of errors that had to be attended to.

At the second moderation all errors had been corrected and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

161. RELIGION STUDIES P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

There were some minor technical errors to be corrected.

Marking memorandum:

Answers provided in the memorandum did not always address the questions effectively.

Language and bias:

There was one recommendation to be complied with.

Finding:

At the second external moderation all corrections had been effected and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

162. SEPEDI FAL P1 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

A request was made to include copies of question papers from the past three years in order to detect predictability. In addition, certain adjustments to the paper and memorandum had to be made which had not been picked up by the internal moderator. In addition, it was found that cognitive skills were not appropriately distributed and the memorandum was not accurate. There was some evidence of bias – text should reveal both sides of the coin, the good and the bad. It was not easy to determine whether there was repetition because papers from the past three years were not made available. Internal moderation: There were some changes and corrections to be made.

Content coverage:

The analysis grid had to be updated to accommodate the changes.

Cognitive skills:

The analysis grid had to be balanced.

Language and bias:

The text for the comprehension test was inappropriate.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

163. SEPEDI FAL P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Copies of questions of the past three years must be attached to enable the panel to ensure that questions are not repeated. The analysis grid had to be reworked for minor adjustments.

Internal moderation:

There were some changes and corrections to be made that were not picked up by the internal moderator.

Content coverage:

The analysis grid had to be reworked to accommodate the required changes.

Cognitive skills:

The analysis grid had to be balanced. Moreover, it was found that the distribution was inappropriate.

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was inaccurate.

Language and bias:

There was some evidence of bias – the text did not provide a balanced view.

Predictability:

Without the previous three years' question papers it was not possible to judge whether there was repetition.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved and had to be submitted for further moderation. The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

164. SEPEDI FAL P2 NOV '12

Internal moderation:

Several adjustments to the question paper still needed to be effected. Rigorous moderation had to be done and the changes had to be effected as required.

Content coverage:

The analysis grid had to be reworked to accommodate the required changes.

Marking memorandum:

The marking memo should always make provision for alternative responses. Accordingly, several adjustments were required.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

165. SEPEDI FAL P2 MAR '13

Marking memorandum:

The marking memo should always make provision for alternative responses. In addition, there were several adjustments to be made.

Finding:

The question paper and memorandum were conditionally approved and had to be submitted for further moderation. Rigorous moderation had to be done and the changes had to be effected as required. The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

166. SEPEDI FAL P3 NOV '12

A file with a full history should be submitted. Although evidence of moderation was available, the wording of Q1.6–1.8 was a concern. The DBE was requested to submit a full history in order to verify Q8.2 and 8.3.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

167. SEPEDI FAL P3 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The memo for Section B and C had to be included to guide markers on the topics set. Internal moderation: Although there was evidence of moderation, the wording of Q1.6–1.8 was a concern.

Content coverage:

Challenges were identified concerning the phrasing of pictorial questions (Q1.6–1.8).

Marking memorandum:

Limited compliance – the memo was inaccurate; it was found that it would not facilitate marking and the mark allocation and mark distribution in the questions was incomplete.

Language and bias:

Q 1.3 needed to be rephrased.

Predictability:

The DBE was advised to submit a file with a full history in order to verify minimum standards 8.2 and 8.3.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

168. SEPEDI HL P1 NOV '12

The grid needed to be reworked as it required minor adjustments here and there. The external moderators requested the DBE to include copies of question papers from the past three years in order to detect predictability.

There was no evidence that the paper had been internally moderated. Moreover, there was an inappropriate distribution in terms of cognitive levels.

There was some evidence of bias – in future such texts should be avoided. Both comprehension and visual texts emphasised the bad side of government employees, implying that they are all bad people.

Judgement on predictability was precluded by the non-submission of the past three years' question papers.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

169. SEPEDI HL P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The grid needed to be reworked as it required minor adjustments. There was a request to include copies of question papers from the past three years in order to detect predictability.

Internal moderation:

There was no evidence that the paper had been internally moderated.

Cognitive skills:

The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was inappropriate.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate.

Language and bias:

There was some evidence of bias – in future such texts should be avoided. Both comprehension and visual texts emphasised the bad aspects of government employees, implying that they are all bad people.

Predictability:

Judgement on this was precluded by the non-inclusion of the past three years' question papers.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

170. SEPEDI HL P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The analysis grid needed to be reworked because of some minor adjustments. Copies of the past three years' question papers should be provided at the next moderation.

Internal moderation: Some questions needed to be adjusted or corrected.

Cognitive skills:

The cognitive levels had to be balanced.

Marking memorandum:

Several adjustments had to be done.

Findings:

At the second external moderation the question paper and memorandum were approved as all recommendations had been complied with.

171. SEPEDI HL P2 MAR '13**172. SEPEDI HL P3 NOV '12**

A request was made to include copies of question papers from the past three years in order to detect predictability. Internal moderation was not rigorous.

There was limited compliance in respect of predictability. The DBE was requested to submit a full history of the paper in order to verify Q8.2 and 8.3.

The paper was not fair, valid or reliable, did not compare favourably with previous years' question papers and was not of an appropriate standard.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

173. SEPEDI HL P3 MAR '13**Technical criteria:**

The memo for Sections B and C should be included to guide markers on the set topics.

Internal moderation:

There was no thorough moderation – there were clear grammatical and typographical errors.

Marking memorandum:

Limited compliance – the memo was inaccurate; would not have facilitated marking; and the mark allocation and mark distribution in the questions was incomplete.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

174. SEPEDI SAL P1 NOV '12

Content coverage:

There were several questions that needed to be adjusted or rephrased, and the analysis to be adjusted accordingly.

Marking memorandum:

Several adjustments had to be made to the marking memorandum.

Finding:

At the second external moderation all adjustments and corrections had been effected and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

175. SEPEDI SAL P1 MAR '13

Internal moderation:

Several adjustments had to be made to both the question paper and memorandum.

Marking memorandum:

Several corrections had to be made.

Finding:

At the second external moderation all adjustments and corrections had been effected and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

176. SEPEDI SAL P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

The analysis grid needed some minor adjustments.

Content coverage:

Some corrections had to be made, and an instruction had to be adjusted.

Marking memorandum:

There are some items to be corrected in the memorandum.

Finding:

At the second external moderation all corrections had been done and the question paper and memorandum were approved.

177. SEPEDI SAL P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The analysis grid needed some minor adjustments.

Content coverage:

Some minor adjustments had to be attended to in both the question paper and memorandum.

Finding:

At the second moderation the question paper and memorandum were approved.

178. SESOTHO FAL P1 NOV '12

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators at the first moderation had been addressed.

179. SESOTHO FAL P1 MAR '13

180. SESOTHO FAL P2 NOV '12

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators at the first moderation had been addressed.

181. SESOTHO FAL P2 MAR '13

182. SESOTHO FAL P3 NOV '12

There was no internal moderator's report. The memorandum was inaccurate and would not facilitate marking. Descriptors in the rubric for Section A needed to be corrected and the descriptors for Sections B and C, levels 7, 6 and 5 needed to be reorganised properly to make the memorandum user-friendly and accurate.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

183. SESOTHO FAL P3 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Instructions 1 and 2 had to be merged to make them one instruction.

Internal moderation:

There was no internal moderator's report

Content coverage:

The content was adequately covered

Marking memorandum:

The memo was inaccurate and would not have facilitated marking. Descriptors in the rubric for Section A needed to be corrected and the descriptors for Sections B and C, levels 7, 6 and 5 needed to be reorganised properly to make the memo user-friendly and accurate.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

184. SESOTHO HL P1 NOV '12

Approved at the second moderation.

185. SESOTHO HL P1 MAR '13

Approved at the second moderation.

186. SESOTHO HL P2 NOV '12

Approved at the second moderation.

187. SESOTHO HL P2 MAR '13

Approved at the second moderation.

188. SESOTHO HL P3 NOV '12

Certain instructions needed to be modified and edited. Although the paper had been intensely moderated, certain non-compliances were picked up by the external moderators in respect of content coverage. Too many words were used in structuring lengthy contexts which detracted from the real focus on the topic. The context for essay 1.1 was inappropriate for a narrative essay and the context of essay 1.3 was inappropriate for an argumentative essay. Marking grids and rubrics were well laid out, but, in light of the changes, these needed to be reconsidered as well.

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved at the second moderation and no resubmission was required. The internal moderator was, however, required to ensure that the concerns raised in the report were addressed.

189. SESOTHO HL P3 MAR '13

Approved at the second moderation.

190. SESOTHO SAL P1 NOV '12

Approved at the second moderation.

191. SESOTHO SAL P1 MAR '13

192. SESOTHO SAL P2 NOV '12

Approved at the first moderation.

193. SESOTHO SAL P2 MAR '13

194. SETSWANA FAL P1 NOV '12

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

195. SETSWANA FAL P1 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

196. SETSWANA FAL P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria/internal moderation:

The quality of illustrations was not appropriate and not print-ready; there was limited compliance in respect of internal moderation; the quality, standard and relevance of input from the internal moderator were inappropriate; and there was no evidence that the internal moderator's recommendations had been effected. The DBE panel was advised to revisit the Examination Guidelines for Languages (15–16 April 2010).

Content coverage:

There was limited compliance. All questions needed to be revised to suit the ASs and the guidelines for literature. Questions were not found to be within the broad scope of the AS. Moreover, the weighting and spread of LOs and ASs were inappropriate

Cognitive skills:

There was limited compliance. The distribution in terms of cognitive levels was inappropriate and choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty.

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was inaccurate, did not correspond with question paper, did not make allowance for alternative responses and would not have facilitated marking.

Predictability:

The paper did not contain an appropriate degree of innovation.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

197. SETSWANA FAL P2 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The quality of illustrations was neither appropriate nor print-ready.

Internal moderation:

There was limited compliance – the quality, standard and relevance of input from the internal moderator were inappropriate; and there was no evidence that the internal moderator's recommendations had been implemented. The DBE panel was advised to revisit the Subject Assessment Guidelines for Languages (15–16 April 2010).

Content coverage:

There was limited compliance – all questions needed to be revised to suit the ASs and the guidelines for literature; the questions were not within the broad scope of the Statement and the weighting and spread of LOs and ASs were not appropriate.

Cognitive skills:

Limited compliance – the distribution in terms of cognitive levels was inappropriate; and choice questions were not of an equal level of difficulty.

Marking memorandum:

The memo was not accurate; did not correspond with the question paper; did not make allowance for alternative responses and would not have facilitated marking.

Adherence to policies/guidelines:

Limited compliance – the paper was not in line with current guideline documents; and the weighting and spread of LOs and ASs were inappropriate.

Predictability:

The paper did not contain an appropriate degree of innovation.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

198. SETSWANA FAL P3 NOV '12

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

199. SETSWANA FAL P3 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

200. SETSWANA HL P1 NOV '12

External moderators identified mistakes in respect of the quality of visual texts, phrasing of questions, spelling and punctuation, contradictory statements, inconsistencies, inadequate responses and code-mixing.

There was full compliance, that is, 40: 40: 20, in respect of the distribution of cognitive skills. However, there were subtleties in language and grammar that twisted the intended meaning.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

201. SETSWANA HL P1 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

Incorrect phrasing of Q1.2.6, 1.2.7 and 1.2.8.

Language and bias:

The cartoon in Q4 was biased towards other religions.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

202. SETSWANA HL P2 NOV '12

203. SETSWANA HL P2 MAR '13

204. SETSWANA HL P3 NOV '12

The pictures used in Q1.6 and 1.8 were inappropriate and would not trigger learners' creativity and imagination.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

205. SETSWANA HL P3 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

The picture in Q2.2 did not correspond closely to the question asked.

Language and bias:

There were subtleties in language and grammar in Qs 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8.

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

206. SETSWANA SAL P1 NOV '12

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second moderation.

207. SETSWANA SAL P1 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the second external moderation.

208. SETSWANA SAL P2 NOV '12

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the first moderation.

209. SETSWANA SAL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

The question paper was approved at the first moderation.

210. SISWATI FAL P1 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were a few editorial errors and changes to be attended to.

Internal moderation:

There were still some challenges to be attended to.

Marking memorandum:

There were many mistakes to be attended to.

Finding:

At the second moderation the question paper was found to be fully compliant and was approved.

211. SISWATI FAL P1 MAR '13

212. SISWATI FAL P2 NOV '12

Finding:

At the second moderation the question paper was found to be fully compliant and was approved.

213. SISWATI FAL P2 MAR '13

214. SISWATI FAL P3 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

There were some minor errors to be attended to.

Internal moderation:

Only two further errors were identified.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved, but did not have to be returned for further moderation, as the internal moderator had to implement the suggestions for correction. The question paper was, nevertheless, submitted for second moderation and approved.

215. SISWATI FAL P3 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were some editorial corrections that had to be made before the question paper could be signed off. In addition, the correct sources of pictures and cartoons had to be provided.

Internal moderation:

Only two errors were identified and had to be corrected.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved and had to be resubmitted for further moderation. At the second moderation all requirements had been met and the question paper was approved.

216. SISWATI HL P1 NOV '12

Finding:

At the second external moderation all comments had been addressed satisfactorily and the question paper was approved.

217. SISWATI HL P1 MAR '13

Finding:

At the second external moderation the question paper was found to be fully compliant and was approved.

218. SISWATI HL P2 NOV '12

Finding:

At the second external moderation the paper was found to be fully compliant and was approved.

219. SISWATI HL P2 MAR '13

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second external moderation.

220. SISWATI HL P3 NOV '12

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were some minor editorial errors to be corrected in the question paper

Internal moderation:

The few errors could be corrected by the internal moderator.

Finding:

At the first moderation the question paper was conditionally approved, and did not have to be resubmitted for further moderation.

221. SISWATI HL P3 MAR '13

Technical criteria:

There were some editorial corrections to be made.

Internal moderation:

A few errors were identified that could be handled by the internal moderator.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation and did not have to be returned for further external moderation.

222. SISWATI SAL P1 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

There were some editorial errors and changes to be attended to.

Internal moderation:

There were still some challenges to be addressed.

Marking memorandum:

There were many mistakes to be attended to.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved and had to be returned for further moderation. At the second moderation there was compliance in all respects and the question paper was approved.

223. SISWATI SAL P1 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

There were some editorial corrections to be made to both the question paper and the memorandum.

Internal moderation:

There were several errors to be corrected.

Marking memorandum:

There were many mistakes to be attended to.

Finding:

At first moderation the question paper was conditionally approved but had to be submitted for a second external moderation. At the second external moderation all editorial comments had been attended to satisfactorily and the question paper was approved.

224. SISWATI SAL P2 NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Q1.1 had to be reviewed, and there were corrections to be made.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved and had to be returned for further moderation. At the second moderation the question paper was approved.

225. SISWATI SAL P2 MAR '13

First moderation

Technical criteria:

Some questions needed review and correction.

Internal moderation:

The internal moderator's recommendations had been implemented, but there were two questions that needed review.

Overall impression:

Learners would find this paper challenging and demanding. Two questions had to be reviewed, and some errors had to be corrected.

Finding:

The paper was conditionally approved and had to be returned for further moderation. At the second moderation the questions had been reviewed and the editorial comments attended to in a satisfactory manner, and the question paper was approved.

226. TOURISM NOV '12

Technical criteria:

Instructions to candidates were not clearly specified. The quality of graphs required improvement.

Internal moderation:

The quality and standard of the internal moderator's input was inappropriate.

Content coverage:

The weighting and spread of content was inappropriate. The examples and illustrations used were not suitable, appropriate or relevant.

Marking memorandum:

The memorandum was inaccurate and did not correspond with the question paper in some respects:

- Q4.1.1 – some inclusions needed to be made
- Q6.2.2 – calculations were not correct
- Q7.3.1 and 7.3.2 – answer was wrong.

Language and bias:

Terminology was not used correctly and subtleties were found in the grammar that might create confusion. There was some evidence of bias and the passages used were not of appropriate length or vocabulary.

Finding:

The paper was approved at the second moderation when all the concerns raised by the external moderators in the first moderation had been addressed.

227. TOURISM 'MAR 13

Minor changes were needed.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved at the first moderation.

228 – 243. TSHIVENDA HL, FAL AND SAL NOV '12 & MAR '13

First moderation:

The following obtained in Paper 1 during the first moderation: The comprehension test for the November 2012 lacked coherence and logic, the message did not flow coherently from one paragraph to another, and this might cause confusion. It was recommended that the comprehension be replaced, as well as the visual text. There was no innovation in the text; it was found to be uninteresting and would not motivate the learners.

The Analysis Grid for the March 2013 paper indicated further changes to be effected by the examination panel, but it was nevertheless submitted to the external moderators. Cognitive levels on the grid needed to be changed and addressed as requested by the external moderators.

Marks were incorrectly calculated on Text 2 in the March paper – 9 marks were given instead of 10. The summary text in the March 2013 paper needed to be replaced as it was a repetition of that in the November 2011 paper.

Finding:

With the exception of HL Paper 1, which was approved in the second moderation, the rest of the papers were approved at the first moderation.

244 & 245. VISUAL ARTS P1 AND P2 NOV '12

Both papers were approved at the first moderation.

246. VISUAL ARTS P1 MAR '13

Minor editorial errors were found.

Finding:

The question paper was conditionally approved.

247-254. XITSONGA HL, FAL AND SAL NOV '12

Finding:

All the Xitsonga papers were approved at the second moderation.

255-262. XITSONGA HL, FAL AND SAL MAR '13

Finding:

All the Xitsonga papers were approved at the second moderation.

ADDENDUM 2 A

MODERATION AND VERIFICATION OF GRADE 12 SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

(To be read in conjunction with chapter 2 of the main report)

PHASE 1: VERIFICATION OF TEACHERS' FILES

EASTERN CAPE

ENGLISH FIRST ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

The content coverage and relevance of the set tasks were generally acceptable. There was, however, constant reuse of old material, which resulted in problems on both the technical and the cognitive levels.

In Libode District work of an acceptable standard was being produced, and teachers were standardising tests and tasks, although some of the tasks were not of an appropriate standard. Moreover, one topic only for a writing task would not offer enough practise for the final examinations.

On the other hand, the Fort Beaufort schools were each doing their own tasks and the standards varied between schools and within the tasks themselves. Many were below standard as far as content, technical criteria, and memoranda and/or rubrics were concerned, with many memos and rubrics being incorrect and outdated. Internal moderation was inadequate.

Most schools were setting tasks at a low level. In most cases levels 1 and 2 of Barrett's taxonomy were used. This was evident in the schools from Fort Beaufort District.

In many cases, the rubrics or tools being used were not in line with the Subject Assessment Guidelines (SAG). Where the marking tools had been adopted from pre-existing papers, they were not properly aligned or renumbered.

At some schools no marks were reflected for the second term. Marks in memos often did not correlate with the test marks. In addition, mark distribution was seldom indicated in the memoranda.

Internal moderation across different levels

A serious lack of moderation and feedback was noted. The moderation was not rigorous, as in one case missing questions had not been picked up, although the test was signed.

Feedback and support

Very little actual written feedback was in evidence.

Areas of good practice

Schools in the Libode District had used common tasks, which meant that their work could be assessed accurately and the schools in the area were likely to benefit.

Areas for improvement

- Rubrics were not used correctly, resulting in generalised marking; rubrics were inappropriate and outdated.
- In some of the teacher-developed tasks the distribution of marks in questions was inaccurate.
- The standard of questioning was pitched at the lower cognitive levels.
- There was a lack of rigorous internal moderation of teachers' files.
- No constructive feedback was given by the moderator to the educator.
- Substandard tasks were developed by some of the selected schools, and there was careless use of previous examination material. Instructions were often not clear or were not given at all.
- Choices were not given when setting creative writing tasks.
- Marking memoranda did not always correlate with question papers.

Recommendations

- District officials (subject advisors) should moderate their educators' files thoroughly and offer constructive comments.
- Standardising of tasks is recommended.
- Educators should align their assessment tasks with those that are used in the final NSC examination.
- Educators should pay more attention to the structure and level of questioning in the NSC question papers, and not restrict themselves to level 1 and 2 questions only.
- Moderation at all levels is essential, but not merely by signing. Feedback is crucial.

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

- LO2 was over-assessed to the neglect of LO1 (science investigation) and LO3 (science, environment and human development).
- Most of the examined content across the selected schools was within the policy and guidelines. At one school, however, discontinued content was assessed.
- In both districts it was observed that although the practical investigations dealt with were within the policy and guidelines, the topics chosen were inappropriate because they were available in full in the textbooks. This inflated learners' marks, causing bunching and, therefore, a poor spread of marks.
- The common tests and June exams were of an appropriate level of difficulty, but the practical investigations were too easy.
- The marking tools were appropriate.
- The mark allocations in some instances were not aligned with the difficulty of the tasks.

Internal moderation across different levels

There was evidence to suggest that moderation was indeed taking place at schools. This was suggested by the colours used in the teachers' files to indicate different levels of moderation.

Feedback and support

Evidence of feedback was found. The feedback from subject head to teacher was appropriate as far as monitoring was concerned. However, feedback on subject content, science conventions and language errors was, non-existent.

Areas of good practice

- There was evidence of re-marking and monitoring.
- There were pockets of good common tests and June examinations that were set at school level.

Areas for improvement

- Averages should be shown on mark sheets.
- Practical investigations (PIs) that can achieve an appropriate spread of marks should be selected for school-based assessment (SBA) and rubrics should be used to assess them.
- The coverage of LO1 and LO3 in tasks needs to be improved.

Recommendations

Moderation should be viewed as a process to enable each learner to obtain the mark that he/she deserves in each assessment task. Any issues that prevent this from being achieved should be addressed urgently.

LIFE ORIENTATION

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

Task 1 did not address the content as outlined in the guideline, and the technical quality was poor. Task 2 included inappropriate content, as the CV and letter of application were Grade 11 tasks, and the other topics did not form part of the core content to be assessed.

Most questions in the examination task were lower order questions, which compromised the standard of the task. The structure for Section B was incorrect.

In most of the tasks the rubric was appropriate, although in some instances model answers were not provided. Mark allocation was not indicated, and in Section B of the question paper question 5 was not clearly formulated.

The marks from Gobinamba were inaccurate, indicating that the marking tool was not applied consistently. In Term 1, all learners had earned an A symbol as a term mark.

The physical education tasks (PETs) generally reflected 100% attendance for all learners, implying that none of the learners had ever been absent.

Internal moderation across different levels

In some schools there was evidence that files were checked for compliance, but they had not been moderated.

Feedback and support

Where the standard was found to be inappropriate, there was no detailed input or informative notes on how to improve it.

Areas of good practice

The use of common tasks was noted, although the quality of the tasks needed to be strengthened.

Areas for improvement

- The first two tasks covered the same aspect, even though there was a wide variety to choose from.
- The tasks were pitched at a low cognitive level. Substandard tasks were developed to assess PET with the result that all learners earned high marks for PET.

Recommendations

- The assessment of the various LOs and ASs must be carefully balanced in order to ensure that the relevant content is examined.
- Tasks emanating from a province should set the standard for the schools in that province to follow, and should be of a standard equal to national question papers in all respects. Such papers need to reflect an appropriate spread across the cognitive levels.
- Workshops must be held to bring PET up to standard. In addition, educators need guidance on how to assess PET.
- Question papers must include higher-order questions.
- The province/districts should devise intervention strategies to address the development of tasks.

KWAZULU-NATAL

ACCOUNTING

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

- The content coverage for controlled tests, common assessment tasks and the June examination was appropriate. However content coverage in written reports and projects was a challenge. Many assessment tasks addressed only one assessment standard. Moreover, questions were often theoretical and irrelevant to the subject.
- Most of the assessment tasks were a combination of very low and medium-order questions with no balance of questions within a specific task. Also the subject cognitive norms were not adhered to.
- The marking reports and project rubrics were vague in most cases with subjective criteria. Marks allocated on rubrics were high and not consistent with the difficulty of the question, for example 5 marks awarded for giving the name of a company.

Internal moderation across different levels

There was no evidence of moderation at any level in any of the teachers' files that were submitted.

Feedback and support

There was limited evidence at a few schools that educators were supported at school and district levels.

Areas of good practice

- A common provincial paper was administered and written by schools, including the under-performing schools.
- Diagnostic analysis provided after each assessment task allowed educators to identify problem areas.

Areas for improvement

- Administered and planned assessment tasks lacked evidence of moderation across different levels. Some assessment tasks were technically inadequate.
- In cases where moderation had been done, it was limited and did not provide detailed input which would improve on the concerns.
- Vague and subjective criteria were used to mark some of the tasks.
- There was no variation in the types of question.
- Questions for projects and written reports were not cognitively balanced, as they were pitched either too high or too low.

Recommendations

- It is important to incorporate a variety of question types to prepare learners for the examination situation.
- The prescribed cognitive weightings should be adhered to.
- All moderation should be thorough and provide detailed feedback in order to improve practice.
- Tasks such as projects have to be designed in such a way that they cover a range of assessment standards.

MATHEMATICS

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

- Tasks were set locally and several schools had the same investigations. These were mostly elementary, or consisted of previous test or examination questions.
- Special common tests were set by the province for the under-performing schools, and written in March and June. Each consisted of two papers. The content coverage was good; however, typographical errors were found and there was an incomplete diagram in the June test paper 2. There was also a serious error in both the March paper 2 and the memorandum.

- The cognitive demand of investigations was generally low and very little problem-solving was included.
- Common tests were set specifically for the underperforming schools. There was a good spread of questions testing knowledge, routine procedures and complex procedures, but an under-emphasis on problem solving in the March papers.
- Investigations: Just about every mathematical solution contained major errors.
- Common tests: Both the tests and the memoranda were well typed and easy to use. There were no alternative solutions although many could have been provided.
- The assignments were mainly cut-and-pasted from previous tests and NSC examination papers, and were very difficult to follow.
- No comments were made on mark allocation.

Internal moderation across different levels

Most of the educator files had been moderated at HOD, cluster and district level, but the moderation instrument used was designed to check for compliance only.

Feedback and support

There was very little evidence of feedback by subject heads. The moderation instrument comprised ticks and crosses with very few comments.

Areas of good practice

The June papers had an adequate number of questions at the problem-solving level. Moreover, the verified teachers' files had been moderated at school, cluster and district levels.

Areas for improvement

- Common tests needed rigorous moderation and proof-reading.
- Teachers needed much greater content knowledge, especially in schools in remote areas.
- Teachers needed continuous support on how to set better investigations and assignments at the correct level without using questions that are already in the common domain.

Recommendations

- Moderation of investigations and assignments at provincial level should be provided as a strategy to support under-performing schools.
- The inclusion of alternative solutions for all assignments should be encouraged.
- A greater emphasis on problem-solving questions is needed.

- Training in specific sections of the curriculum should be put in place in order for teachers to increase their subject knowledge.

HISTORY

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

There was a tendency to use previous question papers without adjusting for source-based and extended writing tasks. Standardised tests were set by the provincial education department (PED). In some schools there was no evidence that the historical enquiry that commenced in Grade 10 had been monitored.

Cognitive levels were addressed in terms of subject guidelines. The distribution and consideration of cognitive domains was evident at the setting stage of tasks and the controlled tests. The educators administered standardised tests that were set by the Department of Education and these were pitched at the correct cognitive levels. The June examination was also a provincial paper.

No comments were made on the appropriateness of the marking tool or on mark allocation.

Internal moderation across different levels

There were no comments.

Feedback and support

There were no comments.

Areas of good practice

- The portfolio system was well organised and managed, and easily accessible.
- The portfolios presented a clear picture of the status of History teaching in the province.
- It was evident that SBA had been integrated into the teaching and learning of History and was not regarded as an 'add-on'.
- The use of diagnostic analysis sheets gave the educator a detailed overview of the learners' performance in a test.
-

Areas for improvement

- The curriculum advisor in one region was not involved in any kind of moderation.
- In some schools the heritage assignment mark was not reflected on the mark sheet.

- There was too much reliance on the use of previous national examination papers as SBA tasks.

Recommendations

- Cluster/district moderation should be more rigorous and more frequent, and should be undertaken by the subject advisors.
- Where the HOD is not a subject specialist, the cluster leader should assist a school to ensure that assessment is done in terms of the SBA document.
- Teachers need to be orientated on the various forms of assessment, especially extended writing and the proper administration and use of a rubric for this section.
- The identification of best practices is encouraged in order to support schools.
- The heritage tasks should be continuously monitored and assessed.
- A variety of sources, such as visuals, statistics and texts, need to be used for source-based and extended writing tasks.

LIFE ORIENTATION

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

All tasks assessed the relevant content, which was appropriately pitched for Grade 12. Various questioning styles were used. One of the districts used the Gauteng SBAs without amending them at all. Moreover, one question was outside the LOs and ASs, which would have disadvantaged learners.

The SBA written tasks were pitched appropriately and required extensive research on the part of the learners. The tasks were divided into various activities with varying levels of difficulty. The Gauteng tasks were appropriately pitched, but they might pose a challenge to the teacher who had to assess the tasks.

A common June examination was written by some schools. This paper was well crafted and set at the appropriate cognitive level. However, the questions in Section C did not have the same weighting and were not at an appropriate level.

In Section A of the second paper (uMkhanyakude District), which was written by all selected schools, the questions were relevant. In Section B the questions were also relevant and thought-provoking. However, in Section C the questions were not of equal difficulty.

The rubrics and memoranda were appropriate and neatly typed, and the mark allocation was clearly indicated. The use of the matrix as a marking tool posed challenges for many educators.

The PET implementation was a challenge. Evidence of the use of assessment tools for marking some of the activities was not submitted, and marks for participation and movement were always high.

The mark allocation was generally appropriate, except in the case of PET, as indicated above.

Internal moderation across different levels

No evidence of internal moderation could be found. Although a common question paper was used, no evidence of internal moderation was included.

Feedback and support

Evidence of general support by subject advisors was found in all files. The fact that the files contained completed checklists is a sign that they had been checked for compliance.

Areas of good practice

- All files were well organised and easy to navigate.
- Evidence of district support was reflected in all files.
- Marking of the written tasks showed a realistic and stabilising process.
- The question papers used were appropriate.

Areas for improvement

- PET was assessed inappropriately. All learners scored between 80 and 100%.
- Tasks from other provinces had to be properly moderated and improved before being used.
- In the second question paper only three alternatives were provided in multiple-choice questions.

Recommendations

- Training should be provided on the assessment of PET.
- The PET mark compromises the authenticity of the final Life Orientation mark.
- The pre-moderation of tasks from other provinces is essential.
- The examination guidelines must be consulted on the number of options required for multiple-choice questions.

LIMPOPO

ACCOUNTING

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

- The questions provided in the project task in general were theoretical and not relevant to Accounting learners in Grade 12. The content was below standard and outside the prescribed scope of content at this level.
- The assessment tasks were generally pitched at lower- and medium-order levels. Moreover, the prescribed taxonomy norm was not considered when setting the tasks.
- The marking tools that had been selected and used to mark the assessment tasks were appropriate.
- It was found that the marking tools did not consider the allocation of method marks where expected and, where applied, they were inconsistent.

Internal moderation across different levels

Although an instrument had been used for establishing compliance, the quality and cognitive demand of tasks were neglected across all levels of moderation.

Feedback and support

There was no evidence of support from the school hierarchy, or from the district or cluster levels. Effective internal moderation across the system continued to be neglected.

Areas of good practice

- The province was strong on the statistical analysis of provincially set assessment tasks.
- Some of the marking tools were well constructed and could be applied fairly. This was evident in schools from Sekhukhune District.

Areas for improvement

- Assessment tasks (including the mid-year examination) satisfied mainly the lower- and medium-order questions, while higher-order questions were not well covered. It was clear that scenario-type questions and problem-solving questions had been avoided so that marking would be easy and learners might score high marks.
- There was evidence of over-reliance on the previous year's papers. The setting of tasks lacked creativity and originality.
- Over-assessment of written reports was observed in the verification of the selected districts.
- Theoretical questions were not directly related to Accounting at Grade 12 level.

- The moderation instrument had been designed to establish a level of compliance with the PED requirements across different moderation levels.
- Method marks were not awarded where they were expected.

Recommendations

- The use of the appropriate weighting as prescribed for cognitive levels is crucial. The questions should adhere to the prescribed cognitive norms.
- Teachers should be encouraged to design their own assessment tasks in line with and similar to the standards set for the final examination. This will give teachers valuable exposure.
- Inclusion of higher-order questions in the scenario-based questions should be encouraged. This will ensure that learners of different capabilities are accommodated.
- The content prescribed for Grade 12 should be adhered to.
- An appropriate moderation instrument should be designed. Quality should be accommodated, and not merely compliance.
- Rigorous moderation of marking tools is crucial and must be implemented. Marking should be consistent and thoroughly checked.

LIFE SCIENCES

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

- Incorrect content was used as the basis for a research project in the Waterberg-Mogalakwena District. The districts administered a common examination paper, but there was duplication of questions and inconsistent mark allocation.
- The prescribed taxonomy levels were not considered in either the assignment or the mid-year examination paper.
- Although the tool designed for marking the mid-year examination was appropriate, there was a wrong answer.
- The allocation of marks for the essay question was not clear. There were discrepancies in the distribution of the marks.
- The use of the memorandum was consistent and teachers indicated how they allocated the marks.
- The allocation of marks was largely unfair as there were inaccuracies.

Internal moderation across different levels

There was evidence of some internal verification, as there were completed school moderation forms indicating compliance. There was also a curriculum specialist tool with comments.

Feedback and support

There was very little evidence of feedback by the subject head to the educators. There were some comments by the curriculum specialists, but a serious lack of informative input that would bring about improvement in the assessment of the subject.

Areas of good practice

Some moderation was done at various levels, that is, school, cluster/district, curriculum specialist and provincial.

Areas for improvement

- The distribution of content in terms of LOs and cognitive levels for the mid-year examination was unbalanced.
- The incorrect alignment of content used for the Term 2 research project assignment was noted across selected schools from the Greater Sekhukhune district.
- An essay task administered in the Waterberg-Mogalakwena District was unclear in terms of instructions and in most cases the marking was not accurate.
- The rubric used for the marking of an assignment administered by selected schools in the Greater Sekhukhune District was vague and subjective.

Recommendations

- The marking guideline for the assignment in the Waterberg-Mogalakwena District must be rearranged to make it user-friendly.
- Examination guidelines must be consulted when setting examinations and tests to assist teachers in setting tasks that are of a good standard.
- Qualitative and detailed inputs from internal moderation must be used to improve the teaching and learning.

LIFE ORIENTATION

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

- The prescribed LOs were adequately covered and the expected skills were tested. A good provincial mid-year examination was set which complied with the SAG.
- PET was a challenge in respect of the interpretation of the SAG requirements, the formulation of instructions, the relevance of assessment tools, and the calculation of PET marks for participation and movement performance.
- The spread of tasks and questions across the cognitive levels was acceptable.
- The relevance of assessment tools for PET was questionable, however.

Internal moderation across different levels

Standardised moderation tools were completed for all schools at district level. The school moderation tool was, however, merely a checklist.

Feedback and support

At district level there was developmental feedback, but at school level there was limited evidence of feedback. Quarterly meetings were held with the district officials to determine support action to be taken. Support meetings were then in turn conducted with educators.

Areas of good practice

- Educator files were well arranged and all the required documents were in place.
- The move towards common examinations and tasks was commendable, but the structure and technical criteria have to be revisited.
- In some educators' files a moderation register was included indicating the level of moderation.

Areas for improvement

- At Dennis Mataba Senior Secondary there was no evidence of PET implementation. Moreover, no rubric had been included to indicate how marks were awarded.
- Calculation of the PET marks submitted with the teacher file was incorrect.
- At George Langa there was no Term 2 mark sheet for PET.
- At Mashakwaneng High School learners participated in a board game only, which did not give much scope for the evaluation of movement. No assessment tool was found to substantiate the marks awarded to learners.

Recommendations

- Moderation should include qualitative and developmental feedback to teachers and not just checklists.
- Teachers who are struggling to implement tasks should be assisted. This includes training in the setting of formal tasks, twinning of schools with others that do quality work, and providing schools with models.
- The assessment tools for PET should be developed according to the nature of the task. The tools should be quality assured at both district and provincial levels as they do not comply with the SAG. Training on the development of PET tasks and assessment tools is of the utmost importance.
- The use of generic marking tools should be discouraged as they do not address the specific nature of a task.
- Teachers' files should contain proof of all assessment done, including assessment tasks, assessment tools and mark sheets.

- Moderation at all levels must be conducted diligently and thoroughly, as shortcomings were detected. Marks had been incorrectly validated.
- Proof of moderation of provincial common tasks should be available.

MPUMALANGA

GEOGRAPHY

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

The assessment tasks were derived from previous question papers and were therefore up to standard. In some cases Term 2 and 3 work was assessed in Term 1, and this would have disadvantaged the learners. The March test and the mid-year examination were standardised. In most schools the practical task was a common paper which was a copy of the November/supplementary question papers. Generally, all the question papers were cut-and-paste copies of previous papers.

Although previous question papers were used, the cognitive demand of the tasks was not balanced as the whole paper had not been used, and in some cases only level-1 questions had been selected. Educators needed to make use of an analysis grid to help balance the weightings, and to modify the questions taken from previous papers or textbooks.

In some cases the memorandum did not match the question paper. The rubric developed for the research/assignment did not have balanced descriptors, which would lead to bunching and encourage teachers to award average marks if they were not sure about learners' work.

Mark allocation was indicated by ticks on the original memo, but where educators had copied the responses by hand, the mark allocation was often left out.

Internal moderation across different levels

Moderation was conducted in different colour pens, but it was not always clear which level of moderation was which. Comments merely indicated 'satisfactory' and did not focus on cognitive demand and content assessed. Accordingly, this constituted monitoring rather than moderation.

Feedback and support

Feedback was detected at all levels, but was generic rather than directed at specific tasks.

Areas of good practice

- All the schools completed the four prescribed tasks for Terms 1 and 2 as prescribed.
- All the assessment instruments were available, including the map and the photograph.

Areas for improvement

- Previous question papers should be used as a framework to develop new tasks for a particular year.
- Tasks should be pre-moderated to ensure that they meet the requirements of the SAG and that previous question papers are not used.
- The colour of the pens used at the various levels of moderation should be standardised.

Recommendations

- When designing tasks, educators should consult the relevant policies.
- Over-dependence on previous question papers should be discouraged as it compromises the reliability of assessment tasks.
- There is a need to train teachers to set/develop their own assessment tasks.
- Using previous question papers also disadvantages learners when they are assessed on content that has not yet been taught.
- Moderation should be developmental, and constructive feedback should be given.

LIFE SCIENCES

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

The specifics of the tasks differed in each of the two districts. In one district all the tasks were common tasks, while in another district only some of them were. The tasks generally lacked creativity and contained questions from previous question papers. The practical task and the assignment were not valid as they did not assess what was supposed to be assessed according to the SAG. No marks were awarded for the actual doing of a task. It would appear that teachers did not understand the SAG requirements.

It was difficult to determine the cognitive demand as analysis grids had not been drawn up. In general, the practical task and the assignment focused on lower cognitive skills: they did not require 'doing', but were merely simple theoretical questions. In many cases

the tasks/assignments did not meet the requirements of an assignment as indicated in the SAG. The March controlled test and the June examination were common tasks, but the questions had been incorrectly evaluated, with what was given as higher-order questions actually being lower order.

The marking tools for the practical and the assignment were inappropriate, but the marking memoranda for the common test and the June examination were acceptable. However, the rubric for one task was unreliable.

Where a marking memorandum was used the allocation of marks was appropriate.

Internal moderation across different levels

There was limited evidence of moderation at all levels. Although there was evidence in some schools of a checklist, there was no constructive moderation that would lead to improved quality. In general, the quality and rigour of moderation was unsatisfactory.

Feedback and support

Appropriate feedback and support was lacking. Moderation instruments did not include criteria for quality, only general compliance. Moreover, there was no evidence of input by subject advisors or facilitators in the files moderated by Umalusi.

Areas of good practice

The implementation of common cluster tasks was an area of good practice.

Areas for improvement

- While the implementation of common cluster tasks/district tasks was to be encouraged, they require thorough planning and rigorous moderation by specialists.
- There was no distinction between monitoring and moderation.
- The importance of the moderation process appeared to have been ignored.
- Recycling of previous question papers, tasks and assignments was taking place on a large scale. This practice disempowered teachers and prevented them from being creative.
- Appropriate standard-setting was lacking.
- The absence of grids made it difficult to analyse the cognitive weighting of tasks and tests.

Recommendations

- Teachers should be encouraged to design additional tasks. These could then be moderated to create a bank of exemplars of comparable standard for the use of the cluster/district/province.

- By doing this, the designing and standardising of tasks will have been done beforehand, and there will have been time to address issues of standards.
- Improved moderation would make a great difference to the standard of work in general.
- Proper feedback should be given so that teachers are praised for good work, as well as being informed about their shortcomings.

LIFE ORIENTATION

Quality and standard of assessed tasks

There was no evidence that task 1 was moderated. Instructions to learners were not clear. Old sources had been copied, or irrelevant sources used to assess certain skills. Part of the task was not at the required cognitive level. The layout was not learner-friendly.

Task 2 was indicated as a research task, but no clear instructions were given. There were no research sources or material and the technical quality of the task needed serious attention.

In the June examination the question paper was not in line with the current SAG document. The technical standard of the paper was low and the structure of both sections was incorrect. Very limited content was assessed in Section C.

The questions were generally of a lower cognitive demand and posed limited challenges. The memorandum did not always reflect the cognitive demands of the question. The rubrics were too generic and the rubrics and the activities did not correspond. The rubric designed to assess running was used for the assessment of dance.

The marks from Bohlabela suggested that the marking tool may not have been applied consistently. Most learners scored very high marks in the first term. The PET generally scored 100% for attendance, implying that no learners were ever absent.

Internal moderation across different levels

There was no evidence of any moderation. Generally, the teachers' files were in order.

Feedback and support

There was evidence that the appropriate documents had been distributed to all schools. Some of the files had been checked for compliance.

Areas of good practice

Use of common tasks was noted in some districts. This could be an acceptable tool for setting acceptable standards.

Areas for improvement

- The tasks lacked cognitive demand.
- At one school the learners' PET marks were incorrectly calculated and at another there was no Term-1 PET mark.
- At other schools no memorandum was included for the June examination.
- The June question paper was not pitched at Grade 12 level.
- Technical errors were observed in most of the tasks.
- Mark allocation and the spread of marks were not indicated in the memorandum.

Recommendations

- Pre-moderation of tasks should be conducted before tasks are administered.
- The standard of tasks has to be improved by ensuring that the prescribed weighting for cognitive levels is followed.
- Common tasks are useful for establishing a common standard, but the tasks must be error-free, and pitched at the appropriate levels.
- The SAG document should be implemented at all times.
- The technical aspects of tasks and question papers must be thoroughly moderated.
- The instrument used to record marks for the PET component should be improved to provide more information or evidence about the marks that are awarded.

ADDENDUM 2 B

MODERATION AND VERIFICATION OF GRADE 12 SCHOOL-BASED ASSESSMENT

(To be read in conjunction with chapter 2 of the main report)

PHASE 2: QUALITY ASSURANCE OF LEARNERS' SBA FILES

EASTERN CAPE

HISTORY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts were invited for moderation; four schools from one and five schools from the other. One teacher's file and three learners' files from each school were moderated. The Department of Basic Education (DBE) had worked with all the schools that submitted their documents – the DBE had moderated the teacher's file and three to five learners' files from each school.

Quality of the DBE moderation instruments

The instrument encompassed all aspects of worthwhile moderation. However, no completed instrument was available during the Umalusi moderation session.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF LEARNERS' EVIDENCE

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE actual moderation of learners' evidence

At some schools the DBE moderators had re-marked some of the evidence, while at other schools files were only checked for compliance with policy. Very few comments were found, and these focused mainly on criteria descriptors from the rubric. No recommendations were found in the moderated sample.

Marking of the tasks

No discrepancies were found in the marking with rubrics. The marking guidelines were appropriate and in line with National Senior Certificate (NSC) policy and guidelines. A common rubric was used in the Eastern Cape to assess the heritage assignments. This rubric was in order, except that some of the criteria were weighted too heavily. The analytical essay rubric was satisfactorily applied in most cases. At two schools the markers did not indicate the rubric levels at the end of the essay and at one school the wrong rubric was used to mark the analytical essay. There was also a tendency to be too generous with marks, although in general the allocation of marks was fair. Learners should be penalised for simply rewriting sources.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners coped with the lower-order but struggled with the higher-order questions. The ability to express themselves in their second/third language was a major challenge for learners and they needed assistance with the structuring of sentences and paragraphs.

Although learners could write down information, they struggled to take a stance and defend or criticise it.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

A well-developed moderation system was in place, although there was little evidence that tasks were quality-assured at schools before being given to learners. Script moderation at all levels was not rigorous enough, and marks were often not adapted. This called into question the credibility and purpose of the moderation process.

Areas of good practice

- The school-based assessment (SBA) process was managed appropriately.
- A provincial moderation process was in place at various levels.
- The files were fairly complete and presented a picture of the status of the SBA in History in the province.
- It would seem that the historical inquiry process is established in the Eastern Cape.
- The provincial trial examination papers were well developed.
- Common papers were written in June as well.

Areas for improvement

- Not all files were in order and therefore not accessible.
- The extensive use of previous question papers is a concern.
- There is little evidence of quality assurance of tasks.
- The process of script moderation was not rigorous enough.
- All tasks should be labelled and include the relevant instructions.

- There were no remarks by teachers in the learners' files.
- Marks were sometimes recorded incorrectly.
- The recording sheets were not available in all the files.
- The use of the SAG norms for cognitive levels should be adhered to.
- Guidance on the nature of the heritage assignment as a provincial initiative needs attention.

Recommendations

- It is essential that tasks be appropriately quality assured before they are written.
- The moderation of scripts at school level should be rigorous.
- Teachers should be guided in the setting of the heritage assignment. This assignment has to be set around a single key question and appropriate rubrics have to be applied to assess these tasks. Guidance is also required on the proper selection of authentic and personal sources to address the formulated key question.
- The identification of best practices is encouraged to support schools.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Ten poor-performing schools were selected for moderation. The DBE moderated 10 schools, five from each district.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

One of the DBE moderators reduced marks drastically, while the other made minor adjustments. Although this moderation was thorough, it was not rigorous enough. Scripts were re-marked according to the memorandum and the use of the moderation tool was consistent throughout.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The DBE did not leave any reports behind, and no feedback or comments were made on any of the moderated scripts.

Marking of the tasks

The marking tool was comprehensive and had been pre-approved by Umalusi.

Marking at school level was quite lenient. At times the marks were drastically reduced by the DBE moderator. Section A was generally meticulously marked, but Sections B and C presented problems of interpretation. In these sections marking was often imprecise and marks were allocated to incorrect answers. It appeared that markers did not always understand where to allocate marks. It might be that the memorandum had not been discussed in the province, or that the specific teachers had not attended.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners' marks were inflated, and in some cases allocated more than the total after adding up the marks – 24 marks more in one case. Learners battled with CAT in comparison with other tasks.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

The head of department (HOD) at school level had done shadow-marking. No marks were adjusted, as this was a compliance check, and not a qualitative moderation process.

District moderation was thorough, however, and in some cases awarded different marks were awarded. National moderation was stringent and had fully complied with the expected standard of marking.

Areas of good practice

- District level moderation had been thorough.
- National moderation had been stringent and fully compliant with the memorandum.

Areas for improvement

- There was a lack of thorough school-level moderation.
- There appeared to be a lack of content teaching. Learners' conceptual knowledge and critical thinking were poor.
- Learners had a poor grasp of how to analyse questions and provide responses.
- There was poor mastery of basic examination writing skills.
- At most of the schools marking was too lenient.
- The two DBE moderators appeared to apply two different standards of marking.
- There was a huge discrepancy between the internal assessment and the CAT marks.
- Physical Education (PE) marks remain suspect and have a negative impact on the authenticity of the final Life Orientation mark.

Recommendations

- Moderation at school level has to be tightened up. HOD training in moderation processes and practices needs to be conducted to ensure that school managers understand these processes and their importance.
- It is vital to teach the Life Orientation content.
- Higher thinking skills must be taught so that learners are able to solve problems, and critically analyse, evaluate and synthesise information.
- The perception (in Life Orientation) that every answer is correct has to be eradicated. Educators need to understand marking processes, and this may require training.
- Uniformity in approach on the part of DBE moderators is essential. They should operate as a team and be equally stringent.

MATHEMATICS

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Files were provided from five schools in each of two pre-selected districts, Fort Beaufort and Bizana. The DBE moderators had moderated about 10% of the files, although the work done was not readily evident.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation instrument was not available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

Some of the tasks had been moderated in detail. However, the external moderator had misgivings about the moderation of both the internal and the DBE moderators and both moderators awarded less than the maximum for correct answers in seven cases.

Marking of tasks

At Bizana the common tasks were all of a high standard. Assignments selected from previous question papers were of an appropriate standard, but teachers were unable to set their own questions. The introduction of common papers had raised the quality of the assessment tasks. The tools were mostly appropriate and the standard of marking was

generally acceptable. At one school the marking was particularly poor, with the teacher awarding 0 for answers that deserved full marks.

Overall impression of learner performance

- As all the schools selected were underperforming, the results were obviously biased. According to a table compiled by the external moderator, 66 out of 235 candidates scored below 10% in June. None of the learners in the Fort Beaufort district passed the June examination.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

The Bizana moderator was excellent and produced original questions and accurate marking memoranda. There was therefore a marked improvement in this area. Systems were in place to ensure that moderation took place, although the quality varied from school to school. Although there was checking of compliance, actual qualitative moderation was seldom done. There was a lack of expertise in the schools for meaningful mathematics moderation.

Areas of good practice

The standard of tasks had improved since the previous external moderation. Internal moderation was now in place.

Areas for improvement

- Evidence suggested that very little teaching was occurring in most of the classrooms. Teaching thus needed a great deal of attention.
- There was urgent need for teachers to be properly monitored.
- There appears to be a critical shortage of appropriately qualified teachers in the province.
- There is an urgent need for a Mathematics coordinator in this province.
- The Mathematics official in Bizana had given better guidance to the teachers than the one in Fort Beaufort.

Recommendations

The areas for improvement should be attended to.

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

The size of the DBE-moderated sample was 0,53% of the total number of learners registered to write Physical Sciences in the Eastern Cape in 2012. The moderation report cannot be reported upon and adherence can only be judged through the DBE instrument which was made available, and the comments in the files that they looked at. Comments were thin and mostly chastising, and reprimanded learners for their poor performance.

There were no comments on the standard of the SBA tasks and their answers in general because there was no evidence that they had been moderated by the DBE. There was therefore little evidence of adherence to the DBE moderation requirements in the tasks sampled by Umalusi.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation tool was appropriate and it evaluated the standard of marking. There was no evidence in the Umalusi sample that the research project had been moderated, although it made up 20% of the total SBA mark in the NSC. The tool was, however, inappropriate in the sense that it did not make provision for the moderation of physical investigations and research projects.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The application of the DBE moderation tool was consistent with its contents. However, the DBE did not moderate the tasks, that is, the actual question papers and control tests. The many errors that the teachers made were not corrected by the DBE. Moreover, many errors were found in the September examination papers, the second control tests, the research projects and their answers. These had not been moderated by either the provincial education department (PED) or the DBE.

In most cases the first page of a task was signed and a comment written was made. However, the comments did not say anything about the learners' mistakes. Moreover, the comments were chastising, and not remedial. No recommendations appeared in the moderated sample.

Marking of tasks

Only one criterion was directly related to marking, namely: "Is the marking of the learner evidence accurate?" However, this was not sufficient to be a good guide for the DBE moderator. There was no mention of consistency, feedback or correcting learners' mistakes, or fairness. In addition, there were errors in the marking memorandum that the DBE moderators did not pick up; indeed, they used them for marking.

The cases where the DBE actually marked a task, the results were excellent And there was good correspondence among the markers. Although the marking tool was not appropriate, the marking by the moderators was.

The feedback however was inappropriate.

Overall impression of learner performance

Performance in the September examination was low. The question papers were challenging with cognitive levels of difficulty estimated to be more or less in line with requirements.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Internal moderation at schools was evident and had taken place at school, cluster and district levels. Shadow-marking had been done without much genuine moderation.

Areas of good practice

- There was evidence of re-marking, feedback and monitoring at school, cluster and district levels.
- The scope of SBA implementation could be seen.

Areas of concern

- Averages should be shown on mark sheets.
- All marks should be recorded.
- Only research projects that can achieve an appropriate spread of marks should be selected for SBA.
- All assessment tasks should be accompanied by a completed taxonomy grid.
- Moderation should be improved.
- One of the major problems in the province is the large number of Science teachers in temporary posts who may not be qualified or experienced enough to do the re-marking.

Recommendations

Moderation should be viewed as a process that can ensure that the mark each learner gets is one that they deserve to get in each assessment task. All issues that prevent from this being achieved should be addressed urgently.

FREE STATE

ACCOUNTING

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Randomly selected learners' files from five schools per district, that is, 10 schools, were subjected to SBA moderation. The DBE moderated three schools from each district in depth. The DBE moderation reports were not included in the files, however, so it was not possible to establish how thorough the moderation had been and what their findings were. They had, however, picked up errors in two assessment tasks that the teachers and the internal moderators had missed.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The tool was not available for individual external moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- There was no DBE moderation report available to evaluate the quality and standard. Inputs and comments in the files enabled the Umalusi moderator to observe that the moderation had been thoroughly done.

Marking of the tasks

The marking tools were generally appropriate and their application consistent. Both the June and the trial examinations had been set provincially, and the standard was comparable to the NCS examinations. The tasks were well designed with appropriate marking tools including method marks for consequential errors. In the Fezile Dabi District all the sampled schools had done the same seven tasks. The marking tools were generally of good quality.

In Matheo District five of the tasks were common tasks, and two were set individually. The latter were of varying quality, with the tasks of only one school, Reamohetse Secondary, being satisfactory.

Because the marking tools were fairly well designed, the allocation of marks was fair. Appropriate use was made of method marks.

Overall impression of learner performance

In most of the schools sampled, the marks of the class tasks (report/case study) and the project were significantly higher than the examination and the control test scores. There might, thus, have been copying or collaboration among learners, or they might have received additional support in doing the class tasks and the project. This raised the overall SBA mark unrealistically in six of the sampled schools.

The marks achieved in both the June and the September examinations were very poor in all the sampled schools. Reasons for this might include poor discipline, lack of content knowledge on the part of the teachers, ineffective formative assessment in the classroom, poor teaching plan, or disjuncture between the teaching plan and the assessment plan. This does not auger well for the province, as the examinations were of a good standard.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Most of the teachers' files reflected several moderation reports from school, cluster, district and provincial level. The quality of advice given to teachers was variable, ranging from a tick-box approach to generalisations or a focus on administrative issues. In other cases the school-based HOD and subject advisors gave constructive and practical advice, which appeared to have had little effect on the ultimate achievement in the sampled schools. There were no significant inconsistencies in the marking, although sometimes moderation appeared to be a shadow-marking exercise. Mark sheets were not adjusted to accommodate moderated marks.

Areas of good practice

In the Fezile Dabi District all seven tasks (provincially set) were of good quality and were consistent with NSC standards.

In the Matheo District the five major tasks were the same as those used in the Fezile Dabi District, and were of a good standard. Reamohetse Secondary produced two good tasks. Some of the HODs and subject advisors were providing their teachers with good constructive advice.

Areas for improvement

Teaching plans were not reflected in the teachers' files. In one case (Senakangwedi Secondary) the teacher was using the CAPS teaching plan (for 2014) which does not correspond entirely with the NCS assessment plan. In addition, in some cases the first task did not correspond with the teaching plan content. The assessment plan was very sketchy in most cases with no content specification.

Wide discrepancies in the marks of the various assessment tasks were noticed in most of the schools sampled. This might be due to copying or collaboration. In some cases the answers were very similar to the marking guideline.

In general the SBA marks were significantly higher than the internal examination marks. The March examination reflected content that had not yet been fully taught, namely, the cash flow statement.

A few errors in the centrally set March test and the June examination were not picked up by most of the teachers in the sampled schools prior to conducting the assessment tasks. Marks that changed as a result of moderation were not changed in the teachers' mark sheets. There was also no evidence of any re-marking done by the teacher.

The quality of the mark sheets left much to be desired, with no totals or averages being reflected. In many cases mark sheets were incomplete, and there were errors in the capturing of marks.

Recommendations

- DBE moderation reports should be made available to the Umalusi external moderators.
- Subject advisors should place greater emphasis on the teaching plan in order to see that it dovetails with the assessment plan.
- The inflated marks for class-based or homework-based case studies and projects should be brought under control.
- Declarations by learners were not always properly processed, and signatures of learners and teachers were missing in three schools.
- Provincial and district examiners should look at the content of the March test to ensure that it covered the relevant work.
- Centrally set tasks should be properly moderated before being distributed.
- Subject advisors should require teachers to complete the centrally set tasks themselves before marking the scripts, as this would enable them to engage more meaningfully with the subject content. This practice would also have a beneficial effect on the quality of learning and teaching.

- Teachers should be encouraged to re-engage with scripts after moderation if differences in marking are detected.
- The final mark sheets should be available for Umalusi moderation.
- Learners' subject knowledge was obviously low as they could often not score marks on the relatively easy parts of the curriculum. Subject advisors should ensure that teachers are aware of the "Mind the gap" guide published free of charge by the DBE which would be of great help.

ENGLISH FAL

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts were selected, and five schools from each district submitted evidence files. Each school was expected to submit 20 learners' files and approximately 125 learners' files were submitted in total. Although the DBE had been engaged in moderation for a period of five days, there was no report available. Two administration assistants and the Umalusi moderator went through all the files to identify those that had been moderated, and extracted them for external moderation. There were 19 such files, as well as the teacher's file from each school.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

DBE moderation instruments were not made available to Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

It was difficult to assess the DBE's moderation according to their instrument without having access to it. It appeared that their moderation was limited to shadow-marking or checking marks.

Many of the inputs or comments made by the DBE merely reflected those of the Free State district official who had moderated the files earlier.

As no report of any kind was made available by the DBE, it could not be stated what the recommendations were, if any. It could only be verified that the DBE had re-marked tasks for the third term.

Marking of the tasks

The files of the Free State educators all contained memoranda of tasks to be completed by the learners. These memos were generally accurate.

Although literature orals had been set, most schools assessed these tasks using a writing rubric. It subsequently had to be made clear to the schools that oral response to literature was an oral task and not a written task, and that the oral rubric relating to speaking should have been used.

Obviously, if the incorrect rubrics were being used by some educators, incorrect evaluation would consistently be taking place. There was evidence in learners' files (Nomsa School) that rubrics for writing tasks were not being used correctly. In this case the writing rubric Content and Planning mark had been split into two sections, for example, 8 = Planning; 18 = Content. This was unacceptable as the two criteria should have been assessed together and only one mark awarded.

In most cases the allocation of marks and the transference of marks were done accurately. However, there were some discrepancies. At Phetogane Secondary School one task was marked out of 35, but on the mark sheet it was indicated that the task was out of 30. At Senakangwedi, marks for Tasks 12 and 13 had not been entered on the mark sheet. It was also found that in Task 13 correct answers were marked wrong. At Popano School, one learner had only one oral mark and nothing else. In addition, the marks of two learners had not been adjusted when they were entered on the mark sheet. At Leratong Secondary School there was no evidence in a learner's file of Tasks 11 to 13, although the marks appeared on the mark sheet.

Overall impression of learner performance

Generally, the learners had performed well and had completed their tasks for the third term to the best of their ability.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

The entire moderation process at school level is in need of an overhaul. There was very little evidence of school moderation, but there was sufficient and very competent moderation being done at district level. Ms Webber was doing a sterling job with regard to district moderation.

There was very little moderation of the learners' work. It is imperative that they be guided to improve their work. Not only had moderation not been done, but some of the marking was very superficial with errors not being identified. Learners need guidance and they can

only learn from their mistakes if the mistakes are pointed out to them. This involves both marking and moderation.

Areas of good practice

- Having moderated the various learner and teacher files of both districts, it was pleasing to report that the learners seemed to be achieving wonderfully in the third-term tasks.
- Generally, the marking of tasks was accurate. The allocation of marks and their transference was accurate in all but one case (Phetogane Secondary School).
- Common tasks had been written, and they were all of an acceptable standard.

Areas for improvement

- Accurate moderation of learners' work is needed at school level.
- The allocation of marks for writing tasks was good, but errors were not identified.
- Incorrect rubrics were being used for the marking of oral tasks.
- SAG documents with full instructions were not used, or had not been made available to educators. None were found in the files.
- The DBE assessment tools were not available. It is noted that they are needed by the Umalusi moderators if they are to verify DBE moderation.
- There was very little indication of moderation of the actual work of candidates in the schools.

Recommendations

- Teachers have to make a point of indicating errors in essays so that learners can learn from their mistakes.
- Educators have to have access to the relevant policy documents.
- If oral literature has to be done so late in the year, it would be better to focus on the current networks for reinforcement, rather than on films or television shows.
- Literature orals are not written exercises. Although this was pointed out by the Free State district moderator, it appears to have been ignored.
- DBE moderation should have taken place earlier in the year instead of just prior to the final examinations when learners and teachers needed their files.
- Tasks must be moderated before being administered to learners. Tasks contained typing errors and, in some cases, no instructions (Leratong Secondary School, Task 13). In addition, some answers were missing from memos and, at Metsimatle Secondary School, there were errors in the instructions of their oral Task 11.
- It is recommended that the DBE moderators submit a report before leaving a centre so that the Umalusi moderators will have an idea of how many files have been moderated, which ones they are, and what assessment tools were used, etc., as it was difficult to moderate their moderation.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Files from 10 schools in two districts were submitted for external moderation.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The instruments were appropriate and addressed critical aspects of moderation. It would be a great help if a copy of the reports were left for the Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- The moderation was done thoroughly and the comments in the tasks were developmental and indicated what errors had been made.
- The province had done common tasks, and it was not necessary to moderate multiple copies of the same task.
- It would appear that no internal moderation at any level had taken place as there were no reports.
- Detailed feedback had been provided by the DBE moderators.
- Tasks had been approved, but there was no evidence of moderation; instructions to learners were ambiguous; the tasks did not address content at appropriate level; the research task was clearly not understood by learners; no clear instructions were given and the format of the question paper was not in line with the SAG. In addition, writing in paragraphs in Section C was a challenge for learners.
-

Marking of the tasks

The memoranda were not always pitched at the correct level and the rubrics were too generic.

The marking tool was not applied consistently. The PET assessment usually indicated 100% for attendance, implying that no learner had ever been absent. Moreover, the PET marks need to be revisited.

Overall impression of learner performance

The marks appeared to be unreliable; in the first term most learners achieved at levels 6 and 7.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

No reports were available and there was no evidence of internal moderation of tasks.

Areas of good practice

The files were well arranged, and the SBA policies were available.

Areas for improvement

- At one school all learners got almost 100% for PET. There was no rubric to indicate how the marks were awarded.
- At one school the June examination was written in March.
- At another school it was clear that the learners had not understood the content.
- All schools performed poorly in the DBE CAT.

Recommendations

- Teachers should be trained in the application and development of rubrics.
- Moderation should be undertaken at least twice a year by clusters and districts.
- If schools set their own examination it should be moderated at least at district level. All tasks should be quality assured.
- The setting of good common tasks is recommended. This should be done by panels.

LIFE SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Files from two districts (Motheo and Fezile Dabi) were presented for moderation: five low-performing schools from each district, and a teacher's file from each school. All the learner and teacher portfolios that had been selected for moderation by the DBE were moderated by Umalusi. The DBE indicated by means of post-it notes which tasks had been moderated, and some contained comments on what they had found. The Umalusi moderator moderated the same 11 teacher portfolios and 30 learner portfolios that were moderated by the DBE.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

No evidence of moderation was found, although one moderated file was produced at the end of the session. The only evidence of moderation that was found was in the three tasks that were re-marked. In some cases the DBE moderators marked answers wrong that had been correctly marked right by the markers. These errors were in the memorandum, and were not picked up by the DBE moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- It appeared that the nature of the DBE moderation was verification. All the tasks scrutinised had been signed and dated, but there was no evidence of comments about the validity of the tasks or of their memoranda being subjected to moderation by the DBE.
- Where mark sheets appeared in the teachers' files they had only been completed up to June. Where the DBE had changed the marks, the changes were not recorded.
- There were no DBE recommendations to be commented upon.

Marking of the tasks

The memorandum had been slavishly followed, even when it was incorrect. The external moderator was unable to comment on the fairness of the mark allocation because of the errors in the tasks and their memoranda.

Overall impression of learner performance

Given that the learners were selected from underperforming schools, the low levels of learner performance had been anticipated and were consequently confirmed.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

- Some teacher portfolios contained moderators' reports, but it was not possible to distinguish between the levels of moderation. There was no evidence of DBE moderation except for the post-it notes that identified various tasks.
- There was, however, evidence of moderation of learners' portfolios, which involved counter-marking. Nevertheless, some incorrect marking had not been detected. Consequently, moderation seemed to serve a monitoring function, rather than moderation.
- There was no evidence of formative feedback from teachers to learners, or from moderators to teachers.

Areas of good practice

- The strengths and weaknesses were discussed on the last day of the Umalusi process.
- The intention behind common tasks could be considered a strength; but for all sorts of reasons, such as validity issues, timing and the professional development of educators, educators should be encouraged to use such tasks creatively and critically.

Areas for improvement

- Educators should be encouraged to use common tasks critically so that they can improve the tasks and the accompanying memoranda wherever possible.
- The prescription of a “hands-on” practical is an unfortunate name as a research inquiry might or might not be “hands-on”. This should rather be called an “authentic” practical so that the candidates do the tasks themselves. In reality the practical was being treated as a theory test.
- Some teachers confused “hands-on” with “hypothesis testing” in their files.
- The SAG gives little guidance on what a project/assignment task is.
- Learners should be encouraged to do corrections so that they can learn from their mistakes.
- The poor performance of learners is a cause for concern.

Recommendations

- Every task should be moderated before it is administered to learners.
- Internal moderation is more than simply endorsing the educators' decisions.
- There should be improved coordination between DBE and Umalusi moderation processes.
- Teachers need to be guided regarding the marking of graphs and essays.

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Five schools each were selected from the two pre-selected districts, Motheo and Fezile Dabi. The size of the sample moderated by the DBE comprised 1,04% of the NSC Physical Science candidates in 2012. The moderation report cannot be reported upon and adherence can only be judged on the basis of the DBE instrument, which was made available, and the comments in the files that they had looked at. Comments were thin and mostly chastising, and reprimanded learners for their poor performance. There were

no comments on the standard of the SBA tasks and their answers in general because there was no evidence that they had been moderated by the DBE. There was therefore little evidence of adherence to the DBE moderation requirements in the tasks sampled by Umalusi.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation tool was appropriate and it evaluated the standard of marking. The research project makes up 20% of the total SBA mark in the NSC. However, the tool was found to be inappropriate in the sense that it did not make provision for the moderation of physical investigations (physics) and research projects.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The DBE tool was used exclusively to re-mark learners' answers in the September examination and the second control test. Consequently, the DBE moderators were judging the accuracy of marking. Their work was, however, consistent with the instrument at their disposal. Very few comments were found in the majority of tasks moderated by Umalusi; the few remarks that were found were negative, and it appeared that the DBE moderator was inexperienced in marking the NSC. The ticks and crosses to show agreement or difference might be useful if they were acted on. No recommendations had been made.

Marking of tasks

The greatest weakness in the DBE moderation exercise was that the moderators made use of question papers and memoranda containing errors. Half a page of errors was noted and another half a page of errors was picked up in the re-marking done by the DBE moderators. Marking cannot be fair if the memorandum is full of errors. In addition, one of the schools had not been moderated at all by the DBE.

Overall impression of learner performance

The performance was better than expected, and one wonders whether poor-performing schools had indeed been selected. Performance in the September examination was low in comparison with the control task and the research project, however. The cognitive levels of the examination (September) were comparable to the standard of the final NSC examination. There was, however, less cognitive demand in the control test and the research project.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Completed checklists were found in the teachers' files. This indicated that SBA at school and cluster level had been strictly monitored. Moderation and feedback to learners were minimal.

Areas of good practice

- SBA was being monitored and implemented.
- The teachers' files were easy to navigate.
- The September examinations were of a good standard and were internally moderated.

Areas for improvement

- Average marks and percentages should be shown on mark sheets.
- Evidence of training and agendas should appear in the teachers' files.
- Only research projects that can achieve an appropriate spread of marks should be selected for SBA.
- Each assessment task should be accompanied by a completed taxonomy grid.
- Teacher marking should be improved in the interests of giving learners a fair deal.
- Feedback to learners should improve.
-

Recommendations

Moderation should be viewed as a process that can achieve the mark that each learner deserves to get in each assessment task.

GAUTENG

ACCOUNTING

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Five schools per district supplied 20 learners' portfolios as required, together with the teacher's file. In schools where there were fewer than 20 candidates, all portfolios were supplied. This was verified by the mark sheets provided in the teachers' files.

All schools had adhered to the requirements. One school (Samelson College in Sedibeng) did not submit portfolios for Accounting as they do not offer the subject at the school.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

- The moderation tool was appropriate.
- It would be a good idea if the completed moderation tool were also submitted to Umalusi in order to enable Umalusi verifiers to know how the questions were interpreted.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- Consistency could not be verified because the Umalusi verifiers were not provided with the completed tool.
- No comments or recommendations by the DBE SBA team were found in the moderated sample.

Marking of the tasks

- The marking tools used in two districts appeared to be acceptable, except for a rubric that was used in almost all assessment tasks. Marks were allocated for vague criteria that were difficult to verify, such as neatness, completeness and timely submission.
- Regarding consistency, the verifier found it difficult to arrive at the same score as the first markers based on the criteria mentioned above.
- The marking was fair in some schools, but very poor in others such as Thuto Tiro Secondary School where there were discrepancies among the marks awarded by the marker, the moderators and the verifier. The allocation of marks for vague criteria such as neatness is difficult because of their subjectivity.

Overall impression of learner performance

Generally, the performance of the learners was not good. They struggled with core subject sections such as cash flow statement, balance sheet, theory questions and interpretation questions.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

- Although there was evidence of internal moderation in teachers' files, the quality was very poor as there were no corrective or congratulatory comments. The focus was on compliance. It was further discovered that the internal moderation tools were copies. There was no sign of the originals.

Areas of good practice

- The DBE SBA circular was fully adhered to by all schools.
- The June and the preparatory examination question papers were common papers.
- Assessment tasks were properly labelled, which made identification easy.
- The learners' and teachers' files were well organised and accessible.

Areas for improvement

- The marking of learners' tasks was poor. At Thuto Tiro Secondary School, five marks were added to each learner's total score without any justification. Method marks were not properly awarded. No penalties were considered for inclusion of foreign items.
- No evidence of pre-moderation of any of the assessment tasks could be found.
- The internal moderation tools were just ticked, without any corrective comments.
- Subjective rubrics were used to award marks for controlled tests and projects, with criteria such as neatness, completeness and submission. For example, learners were given the following marks: 1 for untidy, 2 for acceptable, 3 for above average and 4 for excellently neat.
- Learners did not perform well in higher-order questions such as the balance sheet, cash flow statement and corporate governance, particularly at Eersterus Secondary School, Prince Field Trust School, and J Kekana High School.
- Learners had difficulty answering question papers for the June and the preparatory examinations, giving rise to the suspicion that the internal tasks were set at too low a standard and did not prepare the learners adequately for the examinations. (See Eersterus Secondary School.)
- Learners were not penalised for foreign items, nor were they allocated method marks as applied in the memoranda of the final examinations. (See J Kekana High School and Prince Field Trust School.)
- Work schedules to indicate when sections had been completed were not kept up to date in all schools.
- At most schools the conversion of learners' marks was incorrect and inconsistent.
- One school (Phateng Secondary School) was found with a note, "exempted from district moderation", with only school moderation tools being included in the teacher's file.
- Copied moderation tools were found filed in teachers' files, but with no completed originals.

Recommendations

- Marking has to be done accurately and marks should be justifiable so that a second marker/moderator would arrive at a similar score.
- Evidence of pre-moderation of tasks should be available in the teachers' files.

- Moderation tools should add value to the assessment tasks by indicating weaknesses, as well as making recommendations to improve the identified weaknesses.
- Remedial work should be done in areas where learners were struggling to deal with sections of the subject.
- Workshops should be organised to ensure that teachers themselves are able to cope with the higher-order aspects of the subject.
- Candidates should be penalised for wrong and foreign items in their answers, and method marks would be awarded where appropriate as applied in the marking of the final examinations.
- Work schedules should be kept up to date.
- There should be consistency in the conversion of marks across the province.
- Where a school is exempted from moderation at any level, sufficient reasons should be provided in the teachers' files.
- The original signed moderation reports should be available in the teachers' files.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Ten schools from two districts submitted files. More than 50% had been moderated, but not always the entire script.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE tool was clear and concise. However, no completed reports had been left for the Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

Umalusi moderators awarded far lower marks than the DBE moderators. For example, the DBE gave full marks for a question where an explanation was required even if the learner had not given any explanation. Moreover, they did not follow all the marking rules. There was no visible re-marking in Section C and the DBE had endorsed school marks that were obviously wrong.

Marking of the tasks

- Most schools transferred the learners' marks accurately.
- The quality of marking at schools was poor. Markers did not distinguish between stronger and weaker candidates.
-

Overall impression of learner performance

Learner performance ranged from average to poor in the moderated schools. The learners revealed an inability to interpret action words in questions.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Moderation at district level was effective, although not error-free. There was a downward trend in marks, but only a very small percentage had been moderated.

Areas of good practice

- There was evidence of re-marking/moderation at various levels.
- The recording of marks was accurate.

Areas for improvement

- Teachers do not mark according to the appropriate guidelines.
- Differences exceeding 10 marks were observed after verification.
- Teachers and learners struggled to interpret the requirements of questions.

Recommendations

- District and cluster marking guideline meetings should be held.
- Centralised marking of the CAT would help to standardise marking.
- Teachers and learners should be supported regarding the interpretation of cognitive level action words.
- Moderation at school level must be strengthened.

LIFE SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

The Umalusi moderator verified the sample decided upon by the DBE, that is, five schools each from two districts, Tshwane South (D4) and Sedibeng West (D8). A total of 47 files were moderated by the DBE in terms of a memo dated 03.09.2012.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE instrument was fairly comprehensive. There was no mention of feedback, however. It must be said that while the instrument required the DBE moderator to re-mark learner evidence, there was little or no evidence of detailed re-marking by the DBE moderator.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

Consistency could not be determined because no DBE report was left behind. There was no detailed re-marking of the earmarked tasks. In the few instances where such practice did occur, it focused on the content requirement and the application of the marking tool.

There was no evidence of comments on either the moderated scripts or on the tasks and marking guidelines. Several of the rubrics were badly designed. The mid-year examination contained a great deal of inappropriate content in the question paper and many inaccuracies in the memo.

Marking of tasks

There were several inaccuracies in the common mid-year examination. Some aspects of rubrics were not well designed and allowed for subjectivity. For example, for the assessment of the recording of results, a two-point scale was used (tables not up to standard/tables up to standard), with no indication of what was meant by "up to standard". Full marks were given for answers that were not complete. Moreover, there was little consistency because of the vague nature of the descriptors. Owing to the lack of properly designed rubrics, marking could not be fair.

Overall impression of learner performance

Marks were generally high for the practical task and for the assignment. The performance in the mid-year exam on the other hand was generally poor.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

In learner files there was evidence of moderation on at least two different levels. There was no form of feedback to learners, however. At one school candidates' marks could not be verified because their names did not appear on the mark sheet.

Areas of good practice

The use of common tasks is a good practice because it provides a measure of standardisation.

The use of different coloured pens provides a way of judging the quality of moderation at the different levels.

Areas of concern

- The tasks and tests appeared not to be thoroughly moderated.
- Many errors were identified in the marking memorandum of the test. This resulted in a reduction in the level of inter-rater reliability.

Recommendations

- The importance of pre-moderating tasks cannot be overemphasised.
- Prior to the marking of a common test/examination, memo discussions should be held to standardise marking.
- Feedback is an integral part of moderation and should not be neglected.
- Proper feedback should also be given to teachers, who should be praised for good work, and informed about their shortcomings.

KWAZULU-NATAL

GEOGRAPHY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

A sample of learners' files from 10 schools was supplied.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

No moderation instruments were available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- An example of DBE moderation was found in each school sample. However, no marks had been amended, and it was difficult to judge the quality and standard of DBE moderation.
- No comments or recommendations were evident.

Marking of the tasks

The memos and rubrics were mostly neatly typed and accurate, and they were used appropriately.

Overall impression of learner performance

Many learners achieved very high marks for the research, assignment and practical task, and then below average marks in the June examination.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

This was identified as a strength. Moderation was systematic and undertaken at all levels. The useful, thorough tool was a valuable means of communicating with educators.

AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- Internal moderation took place at all levels.
- Feedback was given to educators.
- There were some innovative ideas for research and surveys.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Educators need to take heed of the feedback provided by moderators.
- Attention to detail is required.
- Amendments should be made to the moderation process, as there could be concepts that are challenging for a marker.
- Inflated marks were awarded for practical tasks.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The DBE could have left a covering letter or a control page so that moderated tasks could be easily accessed.
- The moderation instrument should be made available.

- Practical tasks should adhere to the SAG and deal with challenges such as the application of theory.
- If the SAG were followed, marks would not be inflated.

HISTORY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts were invited for moderation, with five schools chosen from each. The requirement was that portfolios should be submitted from 10 schools, but only five did so.

One teacher's file and three learners' files from each school were moderated. The DBE had worked with all the schools that submitted their documents and had moderated the teacher's file and five learners' files from each school.

Quality of the DBE moderation instruments

The instrument was planned so as to evaluate compliance with the SAG and to evaluate the status of the current moderation systems in the PED. The instrument served that purpose, although no completed instrument was available during the Umalusi moderation session.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE actual moderation of learners' evidence

Checklists developed by the DBE had been commonly used to moderate learners' files and the DBE had provided comments in these files. There was no report on which to base an evaluation, however. Although there were no official recommendations, the comments and recommendations in the learners' files were informative.

Marking of the tasks

No discrepancies were found in the marking with rubrics. The marking guidelines were appropriate and in line with NCS policy and guidelines. A common rubric was used in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) to assess the heritage assignments. There were significant inconsistencies in the standard of marking and marking differed from school to school. The marking of the extended writing tasks were found to be challenging and inconsistent.

However, the educators were mostly able to indicate how marks were to be awarded, and this was found to be fair.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners' performance ranged from fair to good. Where learners had the writing skills, they excelled because they were able to interpret, analyse, evaluate and synthesise evidence from sources. By contrast, where learners had to express themselves in their second/third language they experienced a major challenge and this influenced their performance. The trial examination and heritage assignments were not presented for moderation.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

While some moderation was in place for compliance, there was a lack of rigorous moderation at school level. Moderation by subject advisors was operational to a certain extent, while cluster moderation was mainly in the form of shadow-marking. There were very few qualitative inputs or comments.

Areas of good practice

- The portfolio system had been managed appropriately and this made the files accessible.
- The files were fairly complete and presented a picture of the status of SBA in History in the province.
- SBA was done on a continuous basis and was integrated with teaching.
- A provincial moderation process was in place to a certain extent at various levels.
- The provincially set tasks were of a good standard.

Areas for improvement

- In some schools the heritage assignments had not been fully marked.
- The extensive use of previous question papers is a concern.
- Rigour in moderation at school and district was lacking.

Recommendations

- Cluster and district moderation should be more frequent and rigorous, and undertaken by the subject advisors.
- The cluster leader should assist any particular school where the HOD is not a subject specialist.
- Teachers must be guided in the various forms of assessment, and the proper use of the marking rubric.
- Teachers must also be trained in the application and development of rubrics through practical exercises, for example the heritage assignment.

- Teachers should be encouraged to set their own assessment instruments and to use previously set examination papers only as a standardisation tool.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Files for 10 schools from two districts were submitted for moderation.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

- The quality of the blank instrument was appropriate.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The moderation tool was good, but no completed instruments were available.

Marking of the tasks

Marking was poor because teachers did not adhere to the marking guidelines. At one school a teacher wrote an incorrect answer in red and gave a mark. Learners had difficulty with the language and could not express themselves. Correct answers were marked wrong and vice versa. At one school there was evidence of an irregularity where it would appear that learners had worked together. After moderation differences of up to 10 marks were found. However, in most of the schools the marks were transferred accurately.

Overall impression of learner performance

Performance ranged from average to poor. Learners were unable to interpret action words in the questions.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Moderation at district and provincial level was good and effective.

Areas of good practice

- There was evidence of re-marking at all levels.
- Moderation at district and provincial level had had a positive impact.

Areas for improvement

- Teachers did not mark according to the marking guidelines and they were unable to interpret action words.
- Differences exceeding 15 marks were noted.
- Learners' responses reflected gaps in their knowledge.
- There appeared to be some irregularity with the filling in of additional responses at the end of the scripts.

Recommendations

- District and cluster marking guideline discussions should be held.
- Centralised marking of CAT should be done to standardise marking.
- Teachers and learners must be empowered to understand action words in questions.
- Moderation at school level needs to be strengthened.

MATHEMATICS

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts, Uthungulu/Empangeni and Umlasi, submitted files from schools, with portfolios being received from only eight schools. The fact that all schools were underperforming schools complicated the moderation process and some schools submitted fewer than six files. The DBE had not moderated all the files. In addition, there had apparently been a go-slow strike, and very few schools had any third term assignments. Moreover, no trial or September papers were submitted.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

No moderation tool was available. Although comments were made in the teachers' portfolios, no signs of DBE moderation could be found apart from the June tests. No report was available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

There were few signs of moderation, with the only proof of DBE moderation being found in the June test. The moderation that was found was done professionally, but the quality of

inputs on the part of the DBE was not up to standard. The few recommendations that were made in the files were valid and reliable. The requirement (stipulated by the DBE moderator) that the June paper had to look exactly like the end-of-year paper was not practical as all the work had not yet been done.

Marking of tasks

The marking tools were often untidy and handwritten. They were, however, used appropriately. In most cases marks were allocated fairly, although detailed mark allocation was not found in any of the memoranda.

Overall impression of learner performance

The performance of many of the schools left much to be desired. In one school everyone had failed the June examination, with the highest percentage being 12%. Learners performed better in the assignments, however.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was no proof of moderation of the provincial papers, although some portfolios had been moderated at provincial and DBE level. School moderation varied from school to school, mainly taking the form of checking for compliance.

Areas of good practice

- District moderators were efficient and thorough.
- School-based moderation was done and checklists were completed.
- Common papers were written by all the schools.
- The composite mark sheet was completed accurately.

Areas for improvement

- The strong reliance on externally set papers revealed a reluctance on the part of teachers to set their own papers and write memoranda. This calls the teachers' competence into question.
- A maths subject specialist needs to be involved in school and cluster moderation to help novice Grade 12 teachers.
- The September assessment should have been included.
- The poor quality of some teachers' files was alarming.
- There was a lack of good investigative tasks.
- Memos have to include alternative answers.

Recommendations

- Of the eight selected schools only one had a decent pass rate. Accordingly, the poor-performing schools must be supported.
- Access to computers would help with the recording of marks.
- Workshops on maths in general need to be held across the province.

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Five schools were selected from each of the two pre-selected districts, Uthungulu and Umlasi. The size of the sample moderated by the DBE could not be determined and the moderation report cannot be reported upon. Therefore, adherence can only be judged by the DBE instrument, which was made available, and any comments in the files that were looked at. Comments and feedback by the DBE moderators could not have been a requirement as there was no evidence of these in the Umalusi-moderated sample. No comments could be made on the standard of the SBA tasks or the answers in general because there was no evidence that they had been moderated by the DBE. There was therefore little evidence of adherence to the DBE moderation requirements in the tasks sampled by Umalusi.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation tool was appropriate. However, although it evaluated the standard of marking it was not designed to judge the quality of practical investigations or research projects. As the research project makes up 20% of the total SBA mark in the NSC, the tool was inappropriate in the sense that it did not make provision for the moderation of practical investigations (physics) and research projects. There is therefore doubt about the fairness, validity and reliability of the DBE moderation instrument.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The tool was used exclusively for the re-marking of learners' answers in the September examination and the second control test. Accordingly, the DBE moderators were merely judging the accuracy of marking. Their work was, however, consistent with the instrument at their disposal. Very few comments were made on the majority of tasks moderated by Umalusi, with the few remarks that were found being negative, and it appeared that the

DBE moderator was inexperienced in marking NSC scripts. The ticks and crosses to show agreement or difference might be useful if they were acted upon. No recommendations were made.

Marking of tasks

The greatest weakness in the DBE moderation exercise was that the moderators made use of question papers and memoranda containing errors. Half a page of errors was noted, while another half a page of errors was picked up in the re-marking by the DBE moderators. Marking cannot be fair if the memorandum is full of errors. One of the schools was not moderated by the DBE at all.

Overall impression of learner performance

The performance was better than expected, and one wonders whether poor-performing schools had indeed been selected. Performance in the September examination was low in comparison with the control task and the research project. The cognitive level of the examination (September) was comparable to the standard of the final NSC examination. However, there was less cognitive demand in the control test and the research project.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Completed checklists were found in the teachers' files. This indicated that SBA at school and cluster level had been strictly monitored. However, moderation and feedback to learners was minimal.

Areas of good practice

- SBA was being monitored and implemented.
- The teachers' files were easy to navigate.
- The September examinations were of a good standard and were internally moderated.

Areas for improvement

- Average marks and percentages should be shown on mark sheets.
- Evidence of training and agendas should be included in the teachers' files.
- Only research projects that can achieve an appropriate spread of marks should be selected for SBA.
- Each assessment task should be accompanied by a completed taxonomy grid.
- Teachers' marking should be improved in the interests of giving learners a fair deal.
- Monitoring of SBA at district and provincial levels needs to improve.
- Each task in the teachers' files should be accompanied by a marking memorandum.
- Feedback to learners should improve.

Recommendations

Moderation should be viewed as a process to ensure that each learner is awarded the marks they deserve to get in each assessment task.

LIMPOPO

ACCOUNTING

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

The moderation sample included 20 learners' portfolios and the teacher's file from five schools in each district, although some schools did not adhere to this requirement: Sephakabatho Secondary School sent in only six portfolios out of a possible 14; Nthema Secondary School submitted six out of a possible 25 portfolios; and Raselete Secondary submitted seven learners' portfolios out of 17 as per the mark sheet. All three of these schools were in Capricorn District. One school in Sekhukhune District did not submit portfolios as the particular subject is not offered there.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation instruments were not available to individual Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- Consistency in the application of the moderation tool could not be verified as the completed tool was not available to Umalusi verifiers.
- No comments by the DBE SBA team could be found in the moderated sample. The provincial SBA coordinator indicated that no moderation tools had been left at the PED.
- No recommendations by DBE SBA moderators could be found in either the learners' portfolios or the teachers' files. It was thus difficult to verify which files had in fact been moderated by the DBE.

Marking of the tasks

- The marking tools used in the two districts were acceptable. Only marking memoranda were used to mark the learners' tasks.
- The marking tools were fairly consistent. However, few educators appeared to understand the allocation of method marks, and when learners should be penalised for including foreign items.
- The marking ranged from fair to poor due to the inconsistent awarding of method marks and the penalising of learners for the inclusion of foreign items.

Overall impression of learner performance

Generally, the performance of the learners was not good. Learners struggled with core subject sections such as ratios and analysis, the cash-flow statement and manufacturing accounts.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence that internal moderation at all levels had been done. However, the quality of the moderation was poor. Vague, short and non-specific comments were provided, such as "dig deeper", "work harder", etc.

Areas of good practice

- Cluster moderation at Kgoke Secondary and Makoko High schools was good and included corrective comments that highlighted weaknesses, such as conversion of marks, performance of learners, recommendations, and so on.
- Evidence of pre-moderation was visible in educators' files for each assessment task provided. The moderation was not thorough, however, and no corrective comments were provided that would help improve the tasks before they were written.
- In most schools analytical statistics forms were completed after every assessment task.
- The assessment tasks were organised in the teachers' files in both districts and were clearly demarcated and labelled in learners' portfolios as well.

Areas for improvement

- Method marks were not clearly indicated when marking, probably because teachers did not understand how to allocate them.
- Conversion of marks was not correctly done on some of the mark sheets. This was found at Makoko High, Nthema Secondary, and Mashakwaneng Secondary schools.
- In Nthema Secondary and Kgoke High schools control tests were set without regard for technical aspects such as instructions, date, total marks and duration of the paper.

- Vague comments did not contribute to improvement in the subject. (See Sedibeng Secondary School.)
- Learners' performance was poor in certain sections, such as ratios and analysis, cash-flow statement and manufacturing accounts.
- Learners were not penalised for foreign items as is done in the final examination.

Recommendations

- Method marks should be clearly differentiated from the normal marks/ticks to ensure that learners recognise the difference. Method marks are allocated where part of an answer is correct.
- Conversion of marks should be standardised across the province. Teachers should be helped to understand this.
- All schools should adhere to the DBE SBA requirements regarding submission of learners' portfolios.
- All technical aspects of a question paper should be complied with when setting a test/task.
- Comments by moderators should be specific and helpful to the educator.
- Remedial work should be considered to help learners understand core areas of the subject. Workshops for teachers should be arranged if there is doubt about the teachers' own understanding of the work.
- Learners should be penalised for including foreign items in records and statements as part of their answers.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

In one district, only two schools complied with the moderation requirements for submitting their files.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation instrument was not available to individual Umalusi monitors.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The verifier did not comment on the DBE moderation.

Marking of the tasks

The marking guidelines for the mid-year examination and term tests were appropriate and satisfied the SAG. The handwritten memorandum used by Makoko High did not make provision for enough alternative answers and was not user-friendly. The rubrics used for assignments, practical tasks and research projects were poorly developed and in some cases allowed learners to be awarded full marks.

The marking of the examination question papers was consistent and accurate.

Overall impression of learner performance

The general performance of learners in the mid-year and trial examinations was satisfactory. Their marks in other SBA tasks were higher, mainly due to the poor design of the rubric. Most learners responded well to the majority of questions in the examinations, while others struggled with simple basic calculations, as well as basic subject concepts and terminology. No feedback was given to learners.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of internal moderation done at cluster/district level during the second and third terms. However, there was a total lack of in-school moderation. Actual re-marking of tasks should be done during moderation.

Areas of good practice

- The schools adhered to the prescribed number of SBA tasks/components.
- The PED/district did well in setting common papers for the June and trial examinations.
- The common provincial pace setters (work schedules) and recording instruments are very helpful to educators in general.
- The assessment body has subject curriculum specialists who provide support and guidance to Agricultural Science teachers, especially those without agricultural qualifications.
- Agricultural schools, such as Harry Oppenheimer and Settlers, could be used as resource centres.

Areas for improvement

- Common exemplars of assignments, research projects and practical tasks could be helpful to struggling schools.
- Schools that have to design their own tasks need assistance with designing both the tasks and the rubrics to assess them.

- Internal moderation and monitoring of SBA tasks must be strengthened, and followed up to ensure that teachers implement the proposals.
- The programme of assessment plan and moderation reports for internal moderation must be provided and be available in teachers' files.
- The arrangement of teachers' portfolios needs to be revisited to make them more accessible.

Recommendations

- Training in the setting of standardised question papers, designing appropriate tasks and rubrics should be seriously considered.
- Common SBA tasks should be developed as exemplars.
- Internal moderation, including in-school moderation, must be strengthened, and records made available to external moderators.
- In future the PED should comply with Umalusi's requests to facilitate external moderation.

ENGLISH FAL

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Approximately 200 learners' files from five schools in two districts were made available for moderation. There was no report from the DBE indicating how many they had moderated, and the Umalusi moderator had to go through all the files to find those that had been moderated by the DBE. Forty-seven files were selected for moderation, as well as the teacher's file from each school (10).

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation instrument was not available to individual Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

It was difficult to assess the DBE's moderation according to their instrument without having access to that instrument. There did not seem to be consistency between the two DBE moderators, with one offering more constructive comments than the other.

Whatever moderation instrument the DBE used, the work by one of their moderators, C. Barnard was excellently done. Constructive comments and critical observations were made by this moderator, while the other moderator merely signed where moderation had taken place. The former's questions were pertinent and relevant to both the educators and the learners.

As no report of any kind was made available by the DBE, it cannot be stated what the recommendations were. However, based on the comments by one of their moderators in the relevant files, it can be stated that the recommendations made were relevant and pertinent to both teachers and learners.

Marking of the tasks

The teachers' files all contained memoranda of the tasks to be completed by the learners. These memos were, by and large, accurate. Literature tasks had been set but were marked using a writing rubric, a mistake made by most schools. In addition, many teachers were not using the writing rubrics correctly. They were also not indicating the breakdown of the marks. At Raselete Secondary School the rubric used to assess Task 11 was a "home-made" version and was unacceptable. At Manoke Secondary School there was no evidence of Task 11 in the learners' files.

If incorrect rubrics had been used by some educators, then evaluation would have been consistently incorrect. In some schools (Mashakwaneng, Sedibeng, Mathafeng, Nthema, Makoko and Kgoke) there was evidence that a writing rubric had been used.

In most cases the allocation of marks and their transference to mark sheets had been accurately done. There were some discrepancies, however. At Sephakabagtho Secondary School, Task 13 was marked out of 80 and then converted to a mark out of 30, but the memo was incomplete.

One of the educators (Nthema) had not entered marks for the third term on the mark sheet. Moreover, there was no work in the learners' files for the third term. At Mathafeng Secondary School the teacher had been instructed by the provincial moderator to include rubrics for Tasks 11 and 12, but this had not been done. At Raselete Secondary School and Mathafeng there was a lack of evidence of the last tasks having been done. This raises questions about how the final SBA marks were going to be calculated.

Overall impression of learner performance

Generally, the learners had performed adequately. However, there were some who had had difficulty with higher-order questions.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

The entire moderation process at the school level needs overhauling. Although there was very little evidence of school moderation, there was sufficient competent moderation being done at the district, cluster and provincial levels. It appeared, however, that some educators were not taking note of the moderators' comments.

There was very little moderation of the actual learners' work at school level – it is imperative that they be guided in order to improve their work. Not only was there no moderation of the learners' work at school level, but also some of the essays had been marked superficially. Errors had not been identified and teachers tended to give 'safe' average marks. Learners need guidance and they can only learn from their mistakes if their mistakes are identified.

Areas of good practice

- Some teachers were making an effort to improve their learners' abilities.
- Generally, the marking of tasks was accurate.
- As the tasks were common, they were all of an acceptable level and standard.

Areas for improvement

- Accurate moderation of learners' work is needed at school level.
- The allocation of marks for writing tasks was average, but errors were not identified.
- Incorrect rubrics were being used for the marking of oral tasks related to literature.
- SAG documents with full instructions were not being used, or were not being made available to teachers, as there were none in their files.
- The lack of DBE moderation reports was a problem. The Umalusi moderators needed them if they were to verify DBE moderation.
- All tasks had to include instructions, dates, marks and time allocations.
- At Sedibeng the marking of summaries appeared to be a problem.
- There was no indication of the length of oral presentations.
- Tasks needed to be proofread and moderated before being given to learners. There were too many spelling and grammatical errors.
- In some cases marking needed improvement.
- There were too many cases of incomplete tasks which would have a negative impact on the learners' results.

Recommendations

- Work must be moderated at school level before it is moderated by clusters or the district.
- Teachers should indicate errors in essays so that learners can learn from them.

- The relevant policy documents must be in the teachers' files.
- Oral tasks so late in the year should focus on networks for reinforcement, rather than on unrelated films or television shows.
- Literature orals should be treated as oral and not written work.
- Tasks must be moderated and edited before being given to learners.
- It is recommended that DBE moderators should submit a report before leaving a centre so that the Umalusi moderators have an idea of how many files were moderated.
- It is suggested that when previous examination question papers are used for tasks, learners should not be expected to do a two-hour paper in one period.
- To avoid conversion errors tests should be set for the same number of marks as indicated on the mark sheet.
- DBE moderation should be planned for an earlier date to avoid having to collect files just before the examination.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Files from 10 schools in two districts (Capricorn District and Greater Sekhukhune District) were submitted for external moderation. The DBE moderated five files per school, which was a high percentage.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

- Moderation was thorough. Tasks were re-marked and marks recalculated. The DBE moderation and that of the provincial moderators concurred.
- No copies of DBE reports were available to Umalusi and all the files had to be searched in order to identify those that had been moderated. The moderation was undertaken too late for the province to do anything about the subject.
- It was difficult to distinguish between DBE and provincial moderation.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- No comments or recommendations were made by the various moderators. Provincial moderation was merely a compliance check.

- There were only two significant differences in the marks awarded. There was also found to be consistency between the marks of the two DBE moderators. The DBE moderation appears to have been fair.

Marking of the tasks

Marking varied from school to school. The marking of Section A of the CAT was meticulous, but there were differences in the interpretation of Sections B and C.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners' performance appeared to be fair.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Internal moderation at schools had taken place. The Umalusi moderator could not distinguish between the DBE and the provincial moderation.

Areas of good practice

- Provincial moderation was done.
- Learners' tasks had been thoroughly marked and there was little evidence of marks being changed.
- Learners' and teachers' files were neatly organised.
- Two schools had been selected for provincial marking, which had been done thoroughly.
- Limpopo has handled the assessment of Life Orientation very well, and there is a clear paper trail supporting the assessment and moderation.

Areas for improvement

- Generally, learners had problems with the CAT, revealing a lack of content knowledge.
- There was evidently poor preparation for the examination.
- Learners were challenged when questions requiring higher-order cognitive skills were asked. Moreover, they struggled with the interpretation of the tasks.
- Language could have been a barrier, but learning and teaching were probably at the root of the problem.
- There was significant deviation between the June and the CAT marks.
- PET remains problematic, and there has been no significant progress in the assessment of this subject.

Recommendations

- There is a need to teach content. The perception that Life Orientation is based on general knowledge should be eradicated.
- Learners need to develop examination skills. The exemplar paper as well as the CAT should be used to guide the next group of learners on what to expect in the future.
- Educators need to attend workshops on how to set questions at various cognitive levels, and on the design and use of rubrics.
- Provinces need to develop real-life scenarios and questions should involve critical thinking, evaluation, analysis, synthesis and problem solving.
- PET is not well placed as a component of Life Orientation, and remains a negative factor. The marks were inflated and bore no resemblance to reality.
- Learners should be taught the meaning of “discuss”, “explain”, “evaluate”, “analyse”, “critique”, etc. and how to respond to questions that include these words.

LIFE SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

In other provinces five schools were selected per district, but in Limpopo only four schools per district were selected (Capricorn and Greater Sekhukhune). The reason for this is not known. The DBE moderated all eight schools, selecting files from the sample presented.

Although the DBE moderated more than 10% of the files, it was not clear which files had been moderated, and a lot of time was wasted establishing this.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation tool was not available, and reports on the moderation were not supplied.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The quality and standard could not be established because of the absence of a tool and reports. The DBE made comments on the learners' tasks, and on the tasks and marking tools in the teachers' files. Thorough moderation was conducted, and errors were picked

up that had been overlooked by previous moderation. The comments will have a positive impact if implemented.

Marking of tasks

The rubrics used were generally satisfactory, but some criteria led to unreliability. Use of rubrics within the schools themselves was usually consistent, but there was some inconsistency across various schools. Marks were generally fairly high for the practical tasks and assignments in comparison with the preliminary exams. The way rubrics were designed, however, probably inflated the marks. Another reason could be that the tasks were generally short and focused on a particular topic and skill.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of moderation in green and black ink, which indicated various levels. In some cases there was merely a signature and no evidence of re-marking.

Areas of good practice

- The attempt to standardise tasks is to be commended.
- All required tasks had been completed.
- Teachers' files were well organised and neatly presented.
- There was evidence of various levels of moderation, with evidence of reports on moderation/monitoring in the educators' files.
- The preliminary examinations were fair and valid.
- Standardised moderation templates were provided by the PED.
- Sequencing of items in files was standardised.

Areas for improvement

- Common tasks should be thoroughly scrutinised and moderated. Errors were found in the memorandum.
- Some of the criteria in rubrics were unreliable. Group dynamics should not be subjected to evaluation by rubric. Consequently, unreliable rubrics led to too high marks being awarded.
- There was no form of feedback to learners.
- Learners should be encouraged to do corrections.

Recommendations

- By including higher-order questions in homework and class activities, learners would be better prepared for the standard of work required in examinations.
- Tasks and memoranda should be moderated before being implemented.

- Moderators should clearly date and sign the tasks after moderation, and indicate their designation.
- Evidence of the practical work done, for example photographs, should be included.
- Rubrics are not the only form of assessment tool, and memoranda should also be used where possible.
- Weighting grids should be used when tests are set, which will ensure the standard of the tests.

MPUMALANGA

ACCOUNTING

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

It was difficult to find out precisely what the DBE had moderated because the officials could give Umalusi moderators no indication. There was also some confusion regarding the colour of pens used. From evidence discovered in the files that were moderated, however, it was clear that the DBE had done extensive moderation.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation instrument was not available to individual Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE IN LEARNERS' FILES

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- On the basis of what was observed it was apparent that time had been spent on the moderation process. Comments were consistent throughout.
- The standard of moderation was generally very good, and valuable comments were put in the files.
- As the moderation tool was not available comment on recommendations is not possible.

Marking of the tasks

The DBE moderators did an extensive amount of re-marking.

Overall impression of learner performance

Perusal of the mark sheets revealed very poor results. Most of the internal moderation reports throughout the year had remarked on the poor performance.

Large discrepancies were picked up in many schools between the formal and informal marks. A case study done in the Gert Sibande district included a budget question and a similar task was asked in the trials. Individual learners often did well in the case study, but then could not answer the question in the trials.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

- Moderation was basically non-existent in the schools, but monitoring had been done. However, moderation did not pick up the fact that the tasks were not at an acceptable level.

Areas of good practice

- The whole province wrote a common trial question paper.
- The standard of the June and trial examinations was satisfactory.
- Although questions had been taken from previous question papers, a good balance was maintained with assessment across the LOs and a good spread of cognitive levels.

Areas for improvement

- The control tests were of a lower standard, although they were often taken from other sources. The focus was on lower-order skills.
- No analysis grids were evident in any of the teachers' files.
- The alternative forms of assessment did not meet the criteria. The project was not a project, but an accounting task. The other two tasks were straight accounting tasks of a very low order.
- Learners scored very high marks in these lower-order forms of assessment, which were out of line with candidates' performance in the formal examinations.
- The alternative forms of assessment have not achieved their goal, which was to enable learners to be assessed in other ways besides formal accounting tests. Because of the poor structure and standard of the forms of assessment, the learners did not realise this benefit.
- Very little moderation had taken place, but that which had taken place focused on the common tasks over which the teacher has no control. The moderation should

have focused on the marking. In some cases the moderation form did not agree with the task being moderated.

- At Mchaka High School the last alternative task was not included. It appeared that it had not been done.
- In the Gert Sibande district there were massive variations in marks between formal and informal assessment. Learners achieved almost full marks in the project and case study, and almost nothing in the formal examinations.
- In some cases the marks were entered incorrectly on the mark sheets. Where scripts were moderated, marks were not adjusted.

Recommendations

- The DBE needs to think carefully about the feasibility of setting common tasks, as this takes away the responsibility and creative ability of the individual teachers. The teachers need to be forced to start setting some tasks.
- If this is to continue, it is essential that tasks should be set according to the SAG cognitive level norms. Teachers cannot be expected to take responsibility for poor performance at the end of the year if they had had no hand in setting the tasks.
- The PED should insist that grids be prepared for every task. Teachers should be taught how to apply the grids and no paper should be accepted without content and cognitive level grids in future.
- The PED needs to come on board regarding the alternative forms of assessment. This has been mentioned in previous reports and can no longer be ignored.

Conclusion

Those who were involved in setting the common examination papers had done a good job, and learners were being exposed to what was required of them.

No one attended the report-back meeting. This was because it was held at an extremely busy time of the year, as well as the long distances involved. It was agreed that a copy of the report would be emailed to Mr Buthelezi.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Learners' and teachers' files were submitted for external moderation from three districts and nine schools.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation instrument was not available to individual Umalusi moderators.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The verifier did not report on the DBE moderation.

Marking of the tasks

The marking guidelines for the mid-year examination and term tests were appropriate, and as required by the SAG document. However, the handwritten marking memoranda for Phendulani Secondary School did not have enough alternative answers and was not user-friendly. Moreover, the rubrics used for assessing assignments were poorly developed and did not provide a balanced outcome.

The marking of the examination question papers was consistent and accurate in most of the schools, but some schools did not include the trial examination question papers and memoranda in the teachers' file. In some instances the scripts were not available in the learners' files.

The teachers/markers adhered to the marking memoranda when marking controlled tests and mid-year question papers.

Overall impression of learner performance

The general performance of learners in both the controlled tests and the mid-year examination was satisfactory. However, the question papers, memoranda, scripts and mark sheets for the trial examination were not available for moderation. In most of the schools the mark sheets were incomplete, with some tasks and examinations not being recorded. Some learners scored unrealistically high marks for tasks because of the poorly designed rubrics being used.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence that some cluster/district internal moderation had been done during the second and third terms. However, the moderation instrument differed completely from the moderation reports that could be used by teachers to improve the administration of SBA. A lack of rigour was identified in terms of in-school moderation. The internal moderation reports were not informative; and it would seem that internal moderation needs to be strengthened.

Areas of good practice

- The PED have subject curriculum specialists who provide support and guidance for Agricultural Science teachers, especially those without agricultural training.
- The schools are commended for adhering to the prescribed number of SBA tasks/components.
- The provincial assessment body did well in setting common papers for term tests, June and trial examinations.
- The common provincial pacesetters and recording instruments were very helpful, especially to novice educators.
- Agricultural schools, such as Matthews Phosa, Sinethemba and Umzimcelo, can be used as resource centres.

Areas for improvement

- Common exemplars of assignments, research projects and practical tasks could be helpful to struggling schools that performed poorly in designing appropriate SBA tasks.
- Assistance is required for those schools who designed their own tasks.
- Internal moderation and monitoring of SBA tasks should be strengthened and a follow-up programme should be put in place to ensure that teachers implement the moderators' suggestions.
- The programme of assessment plan and internal moderation reports for SBA tasks should be kept in the teachers' files so as to be accessible to external moderators.
- The arrangement of teachers' and learners' files should be revised to make them more accessible.

Recommendations

- Training in setting standardised question papers and designing appropriate research tasks and projects, as well as rubrics to assess them, should be offered and ought to be very helpful to extend teachers' skills.
- Common SBA tasks should be developed as exemplars.
- Internal moderation at all levels should be strengthened and records should be made available to the external moderators.
- The process of in-school moderation of tasks, as well as before and after it is done, should be strengthened, and records kept.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts had been pre-selected by the DBE. Gert Sibande District submitted the Life Orientation teachers' and learners' files of five schools, while Bohlabele District submitted files from four schools.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation instrument was appropriate.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The province made use of common tasks. The DBE moderation was the third level of moderation carried out on these tasks and moderation was thorough, with clear feedback on each task. The comments were developmental and indicated the errors that had been made. All in all the DBE moderation was found to have been thorough.

Marking of the tasks

The common task had been re-marked and detailed feedback was provided. Although tasks were of fairly good quality, there was no variety in the forms of assessment. The content was not addressed at the required level.

The format of the June examination was not in line with the current SAG document for Life Orientation. There was also no clear evidence that PET had been implemented. The wrong rubric for a ball game was included and the results were unrealistic.

Memoranda and rubrics were unsatisfactory, as they did not reflect the cognitive demands of the questions and the rubrics were too generic and were put to incorrect use at times. A rubric for running, for example, was used for assessment of a dance.

Overall impression of learner performance

There were no comments on this aspect.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was no evidence of internal moderation, and there were no reports available. There was only a checklist to verify the presence of various documents and there was no evidence of pre-moderation of sampled tasks. Internal moderation conducted by the districts lacked rigour.

Areas of good practice

- Educators' files were arranged well.
- Common examination papers were found to be an effective tool for setting acceptable standards.

Areas for improvement

- Tasks were not pitched at the appropriate cognitive levels.
- The use of rubrics was inappropriate.
- Most HODs at schools are not subject specialists, and were not able to moderate Life Orientation tasks.

Recommendations

- Common tasks should be error-free and pitched at the appropriate level.
- Clusters and districts should conduct internal moderation at least twice a year. Moderation should include qualitative and developmental feedback.
- Tasks should contain a variety of forms of assessment, and appropriate weighting.
- Examinations set at schools should be moderated to ensure quality and rigour.
- Higher-order questions should be included in assessment at all levels.
- Moderation of scripts should not constitute mere shadow-marking.

LIFE SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Five schools from each of two districts (Gert Sibande and Bohlabela) were pre-selected. A total of 32 files out of 129 or 24,8% were moderated by the DBE. Only 10 files per school were submitted by Gert Sibande district. While no reports were available, there was clear evidence of re-marking by the DBE moderator.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation tool was fairly comprehensive. However, the tool did not make provision for feedback which is an important aspect of moderation.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

There appeared to have been a great deal of consistency in moderation. This was based on the evidence in the files of thorough re-marking. There was no evidence of any comments or other inputs, however. The moderators did identify some errors in marking, but there was no evidence of recommendations having been made.

Marking of tasks

In general the marking memorandum for the second common controlled test was satisfactory, except for one error. Rubrics for practical tasks were sometimes poorly designed and there was no inter-rater reliability. One practical task set in one of the districts did not satisfy the SAG requirements. Moreover, there was inconsistency in application across different schools. Some marks were awarded unfairly due to the unreliable rubric.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners' overall performance was negatively influenced by poorly designed rubrics. There were also conversion errors.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of various levels of moderation, but only in the form of a signature. There was no evidence of re-marking. The lack of any form of feedback was disheartening.

Areas of good practice

The use of common tasks constituted good practice.

Areas of concern

- The tasks and tests were not thoroughly moderated.
- The nature and requirements of the various practical tasks were not fully understood by teachers.
- There were errors in the marking memorandum of the test.

- A weighting grid was not used when setting tests and tasks.
- There was a lack of feedback to teachers and learners.

Recommendations

- The importance of thorough pre-moderation of tests and tasks cannot be over-emphasised.
- The memorandum for common tests/tasks should be discussed at a memo discussion before marking proceeds.
- It is imperative that weighting grids be used for the content and cognitive levels of tasks and tests.
- Clear feedback is the hallmark of competent moderation.

NORTHERN CAPE

GEOGRAPHY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

It appeared that DBE tried to moderate 10% of the sample, but they were not consistent in the tasks they moderated. This created problems for the external moderator.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

No moderation instruments were available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The DBE merely shadow-marked learners' tasks; however, they failed to pick up errors such as responses not marked.

Consistency could not be determined, as there were no comments, only signatures. No recommendations were in evidence.

Marking of the tasks

The memoranda and rubrics used appeared to be fair. Alternative answers were provided in the memoranda.

In most cases the memo was used consistently. Learners' marks were allocated by using ticks which represented marks.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners did not perform well in the examinations, and they obviously struggled with source-based questions and application, especially in higher-order questions.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of all levels of moderation, if one assumes that different pen colours represent different levels of moderation. However, this process constituted monitoring rather than moderation, which is qualitative. In some schools moderation was evident in the teachers' files, but not in the learners' files.

Areas of good practice

- Learners had completed all seven tasks.
- All learner evidence was marked by teachers.
- Assessment tasks were standardised at both district and provincial level, and learners were therefore assessed with balanced tasks.

Areas for improvement

- Constructive feedback should be given at all levels.
- It was not clear who actually did the moderation. Signatures and designations should be appended.

Recommendations

- Informal assessment could be used to prepare learners for the tasks that form part of the Programme of Assessment.
- Officials involved in the moderation of SBA at all levels need to be empowered.
- DBA moderators should give informative feedback to all stakeholders.

HISTORY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Five schools from each of the two districts were selected for external moderation, hence 10 schools. The files of only seven schools were received, however.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

No moderation instruments were available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

Without a completed instrument it was not possible to comment on the consistency of its use. The quality of the DBE moderators' inputs was therefore unknown. The quality of the feedback and recommendations in learners' files was, however, informative.

Marking of the tasks

The memoranda and rubrics used appeared to be appropriate, with the national rubric in the SAG being used. Alternative answers were provided in the memoranda.

Marking was mainly of an acceptable standard, but the marking of the research project and extended writing components was inconsistent and, in some instances, the latter were not fully marked. There was, however, some consistency in the application of marking tools.

Overall impression of learner performance

Performance ranged from fair to good. Some learners had an understanding of the content and had the associated historical and literary skills needed to express themselves.

Those who performed poorly usually had difficulty expressing themselves in English, while some simply lacked content knowledge, indicating that they had not studied enough.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of all levels of moderation, but the moderation at schools lacked rigour, especially on what was originally planned and what was formally assessed. There was evidence of moderation at cluster level. There was very little feedback, however and what there was comprised mainly a tick-box exercise.

Areas of good practice

- The portfolio system was well organised and managed and files were therefore accessible. They presented a clear picture of history teaching in the province.
- SBA activities were done on a continuous basis, and were integrated with teaching.
- Assessment tasks were standardised at both district and provincial level, and this worked well.
- The common tasks were of a good standard.

Areas for improvement

- In some schools the heritage assignment was not fully marked.
- There was still a great deal of reliance on previous examination papers.
- There was no evidence of DBE moderation, except a signature on the front page of the learners' portfolios. There seemed not to have been any engagement in any form of moderation.

Recommendations

- Cluster/district moderation should be more frequent and rigorous and should be undertaken by the subject advisor.
- The cluster leader should provide support regarding the SBA document at schools where the HOD is not a subject specialist.
- Teachers need to be oriented on the use of various forms of assessment, particularly extended writing and its assessment. They should also be trained in the development and assessment of rubrics.
- Teachers should be encouraged to set their own assessment instruments and to reuse previous question papers only as a standardisation tool.
- The DBE instrument and report should be made available to the Umalusi moderators.
- The identification of best practices is encouraged in order to support schools.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two under-performing districts were selected by the DBE, JT Gaetsewe District, and Pixley Ka Seme district, and five schools from each of the districts submitted teachers' and learners' Life Orientation files.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation instrument was appropriate.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The DBE moderation was the third level of moderation carried out on these tasks. The moderation was thorough, with clear feedback on each task. The comments were developmental and indicated the errors that had been made. The province had made use of common tasks and the DBE moderation had been thorough.

Marking of the tasks

All schools had done the same common provincial tasks, which had been re-marked, and detailed feedback was provided. Marking guidelines were clear. The format of the June examination was in line with the current SAG document for Life Orientation. There were, however, many grammatical and typing errors. There was evidence that PET had been implemented, as well as clear evidence that all schools had engaged learners in the three focus areas, fitness, games and sport, and recreation and relaxation. However, the schools interpreted the SAG individually.

Memoranda and rubrics were unsatisfactory, as they did not reflect the cognitive demands of the questions and the rubrics were too generic and were put to incorrect use at times. A rubric for running, for example, was used for a dance assessment.

Overall impression of learner performance

Teachers were quite rigid in their marking, not acknowledging valid alternatives, and this disadvantaged learners. All schools performed badly in the DBE CAT. A considerable number of learners failed, with marks ranging from 7 to 48 out of 75.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of detailed internal moderation. Although there was feedback, except in the case of PET, it was not detailed enough.

Areas of good practice

- All five assessment tasks complied with the weighting and description in the relevant policy documents.
- Meaningful feedback from the moderation was given to teachers.
- In some schools there was evidence of face moderation of PET.

Areas for improvement

Typographical and grammatical errors were found in the June paper. There was also a problem with some of the numbering which led to confusion.

There were individual schools that did not calculate marks properly or whose record-keeping was inadequate.

Recommendations

- Common tasks should be error-free and pitched at the appropriate level.
- The twinning of struggling schools with others that are performing better should be considered.
- Clusters and districts should conduct internal moderation at least twice a year, and in-school moderation should take place even more regularly. Moderation should include qualitative and developmental feedback.
- PET assessment should be developed according to the nature of the task.

LIFE SCIENCES

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts were pre-selected, JT Gaetsewe District and Pixley KaSeme District, and they submitted files from five and four schools respectively. Twenty learners' files were presented, and only those moderated by the DBE were moderated.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The moderation tool was not available, with only signatures and dates being evidence that DBE moderation had been done.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

In the absence of the instrument and reports, consistency of application could not be commented upon. There were no comments or recommendations on the learners' work.

Marking of tasks

Marking tools were generally appropriate and accurate. There were some instances where responses were marked right, although they did not appear in the memorandum. Tools were generally used appropriately and consistently and mark allocation was fair.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners' performance was average to poor. Answering essay questions was a challenge and they also battled with hypothesis testing.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence of moderation at various levels. Moderation instruments for school, cluster and district level moderation were available in the files.

Areas of good practice

- All the required tasks had been done.
- The assessment tasks were of an acceptable standard.
- Marking was fairly accurate and according to the assessment tools.
- Internal moderation was being done.
- Marks had been converted and mark sheets completed.

Areas for improvement

- The moderation instrument at school level was geared mainly for monitoring, and needed to include qualitative aspects.
- Feedback had not been given at any level.

Recommendations

Answers that have been marked right must be added to the marking tool.

Standardisation in the colour of pens used for moderation would be of great help.

NORTH WEST

ACCOUNTING

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts, Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompai and Dr Kenneth Kaunda, were selected by the DBE for moderation. Five schools per district were chosen, and 20 learners' files and teachers' files were sent from each school. This requirement was adhered to except in the case of Lodirile Tswaing High School, which submitted three out of a possible 14 learners' files. An additional school, Rethusegile Secondary from Bojanala District, was also moderated by the DBE SBA team and verified by the Umalusi verifier.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

DBE moderation instruments were not available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

Consistency in the application of the moderation tool could not be verified as the tool was not supplied to Umalusi verifiers.

No comments made by the DBE SBA moderators could be found in the moderated sample. No moderation recommendations could be found in either learners' portfolios or teachers' files.

Marking of the tasks

- The marking tools used in two districts were found to be unacceptable, as the rubric used to assess the case study contained vague criteria that were very subjective. The awarding of method marks was generally not done correctly.

- The marking tools were used fairly consistently, although the allocation of method marks and the inclusion of foreign items emerged as a challenge for most educators.
- The marking was found to be fair in some schools and poor in others due to inconsistent awarding of method marks and the penalising of learners for including foreign items.

Overall impression of learner performance

Generally, the performance of learners was poor. Learners experienced difficulties answering core subject sections such as ratios and analysis and cash flow statements and theory questions in general also posed problems.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Internal moderation at all levels was found at most schools, with sufficient evidence of such in educators' files. However, the quality of the moderation was very low, and any remarks were vague. Evidence of pre-moderation of tasks could not be found.

Areas of good practice

- The requirements for external moderation were adhered to in most cases.
- There was evidence of cluster, district and provincial moderation in educators' files at most schools.
- Learners' marks were correctly converted and transferred to mark sheets in most cases.
- Common tests, tasks and examinations were provided across the districts.

Areas for improvement

- The case study provided to learners in two districts was irrelevant for Accounting as a subject and not linked directly to the assessment standards for the subject.
- Some of the marking in the preparatory examination was found to be wrong. See Q1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 at Lephatsimile High School.
- At some schools the teachers were too generous with theory marks (see Reabona Secondary School) and learners were not penalised for the inclusion of foreign items.
- The rubric for assessing the case study was inappropriate.
- School-based moderation was not done at several schools. There was also no evidence of pre-moderation of tasks, or of learners' work.
- Learners experienced difficulties with major portions of the work.
- There was a big gap between learners' performance in tasks set at the school, and common tests and examinations. This was an indication that the school-set tasks did not satisfy the SAG norms for cognitive levels.
- There appeared to be some dishonesty in the preparatory examinations at Leruntse-Lesedi Secondary School, where three learners presented answers to questions that

were identical to the marking memorandum. A similar situation was found at Rethuseng Secondary School in the first control test.

- Some educators' work schedules had not been updated to 2012.
- Method marks were not awarded where required.
- Learners' marks were found to be rounded off and not recorded to one decimal point as required. Case study marks were also incorrectly entered at some schools.
- There was no evidence of feedback to learners in their portfolios.
- Teachers' files contain too much unnecessary material.

Recommendations

- All assessment tasks should be relevant to the subject and address the LOs and ASs. They should be aimed at preparing learners for their final examinations.
- Learners should be penalised for including foreign items in their answers in order to prepare them for the final examinations.
- Rubrics should be clear and easy to use. Accordingly, a second marker should be able to arrive at more or less the same mark.
- Moderation at school level is very important and it should be encouraged in order to correct weaknesses and errors in tasks before they are given to learners. Evidence should be available in the teachers' files.
- Schools should consider remedial work on core sections of the work with which learners are having difficulty.
- Examinations and tests should be treated with the same confidentiality as final examinations to discourage dishonesty.
- Work schedules should be updated and reformulated every year.
- Teachers should learn how to award method marks, as these are essential.
- Teachers should attend workshops on the conversion of marks.
- Learners should be provided with feedback on their work.
- Teachers should be encouraged to arrange their files neatly and professionally with only the required documentation inside.

GEOGRAPHY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

The files were submitted as required, and 10% of them were moderated by the DBE moderator.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE instrument was appropriate and provided moderators with subheadings that allowed for interaction with the learners' files. The instrument covered issues of compliance with policy and quality.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

- Learners' tasks had been re-marked thoroughly and some mistakes in marking picked up. Totals had been changed in the learners' files, but not on the mark sheets.
- There was consistency in the use of the instrument in all the files that were moderated.
- Although there were no comments, their inputs had been effective in correcting the marking of the teachers, as the teachers had struggled to understand the memo and had made many mistakes.
- Written recommendations were not available, but the DBE moderators had apparently given a brief report on their last day.

Marking of the tasks

The memorandum provided alternative answers, and a range of calculations were provided for map work. Most of the memos were from previous years' question papers. There was one problem with a memo not being in alignment with the question paper, and incorrect conversion units had been used.

The memo had not been being used consistently in the schools. This might be due to a lack of knowledge on the part of the educators. Fairness was not evident in all schools, as in some cases learners were awarded marks they did not deserve, while in others learners were deprived of marks because the teacher did not fully understand the content.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners' performance varied from school to school and from task to task. Generally, learners did not do well in map-work calculations, or in source-based questions. At Thabasikwa learners generally showed better understanding.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

If one assumes that each pen colour represents a level of moderation, there was evidence of moderation at all levels. However, the process was one of monitoring, rather than moderation. At some schools moderation was evident in the teachers' files, but not in the learners'.

Areas of good practice

- Learners had completed all seven tasks.
- There was evidence of internal moderation at all levels.
- In Paper 2 and the map-work test, schools used different maps instead of one map throughout.
- Evidence of informal assessment and intervention strategies was found in some schools.

Areas for improvement

- Given the importance of SBA, constructive feedback should be given at all levels.
- Previous question papers can be used for informal assessment in order to prepare learners adequately for the examinations.
- The quality of marking of learners' tasks needs to be improved.
- Moderators should sign where they have moderated, and indicate their designation.

Recommendations

- The province needs to train educators in the development of quality tasks.
- Teachers should be discouraged from cutting and pasting out of previous question papers.
- There should be a focus on content training to empower teachers.
- Pre-moderation of tasks will ensure their fairness and reliability.
- Officials involved in moderation should give informative feedback to learners.
- Learners should be motivated to prepare themselves for the formal assessment in order to achieve good marks.
- The DBE's report should be made available to Umalusi moderators.

HISTORY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Two districts were invited for moderation, with four schools from one and five schools from the other submitting files. One teacher's file and three learners' files from each school were moderated. One school from Bojanala District was also included. Of these, six schools' files had been moderated by the DBE. The DBE moderated the teacher's file and three to five learners' files from each of the six schools. There was no way in which the DBE moderation could be identified, except from the date and the signature.

Quality of the DBE moderation instruments

The instrument encompassed all aspects of moderation. However, no completed instrument was available during the Umalusi moderation session.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE actual moderation of learners' evidence

At some schools the DBE moderators re-marked some of the evidence, while at the other schools files were only checked for compliance with policy. Very few comments were found, and these focused mainly on criteria descriptors from the rubric. No recommendations by the DBE moderator were found in the moderated sample.

Marking of the tasks

No discrepancies were found in the marking with rubrics. Different heritage assignments were set at each school. However, the rubrics for marking these assignments were not complete, as some important criteria to be assessed had been left out. The rubric for the analytical essay was satisfactorily applied in most cases. A number of teachers did not use the holistic rubric in the essays where the learners had to use evidence from the sources to explain and develop their line of argument, while in other schools the wrong rubric was used, and this reflected badly on the level of moderation. The allocation of marks was generally acceptable, although learners should be penalised for rewriting sources.

Overall impression of learner performance

Learners coped with the lower-order questions, but struggled with the higher-order ones. The ability to express themselves in their second/third language was a major challenge for learners and they needed assistance with the structuring of sentences and paragraphs.

Although learners could write down information, they struggled to take a stance and to defend or criticise it.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

A well-developed moderation system was in place and moderation reports were available in the files. However, there was little evidence that tasks had been quality assured at schools before being set. Script moderation at all levels was not rigorous enough, and marks were often not adapted. This brought into question the credibility and purpose of the moderation process.

Areas of good practice

- The SBA process was managed appropriately.
- A provincial moderation process was in place at various levels.
- The files were fairly complete and presented a picture of the status of the SBA in History in the province.
- SBA had been integrated into teaching and learning.
- The provincial trial examination papers were well developed.

Areas for improvement

- The extensive use of previous question papers is a concern.
- There is little evidence of quality assurance of tasks.
- The process of script moderation was not rigorous enough.
- All tasks should be labelled and include the relevant instructions.
- No remarks by teachers were found in the learners' files.
- Calculations of marks were often incorrect.
- The use of the SAG norms for cognitive levels should be adhered to.
- Guidance on the nature of the heritage assignment as a provincial initiative needs attention.

Recommendations

- The appropriate quality of written tasks is a necessity.
- The moderation of scripts at school level should be rigorous.
- The use of a uniform provincial recording sheet developed on Microsoft Office Excel should be investigated.
- Teachers need to be guided in the setting of the heritage assignment according to a single key question and the application of an appropriate rubric to assess these assignments. This also entails guidance on the proper selection of authentic and personal sources to address the formulated key question.
- The identification of best practices is encouraged to support schools.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Three districts were pre-selected. Four schools were selected from Dr Kenneth Kaunda District, five from Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati, and one from Bojanala District. It was not possible to determine precisely how many files had been moderated by the DBE as the files were scattered and it was too laborious to go through the heaps of files in search of moderated files.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE tool was comprehensive and addressed various moderation criteria. Generally the DBE had moderated Task 1 and verified PE marks. In a limited number of files the examination task had also been moderated. No reports or comments had been left by the DBE regarding the moderation process. Different coloured pens had been used, but the level of moderation was not indicated so it was very confusing. The tool appeared to have been applied consistently.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

It was not clear what the DBE moderators' brief was. The rigour and quality of moderation was not equal in all districts and in some instances marks had been reduced drastically, by 15, 17 and 23 marks in three cases. This was due to very lenient marking in Sections B and C. No feedback was given in the learners' files. Both DBE moderators had reduced marks.

Marking of the tasks

The marking tool had been standardised at the national memo discussion. It was not, however, strictly adhered to in Sections B and C and markers had awarded full marks for answers that were only partly correct.

Overall impression of learner performance

There were various levels of interpretation of the task. The requirements of the questions were largely ignored. There seemed to have been an expectation that questions would

be based on general knowledge and not on content knowledge. Learners lacked critical thinking skills.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

At school level moderation was scarce, though there was some evidence of cluster and provincial moderation. Few files were subjected to various levels of moderation.

Areas of good practice

- Files were neatly organised.
- At three schools files had been subjected to various levels of moderation.
- There was evidence of support at district level.
- The moderated learners' marks appeared to be stabilising, and did not reveal the extreme performances of the past.

Areas for improvement

- There were irregular patterns of moderation.
- It was difficult to identify moderated scripts.
- There was a lack of school-level moderation. Moderation tools were included, but there was no physical evidence of moderation in learners' files.
- PE marks were still at unacceptable levels.
- Marking was inadequate, particularly where rubrics were used.
- It was clear that the teaching of Life Orientation had been superficial.

Recommendations

The question has to be asked whether the marks for SBA are a reliable reflection of how learners performed if the marks for the moderated files were reduced so drastically.

- The teachers need urgent intervention with regard to marking and moderation.
- Learners' files must be exposed to different levels of moderation.
- Clear marking and moderation guidelines need to be developed by the DBE and mediated by provinces.
- It would be helpful to have the DBE-moderated files kept at the top of the bundle to facilitate the Umalusi moderators' task.
- School-level moderation must be tightened up.
- PE marks must be realistic and constitute a true and honest reflection of the learners' efforts.
- Training in quality marking and moderation is required.
- Teachers must be trained in how to approach the teaching of Life Orientation.

GEOGRAPHY

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

The Umalusi/DBE requirements were met, that is, the files of 10 schools, five each from each of two districts, Metropolitan North and Metropolitan South, were provided.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

A copy of the DBE moderation instrument was not available, so no comment could be made on its quality.

VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

In each batch of files from schools there was evidence of DBE moderation. Without access to the instrument, however, it was not possible to express an opinion on the quality and standard. Some marks had been adjusted, but no comments or recommendations were found.

Marking of the tasks

The memorandum was neatly typed, accurate and user-friendly. Marking was consistent with the marking tool, the memorandum was used accurately and effectively, and the mark allocations were fair.

Overall impression of learner performance

Many learners produced below average work in spite of thorough planning and structures being in place.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

There was evidence that learners' work had been moderated at school and district level. Although the quality of internal moderation was acceptable, there was no evidence of feedback to learners. However, detailed feedback to teachers, HODs and principals was most helpful.

Areas of good practice

- Internal moderation was done at all levels, using appropriate moderation tools in each case.
- Feedback to educators was precise and relevant.
- Subject advisors had implemented innovative interventions.
- Individual schools had come up with good ideas for research and surveys.
- Learners had been given structure and guidance.
- There was a control page that gave a good idea of DBE moderation.
- Moderation in this province/subject was well organised.

Areas for improvement

- There was no feedback to learners.
- Learners need to improve study skills for a formal exam.
- Theoretical knowledge needs to be understood and retained.
- Application needs to be practised.
- Map-work techniques and application of theory require drilling and practice.
- Analysis of exam performance for each individual would allow them to identify weaknesses and work on them.
- Educators should respond to moderation inputs and show progress in their curriculum delivery.

Recommendations

- Learners need to improve study skills for a formal examination. Theoretical knowledge must be understood and retained.
- The current actual moderation tool used by the DBE should be made available.
- Educators need to take note of the details of the reports and comply with instructions.
- The practical tasks should continue to deal with challenges like the application of theory, all calculations and GIS.

LIFE ORIENTATION

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

The requirements were complied with, that is, five schools were drawn from each of two districts.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The instrument was appropriate. It addressed a number of aspects that are critical for moderation, including policy, content coverage, cognitive skills, assessed quality of tasks, language and bias, validity of tasks, technical criteria, usefulness of marking guidelines and overall impression of tasks.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

DBE moderation comprised the second level of task moderation and was found to have been done thoroughly. Clear comments were provided for each task and these comments were developmental and indicative of what errors had been made.

Marking of the tasks

- The layout of the paper for Task 1 was not learner-friendly. Although the task had been approved, there was no evidence of moderation. Instructions to learners were not clearly specified and were ambiguous. The task did not address the content at the required level.
- The second task was indicated as a research task. However, the learners' performance indicated that they had not understood the task.
- The format of the June paper was not in line with the current SAG document for Life Orientation. Learners were awarded full marks for writing incomplete answers.
- The marking tool (memorandum) did not always reflect the cognitive ability demands of the question and the rubrics seemed too generic at times. PET generally reflected 100% attendance for all learners, implying that none of the learners had been absent from school.

Overall impression of learner performance

Not commented on.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

Moderation, in particular school moderation, remained a major challenge. There was no evidence of pre-moderation in almost all sampled tasks. No reports were available.

Areas of good practice

- Teachers' files were well-arranged.
- There is a good support structure in the province, but there are still many challenges to address.

Areas for improvement

- At Saphumelela and Rosendal secondary schools most learners obtained high marks for PET, but no rubric was included to indicate how marks were rewarded. Marks for PET were calculated incorrectly.
- At Intseben Ziswano and Phandulwazi, the performance of learners in terms of the tasks indicated that they did not understand the content.
- All schools performed poorly in the DBE CAT.

Recommendations

- When designing a district task the instruction must be free from ambiguity and the marking tools must be specific and comprehensive.
- When designing a task out of 75 (especially Tasks 1 and 2), it is important to ensure that there is a variety of forms of assessment, that the task is in accordance with Grade 12 level, that the weighting of the questions is appropriate, that the integration of assessment standards is appropriate, and that the assessment tool is reliable.
- Assessment tools should be developed according to the nature of the tasks and should be comprehensive in order to enable fair and accurate marking. Such tools should be quality assured at cluster, district or provincial level, depending on where they were set. The use of generic marking tools must be discouraged as they do not address the nature of a task.
- Higher-order questions should be included in all informal tasks/activities in order to prepare learners for formal assessment where these questions carry a 30% weighting of the total mark allocation.
- It is recommended that the district keep up the good practice of setting a common task as an example for teachers who still struggle with setting tasks and assessment tools of an appropriate standard.

- The PET task assessment tool should be improved by giving clear descriptions for the different levels and indicating the number of repetitions required for each activity in Task 2.
- Post-moderation of tasks by means of re-marking should be addressed to ensure that tasks are properly re-marked, and not just shadow-marked, as the latter does not contribute to the quality of the moderation process.
- As all the tasks are common tasks, memorandum discussions at all levels before the marking of tasks would enhance the quality of marking across the province.

MATHEMATICS

PART 1: FINDINGS WITH REGARD TO THE MODERATED SAMPLE

Size of the moderated sample

Each school from the two pre-selected districts, Metropole South and Metropole North, submitted between five and 20 files for moderation.

Quality of DBE moderation instruments

The DBE moderation instrument was not available.

PART 2: VERIFICATION OF EVIDENCE OF LEARNERS

MODERATED TASKS

Quality and standard of the DBE moderation as evidenced in learners' files

The DBE tool was not available so consistency in its use could not be determined. No comments were visible in the files.

Marking of the tasks

The learners' files of one of the schools did not contain the trial examination answer scripts.

The common task memorandum did not provide sufficient alternative answers and investigation tasks were generally not suitable, although the assessment tasks were mostly appropriate. Educators generally applied the marking tools appropriately and consistently.

Overall impression of learner performance

The external moderator did not comment on this aspect.

Internal moderation at school, cluster and district levels

The recording and reporting of internal moderation at the different levels of internal moderation were satisfactory, but dates had mostly not been indicated.

Areas of good practice

- The system of district moderation used in one district was effective.
- The SBA tool provided by one district was appropriate.

Areas for improvement

- The cognitive levels of assessed tasks were not indicated. There were few Level 4 questions.
- The late scheduling of provincial moderation was a problem.
- The two districts appeared to be working independently.
- Educators appeared not to understand the requirements of investigation tasks.

Recommendations

- More attention needs to be given to improving the assessment tasks, and to implementing a system of moderation before the tasks are set.
- A system of ongoing provincial moderation should be put in place.

ADDENDUM 3

APPROVAL OF FINAL MEMORANDA: MEMORANDUM DISCUSSION MEETINGS

(To be read in conjunction with chapter 3 of the main report).

3.1 PROCESS, PROCEDURES AND ATTENDANCE

Subject	Findings
Accounting	Innovative diagnostic methods were being put in place by the DBE to ensure that the teaching and assessment of the subject in the PEDs were improved. The pre-memo discussion meeting was very valuable. Two dummy scripts were prepared for practice marking which the delegates could take back to the provinces with them.
Afrikaans HL P2	The selection of scripts for practice marking was inappropriate.
Agricultural Management Practices	The Eastern Cape did not attend the discussion. This was not the first time, and would seriously compromise the quality of marking.
Agricultural Sciences P2	Pre-marking was done.
Agricultural Technology	Only the Free State and KZN had received scripts to pre-mark. The paper was written on Friday and the memo discussion was held on Monday; hence, there was no time to access scripts. Limpopo and Eastern Cape did not attend and this might seriously compromise the quality of their marking.
Business Studies	The start was delayed because the DBE team only arrived in the afternoon. A pre-memo discussion had been held the previous day.
Civil Technology	Not all chief markers could mark a sample due to the short period of time between the examination and the memo discussion.
Computer Applications Technology P1	Three internal moderators did not mark scripts – Gauteng, KZN and Limpopo. The rest marked a total of 70 scripts. Some chief markers marked as few as five scripts.
Computer Applications Technology P2	The time between writing the examination and the memo discussion was too short, and it was difficult to get hold of scripts in time.
Consumer Studies	The short period of time between writing the examination and the memo discussion was a challenge.
Dance Studies	The writing of the examination and the memo discussion were too close together to allow for any pre-marking. The discussion was late in starting because all delegates had not been informed of the venue. Not all chief markers attended.

Subject	Findings
Dramatic Arts	Eastern Cape, Limpopo and Northern Cape did not attend the memo discussion.
Electrical Technology	Training of chief markers was included in the programme. Holding the memo discussion the day after the subject had been written compromised the requirement that pre-marking be done. Only two chief markers managed to do any pre-marking. There was little possibility of preparing for the discussion.
English FAL P1	Mpumalanga did not hand in a provincial report.
English FAL P3	Practice marking was done.
English HL P3	The internal moderator sent apologies as he was involved in the memo discussions for EFAL. The fact that scripts for pre-marking were received so late seriously compromised the discussions.
English SAL P1 & P2	The provinces were not represented. No pre-marking had been done.
Geography P2	The use of the Rausch model analysis instrument has been introduced to analyse results.
Hospitality Studies	Four provincial delegates had managed to pre-mark scripts.
Information Technology P1	There was consensus that the practical examination was essential. Eastern Cape representatives did not attend. More time was needed for pre-marking between the writing of the exam and the memo discussion.
IsiNdebele FAL P1	Only the chief marker had marked scripts.
IsiNdebele FAL P2	There were no representatives from different provinces, but the examination panel attended.
IsiNdebele HL P1	In the practice marking session it became clear that the chief marker from Limpopo had not recorded or transferred the marks to the cover of the script correctly.
IsiNdebele HL P2	The chief marker from Mpumalanga had recorded and transferred the marks to the cover of the script correctly. Limpopo representatives could not mark any scripts because there was no memorandum available.
IsiNdebele SAL P2	The discussion was not attended by a representative of the province in which the paper had been written.
IsiXhosa FAL P1	Only chief markers attended
IsiXhosa HL P1	Seven PEDs were represented.
IsiXhosa HL P2	Eight provincial representatives had pre-marked scripts.
IsiZulu HL P2	The Free State representative had not received a memorandum so that province's contribution to the report back could not be accepted. Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Free State did not submit written reports. This was a shortcoming.
IsiZulu HL P3	Six provincial delegates attended the discussion.
Life Sciences P1 V1	A pre-discussion meeting was held. Training of chief markers was also done.

Subject	Findings
Life Sciences P2 V1	A pre-discussion meeting was held. Training of chief markers was also done. Pre-marking was not efficient. Some scripts were received from one school only, others not at all.
Life Sciences P1 & P2 V2	The signed-off version of the question papers and memoranda were not available at the venue. Some delegates received their scripts too late to do any pre-marking.
Mathematics P1	At most six out of 18 delegates participated in discussions. The rest were passive observers.
Mathematics P2	
Mathematics P3	
Mechanical Technology	The Eastern Cape representatives did not attend. Reports were handed in and scripts were marked by all except the Eastern Cape.
Music P1 & P2	Limpopo and Eastern Cape representatives did not attend the memo discussions, and did not send apologies.
Physical Sciences P1 & P2	All delegates had done some pre-marking, but there was no evidence that they had attempted to answer the questions or draw up a memorandum.
Religion Studies P1 & P2	Although there were five days between writing and the memo discussion, chief markers had not yet received scripts for pre-marking.
Sepedi FAL P1, P2 & P3	Two provinces attended, i.e. Gauteng and Limpopo. It is not known whether Mpumalanga should still be attending. PEDs do not give their full cooperation regarding the availability of scripts for pre-marking. Gauteng had not received the 2012 circular containing the marking guidelines.
Sepedi HL P1, P2 & P3	Circular E13 of 2011 containing marking guidelines had not been received in Gauteng. Mpumalanga attended the HL discussions.
Sepedi SAL P1 & P2	Limpopo had no candidates.
Sesotho FAL P1	The internal moderator had to be excused as he was involved in the SAL memo discussions. The chief marker chaired the meeting.
Sesotho HL P1	The DBE internal moderator did not attend due to ill health. There were no representatives from Northern Cape or Limpopo.
Setswana FAL P1	Marked scripts were presented by Gauteng, but there was nothing from North West.
Setswana FAL P2	The Gauteng representative could not attend due to clashes with HL. No scripts were available, but North West made an input.
Setswana FAL P3	No scripts were available, as the time between writing and the discussion was too short.
Setswana HL P1	One province, Western Cape, did not attend, as usual. Only the internal moderator from Gauteng attended. There was an emphasis on maintaining the standard of Setswana HL.
Setswana HL P2	Northern Cape, North West and Limpopo did not send representatives, but did send apologies.

Subject	Findings
	Western Cape, as usual, did not attend. Learners used informal language, the spoken variant, in their writing.
Setswana HL P3	Four provinces sent only one representative each. This was said to be due to budgetary constraints. Not all of the representatives managed to mark scripts.
Setswana SAL P2	No scripts were available, but North West made an input.
Siswati FAL P2	Two/three discussions took place simultaneously so it was impossible to concentrate on one.
Siswati FAL P3	
Siswati HL P1	
Siswati HL P2	
Siswati HL P3	
Siswati SAL P1	
Siswati SAL P2	
Tshivenda FAL P1	
Tshivenda FAL P2 Tshivenda FAL P3	The pre-memo discussion meeting did not take place as the panel members arrived late. No scripts were received for pre-marking
Xitsonga FAL P1, P2 & P3	None of the representatives attended. The panel discussed the papers. The same markers who marked HL also marked FAL.
Xitsonga HL P1, P2 & P3	Mpumalanga did not attend the HL discussions.
Xitsonga SAL P1 & P2	None of the representatives attended. The panel discussed the papers.

3.2 QUALITATIVE ISSUES

Subject	Findings
Accounting	Most changes had to do with clarification for the benefit of markers. The cognitive levels were not changed. The changes clarified the memorandum and made it more user-friendly. All changes were motivated and approved.
Afrikaans FAL P1	All changes were motivated and approved. The changes had no effect on the cognitive level of the paper.
Afrikaans FAL P2	There were many changes and additions. The changes were mostly intended to make the memorandum simpler for markers to use. There was no change in cognitive level.
Afrikaans FAL P3	There were no fixed answers for this paper. The marking guideline and the prescribed rubrics were signed off and used. All changes were motivated and approved.

Subject	Findings
	The changes had no effect on the cognitive level of the paper.
Afrikaans HL P1	<p>There was a very long list of changes.</p> <p>Most of them made provision for additional alternatives.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The additions or changes had no effect on the cognitive levels of the questions.</p>
Afrikaans HL P2	<p>A long list of additions was provided.</p> <p>All additions were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected.</p>
Afrikaans HL P3	<p>There were no changes.</p> <p>It was emphasised that the pictures were only visual stimuli and candidates did not have to write about the pictures.</p>
Afrikaans SAL P1	<p>There were several changes.</p> <p>Most of these made provision for additional alternative answers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes had no effect on the cognitive levels.</p>
Afrikaans SAL P2	<p>Very few changes were made.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>There was no change in the cognitive level of the paper.</p>
Agricultural Management Practices	<p>Changes were limited to the correctness of the content and the proper use of agricultural sciences language. Proposals from provinces were taken into account.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes had no effect on the cognitive level of the paper.</p>
Agricultural Sciences P1	<p>Changes were mainly limited to the correctness of the subject content and the proper use of the agricultural sciences language.</p> <p>All motivations from provinces were taken into account in reaching agreement.</p> <p>Correctness of the subject content was not compromised by the decisions.</p> <p>All changes and additions were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels of questions were not affected.</p>
Agricultural Sciences P2	<p>Many changes were noted, but they were mostly additions.</p> <p>There were some corrections of the memorandum.</p> <p>The changes were all motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive level of the paper was not influenced.</p> <p>The memorandum was strengthened.</p>
Agricultural Technology	<p>The changes were mainly limited to the correctness of the subject content and the proper use of the subject language.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved, and captured in detail.</p> <p>Changes and additions strengthened the quality of the memorandum and reduced the risk of disadvantaging candidates.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected.</p>
Business Studies	<p>There were quite a few additions. This was mainly due to different textbooks being used in different provinces.</p>

Subject	Findings
	<p>All changes/additions were motivated and approved.</p> <p>Problems were caused by incorrect translations into Afrikaans, which lowered the cognitive levels.</p>
Civil Technology	<p>There were no changes, only the addition of alternative answers.</p> <p>All additions were motivated and approved.</p> <p>Cognitive levels were not affected.</p>
Computer Applications Technology P1	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>Additions were made to accommodate alternative interpretations.</p>
Computer Applications Technology P2	<p>Additional points of clarification for markers were included.</p> <p>Overall the changes did not make much difference to the cognitive levels.</p> <p>The changes enhanced the quality of the memorandum.</p>
Consumer Studies	<p>The focus was on the need not to disadvantage any candidates.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected.</p>
Dance Studies	<p>A few changes were made. Some were additional alternatives, while others related to a slight change in mark distribution.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes had no effect on the cognitive levels of the question paper.</p>
Design	<p>There were many changes, but most of them were alternative answers that were added.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive level of the paper as a whole was not affected.</p>
Dramatic Arts	<p>There were few changes, but these served to make provision for alternative and original answers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not changed, but candidates were given greater opportunities to display their cognitive skills.</p>
Electrical Technology	<p>No changes were made to the content of the memorandum; however, a number of notes were added for the markers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not really affected.</p>
Engineering Graphics & Design P1	<p>The changes mainly comprised additions.</p> <p>Learners were given the benefit of alternative answers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>No changes were made to the cognitive levels of the questions.</p>
Engineering Graphics & Design P2	<p>The changes mainly comprised additions.</p> <p>Learners were given the benefit of alternative answers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>No changes were made to the cognitive levels of the questions.</p>
English FAL P1	<p>Synonyms to answers were added.</p> <p>One quotation in the summary was divided into two.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
English FAL P3	<p>No changes were made.</p>

Subject	Findings
English HL P1 & 2	<p>The comprehension section had been perceived as difficult and some learners did not finish it.</p> <p>It was suggested that centres should not engage in "whole-paper" marking as this could disadvantage candidates.</p> <p>The changes that were accepted were mainly alternative answers which enhanced the memorandum.</p> <p>There was a warning against leniency. The memorandum had to be adhered to.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
English HL P3	<p>Changes and additions were made in order to clarify the memorandum and to make provision for alternative interpretations.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
English SAL P1 & P2	<p>No changes were made.</p>
Geography P1	<p>Some diagrams were equally clear in all provinces.</p> <p>Alternative responses were added.</p> <p>All additions were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected.</p> <p>The final effect of the discussion was to enhance the memorandum.</p>
Geography P2	<p>All additions were motivated and approved.</p> <p>Additions were made to accommodate alternative answers.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected.</p>
History P1 & P2	<p>The amendments suggested in the discussions were debated and adopted or discarded through general consensus.</p> <p>The accommodation of changes and additions to the marking guidelines It was a fully collaborative process to.</p> <p>Various changes were made to the marking guidelines and included in the final marking guideline.</p> <p>The purpose of all the adaptations was to streamline the marking guidelines as well as to make sure that no candidate was advantaged or disadvantaged.</p> <p>The changes and additions made to the marking guidelines were necessary to accommodate all possible responses from the candidates.</p> <p>The changes did not affect the distribution of the cognitive levels. The changes/additions all had to do with alternative relevant responses to the same question.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
Hospitality Studies	<p>Three minor changes were made, two of which were additional alternatives.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not changed.</p> <p>The Afrikaans translation was slightly different and that compromised the answers to a few of the questions. A decision was taken to accommodate them.</p>
Information Technology P1	<p>Changes were made to the memorandum, but only to clarify the interpretation of the memo.</p>
Information Technology P2	<p>Additional alternatives were added.</p>

Subject	Findings
	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The cognitive levels of the question paper were not affected.</p>
IsiNdebele FAL P1	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>Additions were made to accommodate alternative interpretations.</p> <p>Provision was made to accommodate one ambiguous question.</p> <p>The effect of this was to the advantage of the candidates.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p>
IsiNdebele FAL P2	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The additions consisted of additional alternatives only.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact was to the advantage of the candidates.</p>
IsiNdebele FAL P3	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes only served to improve the memorandum.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact of the changes was to the advantage of the candidates.</p>
IsiNdebele HL P1	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The additions were in terms of additional alternatives only.</p> <p>The changes served to improve the memorandum.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact of the changes was to the advantage of the candidates.</p>
IsiNdebele HL P2	<p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>There were some refinements which would be to the candidates' advantage.</p> <p>Some alternative responses were added.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact of the changes was to the advantage of the candidates.</p>
IsiNdebele HL P3	<p>The changes served to refine the marking.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact of the changes was to the advantage of the candidates.</p>
IsiNdebele SAL P1	<p>The changes served to refine the marking.</p> <p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact of the changes was to the advantage of the candidates</p>
IsiNdebele SAL P2	<p>The cognitive levels were not affected, but the memorandum was improved.</p> <p>The impact of the changes was to the advantage of the candidates</p>
IsiXhosa FAL P1	<p>Only alternative answers were added.</p> <p>Learners responded to questions at various cognitive levels.</p>

Subject	Findings
IsiXhosa FAL P2	Only alternative answers were added and one correction. The additions would facilitate marking.
IsiXhosa FAL P3	No changes were made.
IsiXhosa HL P1	Only alternatives were added. All changes were motivated and approved. Cognitive levels were not affected.
IsiXhosa HL P2	Alternative answers were added. All changes were motivated and approved. Learners responded to questions on various cognitive levels.
IsiXhosa HL P3	Alternative answers were added to the advantage of learners. All changes were motivated and approved. Changes had no effect on cognitive levels.
IsiXhosa SAL P1	Alternative answers had to be added. Some errors on the memorandum were corrected. Some changes were made. These changes were intended to facilitate marking. Learners would be able to answer at different cognitive levels. All changes were motivated and approved.
IsiXhosa SAL P2	There were no changes.
IsiZulu FAL P1	Some changes were made, an error was corrected in the memorandum, and a few additional alternative answers were added. The changes were all motivated and approved. The changes did not affect the cognitive level of the paper.
IsiZulu HL P1	Most of the changes were in the form of the addition of alternative answers Some clarification was needed for markers. The memorandum was improved. Cognitive levels were not affected. All changes were motivated and approved.
IsiZulu HL P2	No changes were made, but there were some additions. The purpose was to clarify the memorandum for the benefit of markers. All additions were motivated and approved. They did not affect the cognitive level of the paper.
IsiZulu HL P3	Most learners avoided answering the topics linked to pictures. Some small changes to marking symbols were made.
IsiZulu SAL P2	A few minor adjustments were made, mainly in the form of alternative answers. All changes were motivated and approved. The changes had no impact on the cognitive levels of the questions.
Life Sciences P1 V1	The changes made were in the form of additional alternatives. A translation error resulted in a change in the allocation of two marks. With the exception of the above, cognitive levels were not affected. All changes were motivated and approved
Life Sciences P2 V1	Most changes made were in the form of adding alternative answers. One editorial error invalidated a question and the marks for the entire

Subject	Findings
	<p>question had to be converted.</p> <p>One item had a slight impact on the cognitive level, but others not.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
Life Sciences P1 & P2 V2	<p>A fairly large number of changes were made, more in P1 than in P2. The changes were mostly in the form of adding alternative answers and refining the memorandum.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>In some open-ended questions the cognitive levels might have changed somewhat.</p>
Mathematical Literacy P1	<p>Q5.1.2 in the Afrikaans version of the paper did not include reference to the direction as in the English version. The Afrikaans memorandum was adjusted to show how this question needed to be marked so that the candidates would not be disadvantaged.</p> <p>Changes made were in the form of adding alternative answers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes did not affect the cognitive level of the question paper.</p>
Mathematical Literacy P2	<p>Eight delegates submitted alternative solutions to some of the questions and six of them were approved and included in the final moderation.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes did not affect the cognitive level of the questions.</p>
Mathematics P1 & P2	<p>There were a great many changes. Most of the changes were the addition of alternative answers and the clarification and refinement of the memorandum.</p> <p>There was no appreciable difference to the cognitive levels of the question papers.</p>
Mathematics P3	<p>Some changes were made; these were mainly in terms of clarifying the memorandum.</p> <p>In one or two cases the awarding of marks was adjusted.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes did not affect the cognitive levels of the paper.</p>
Mechanical Technology	<p>Changes were mainly in the form of adding alternative answers.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>These had little or no effect on the cognitive levels.</p>
Music P1	<p>Changes did not affect the cognitive levels.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
Music P2	<p>Changes did not affect the cognitive levels.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p>
Physical Sciences P1	<p>The changes were mostly to accommodate what learners were saying and to correct errors in the memorandum.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>The changes had no effect on the level of the questions.</p>
Physical Sciences P2	<p>The changes were mostly in the form of additions of alternatives, and refinement of the memorandum.</p> <p>All changes were motivated and approved.</p> <p>These had no effect on the cognitive level of the paper.</p>

Subject	Findings
Religion Studies P1 & P2	Changes and additions were made to accommodate different sources used in different provinces. Different religions also had to be catered for. Changes had no effect on the cognitive levels.
Sepedi FAL P1, P2 & P3	Only additional alternative answers were added, and one change was made. These had no effect on cognitive levels. All changes were motivated and approved.
Sepedi HL P1, P2 & P3	Only alternative answers were added. In P3 a numbering error in the memo was corrected. These had no effect on cognitive levels. All additions were motivated and approved.
Sepedi SAL P1	Numbering on the memo had become confused and had to be corrected. Only one other error had to be corrected.
Sepedi SAL P2	No changes were made.
Sesotho FAL P1 & P2	Several changes were made, mainly to provide additional alternatives and to clarify the memo. All changes were motivated and approved. The cognitive levels of the question paper were not affected.
Sesotho FAL P3	No changes were made.
Sesotho HL P1 Sesotho HL P2 Sesotho HL P3	Many changes were made, but most were the addition of alternative answers and to improve the memorandum. In P3 the changes were mainly to clarify the marking memorandum and rubrics for markers. The rubrics were extensively edited and the descriptors were realigned to reflect competency levels. The changes were all motivated and approved. These had no effect on the cognitive levels of the paper.
Sesotho SAL P1	The memorandum was made as inclusive as possible. All additions and/or changes were motivated and approved. These had no effect on the cognitive levels.
Sesotho SAL P2	No changes were made.
Setswana FAL P1	Only one spelling mistake was corrected.
Setswana FAL P2	Some changes were made. All changes were motivated and approved. Cognitive levels remained unchanged.
Setswana FAL P3	No changes were made.
Setswana HL P1	A few changes were made. The changes were motivated and approved.
Setswana HL P2	Five changes were made. The changes were motivated and approved. There was no change to cognitive levels as most changes were actually in the form of adding alternative answers.
Setswana HL P3	No changes were made.

Subject	Findings
Setswana SAL P1	No changes were made.
Setswana SAL P2	Only one correction had to be made in Section C. The change was motivated and approved. The cognitive levels remained unchanged.
Siswati FAL P2	A few additional alternatives were added. These did not affect the cognitive levels. The changes were motivated and approved.
Siswati FAL P3	No changes were made.
Siswati HL P1	A few corrections were made and some alternatives were added.
Siswati HL P2	These served to refine the memorandum, but did not affect the cognitive levels. All changes were motivated and approved.
Siswati HL P3	No changes were made.
Siswati SAL P1	A few additional alternatives were added. These had no effect on the cognitive levels. The changes were motivated and approved.
Siswati SAL P2	No changes were made.
Tourism	Many additions and a few changes were made. Their purpose was to simplify the memorandum and make it more user-friendly. Also, to ensure that there were alternative answers. All changes were motivated and approved. The changes did not affect the cognitive level of the question paper.
Tshivenda FAL P1	Some small changes were made in the language section. These were to intended accommodate alternative responses. The changes were motivated and approved. The changes had no effect on the cognitive levels.
Tshivenda FAL P2	A change was made to the marking rubric. Other small changes were made. The changes were motivated and approved. The changes had no effect on the cognitive levels.
Tshivenda FAL P3	Two corrections were made and two words were added. These would facilitate marking. Cognitive levels were not affected. The changes were motivated and approved.
Tshivenda HL P1	Some additions were made (alternative answers). The marking of the summary was changed, as per instruction from the DBE. The changes were motivated and approved. Cognitive levels were not compromised.
Tshivenda HL P2	Some minor changes were made. There was a typing error in one prescribed poem, and one line was different in three different publications, which might confuse candidates. It was decided how to handle this. The changes were motivated and approved.

Subject	Findings
	The cognitive levels were not affected.
Tshivenda HL P3	No changes were made.
Tshivenda SAL P1	Four minor changes were made, mostly typing errors. The changes were motivated and approved. The cognitive levels were not affected.
Tshivenda SAL P2	Only two changes were made. The changes were motivated and approved. The cognitive levels were not affected.
Xitsonga FAL P1	No changes were made. The panel members reached consensus.
Xitsonga FAL P2	A few minor changes were made after consultation among panel members and consensus had been reached. Changes were motivated and approved. The cognitive levels were not affected.
Xitsonga FAL P3	No changes were made.
Xitsonga HL P1	Seven changes were made, all alternative answers. The changes were motivated and approved. These had no effect on the cognitive levels.
Xitsonga HL P2	Only two changes were made; these were minor additions. The changes were motivated and approved. Cognitive levels were not affected.
Xitsonga HL P3	There were no changes.
Xitsonga SAL P1	
Xitsonga SAL P2	

3.3 AREAS/PROBLEMS THAT HAD NOT BEEN APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED DURING THE SETTING AND MODERATION PROCESS

Subject	Findings
Afrikaans FAL P1	More alternatives should have been added. A few questions could have been formulated more carefully to avoid different interpretations.
Afrikaans FAL P2	More care should be taken with the formulation of questions. More alternatives should be included in the memorandum. Some answers were not specific or detailed enough.
Afrikaans FAL P3	Certain aspects of the marking grid needed clarification. This was done by the internal moderator.
Afrikaans SAL P1	More alternatives should have been added. A few questions could have been formulated more carefully to avoid

Subject	Findings
	different interpretations.
Afrikaans SAL P2	Certain aspects of the marking grid needed clarification. This was done by the internal moderator.
Agricultural Sciences P1	It emerged that in some instances translation from English to Afrikaans allowed for open-ended interpretations and possibilities of awarding 'free' marks to Afrikaans candidates.
Agricultural Sciences P2	Language issues were raised by some provinces. The language used should be simplified in future.
Agricultural Technology	The unavailability of a prescribed textbook led to arguments as schools relied on different resources for teaching and learning.
Business Studies	<p>A problem was experienced in aligning the essay questions in Section C with the alternative answers.</p> <p>The impact of translation remains a problem. It had the effect of lowering the cognitive level of one of the papers.</p>
Computer Applications Technology P1	DBE needs to develop an infallible procedure for handling the different versions of question papers and data files.
Computer Applications Technology P2	<p>It should consider applying the principles of project management.</p> <p>The process of setting the paper should begin earlier in the year to avoid pressure at the end.</p> <p>Equipment has been replaced, but there are still problems setting the paper. Perhaps the network itself is at fault.</p> <p>The panel must be provided with the resources they require to produce a professional and error-free product.</p> <p>Provision has to be made for disabled learners. Blind learners could not answer 40 of the marks because the graphics could not be read.</p> <p>The memo needs to make provision for what to do when a form has become corrupted due to problems with the computer set-up at the schools.</p> <p>Candidates' CDs can sometimes not be opened because they have become corrupted. A clear directive on how to deal with this situation needs to be issued by the DBE.</p> <p>The remarks for P1 apply to this paper as well.</p>
Consumer Studies	<p>It was noted that the illustrations were poorly reproduced in the Gauteng question paper.</p> <p>Discrepancies in the question papers in the provinces:</p> <p>The Eastern Cape question paper repeated a 5-mark question instead of a 6-mark question. Q4.2.2 was repeated in place of Q4.4.1</p> <p>In the Western Cape an instruction for a question was missing. Q2.5.2 did not state: 'Motivate your choice'.</p>
Design Studies P1	With the exception of the colour-printing problem in Gauteng, there were no problems.
Electrical Technology	<p>The success of the marking session relies heavily on the level of skills of the markers. It is thus imperative that the Chief Marker and Internal Moderator play an active role in ensuring markers remain fresh and alert when marking.</p> <p>Responses in Electrical Technology require learners to write sentences that convey a proper expression of their understanding of the subject matter.</p>

Subject	Findings
	<p>This requires that the reading and language skills of teachers in the subject must be at an appropriate level, taking the responses required for free response answers into account as opposed to those of mathematically structured answers.</p> <p>This places a huge burden on the marker, who is expected to correctly interpret the intent of the learner and work out whether the response from the learner is acceptable.</p> <p>This requires that persons chosen to mark at this level should have developed the necessary language proficiency.</p>
Information Technology P1	<p>The Department needed to decide who would mark the Eastern Cape papers, as these markers did not attend the memo discussion, and this would have disadvantaged candidates.</p> <p>The examining panel needed to be enlarged. Currently three people had to set three practical papers in addition to the others.</p>
IsiZulu SAL P2	<p>The PEDs failed to send representatives for SAL papers in spite of requests. They do not take this subject seriously, and the lack of a memo discussion will affect the quality of marking.</p>
Mathematics P1 & P2	<p>Provincial representatives complained that some unusual terminology had appeared in the paper. This might have happened during editing.</p>
Physical Sciences P1	<p>It was not known how learners would react to certain questions, as there were unknown variables that could affect the outcome of the marking, e.g. the ability of learners and teachers, and content coverage at the school</p>
Religion Studies P1 & P2	<p>A table to indicate the spread of religions in the question papers should in future be included with the memorandum to ensure equitable representation of all religions.</p>
Sesotho SAL P1	<p>The mark allocation for language in the case of a summary needs to be reconsidered, as it may impact negatively on the quality of marking.</p>
Siswati FAL P2	<p>Material and literary works for Siswati need to be developed, particularly for FAL.</p>
Siswati FAL P3	
Siswati HL P1	
Siswati HL P2	
Siswati HL P3	
Siswati SAL P1	
Siswati SAL P2	
Tourism	<p>There were comments on Q6.2, to the effect that the mark allocation should be higher in order to advantage stronger candidates.</p>
Tshivenda FAL P2	<p>The marking rubric for the essay-type question was adjusted, and the mark allocation per points written was corrected.</p>

3.4 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Accounting

Comments: The meeting held the evening before the memo discussion was extremely helpful. The preparation of dummy scripts for practice marking gave the examiners more work, but provided excellent hands-on experience.

Recommendations: The pre-memo discussion meeting should be recommended for all subjects.

Afrikaans FAL P1

Recommendations: Instructions relating to answering in full sentences should be refined. The SAG should be refined regarding the summary.

One long reading text should be replaced by two shorter ones.

Candidates struggled to complete the paper in two hours.

The questions on advertising techniques do not belong in the grammar section.

Afrikaans FAL P2

Comments: Provincial representatives indicated that the paper was fair but the language usage was problematic.

The rubric for the marking of essay-type questions originated from Home Language and does not always fit the marking of scripts in Additional Language.

Lack of vocabulary leads to the use of words that do not exactly fit the meaning and that leads to confusion among markers.

The paper is too long. 16 questions confuse many candidates, causing them to answer questions on books they did not study during the year.

Recommendations: Reconsider the current prescribed works in the different genres because the nature of the prescribed works is to a great extent alien to the world of experience of most additional language learners.

The level of difficulty between genres and books within a specific genre is not comparable.

Afrikaans FAL P3

Comments: Internal moderators and chief markers complained about the short interval between the exam date and this discussion.

Markers prefer marking P1 and P2 for financial reasons.

Recommendations: At least five working days should be allowed between the date of writing and the date of the memorandum discussion.

The norm time for P3 should be extended.

Afrikaans HL P1

Comments: An analysis grid of the different cognitive levels did not appear as part of the memorandum this year. Some of the chief markers and internal moderators do not form part of the examination panel.

Recommendations: Educators should avoid the old way of teaching (e.g. learning lists off by heart and doing previous years exam papers) and rather focus on teaching the NCS.

A workshop should be held with all the role players (as well as in provinces) to find common

ground and familiarise everybody with the cognitive levels.

Afrikaans HL P2

Recommendations: A suggestion: Exam panels should be appointed long before the beginning of a new year so that the moderation of the papers can be done as early as possible.

Sample scripts sent by provinces should be representative in order to standardise properly. The participants were not able to standardise certain questions (Novel: Vatmaar) because no scripts containing answers to this question were submitted.

Afrikaans HL P3

Comments: Every year Afrikaans HL and FAL Paper 3 are scheduled to be written on a Friday during the afternoon session. It is unfair on Afrikaans HL and FAL candidates to ask them to write a creative paper on a Friday afternoon.

The current rubrics from the DBE disadvantage candidates. The percentages on the highest levels are not a true reflection of a 100% performance.

Recommendations: Please re-visit dates for the final examination 2013.

Afrikaans SAL P1

Recommendations: In future instructions relating to answering in full sentences should be refined.

The summary marking guidelines have to be refined.

Afrikaans SAL P2

Comments: The different aspects of the rubric should not be seen as separate and isolated categories, but rather as distinguishable aspects which should be used as tools to assess responses as a whole.

The marking rubrics need thorough reconsideration, as aspects such as the assessment of length transgressions cause confusion.

The applicability of the current rubric for SAL is sometimes questionable. Review of the marking rubric has become imperative.

Recommendations: The norm time should be extended as fewer and fewer markers apply to mark the writing paper.

Umalusi should make the reports on the moderation of marking available to the chief markers and internal moderators.

Double marking remains the ideal for quality assurance.

New markers need more assistance and guidance.

SAL memo discussions should also take place over two days to allow for training.

Agricultural Management Practices

Comments: Non-attendance by the Eastern Cape could have a serious impact on marking.

The Western Cape did not attend on the second day of practice marking.

There was a complaint about Life Sciences being written on the same day as AMP which might disadvantage learners taking both subjects.

The translation into Afrikaans remained a problem.

Recommendations: All provinces should send representatives to the memorandum discussions. Representatives should attend the full period of discussion. It was not fair that two subjects of this nature should be written on the same day, and this should be addressed in future. The time allocation for the paper should be changed from 2½ to 3 hours. Afrikaans translations should be done professionally.

Agricultural Sciences P1

Comments: It was noted that in Limpopo the label B in the diagram of Q3.2 was not clearly visible. This was due to the quality of printing in the province. Other provinces did not experience a problem with this question. Q4.3.3 in the Afrikaans version was not the same in different provinces e.g. botbosluisuitbraak (Gauteng), bontbosluisuitbraak (Mpumalanga) Recommendations: The PEDs should assist in supplying the chief marker and internal moderator with scripts and memoranda in good time for pre-marking. This would help to improve the quality of inputs in the memorandum discussion.

Agricultural Sciences P2

Comments: There was a printing problem in North West which resulted in a poor quality graph. 'Cloning' is not mentioned in the SAG, only in the subject examination guidelines.

Agricultural Technology

Comments: The dates for writing and the memorandum discussion were too close to each other. Arrows in diagrams tended to shift during printing. The Eastern Cape and Limpopo did not attend the discussion. Recommendations: Practical realities should be considered when planning the memorandum discussions. Printers need to be very careful to avoid distortion during printing. The absence of two provinces from the discussion should be addressed. Subjects like Agricultural Technology should consider collaboration in marking by clustering provinces and creating one venue. This would reduce subjectivity.

Business Studies

Comments: The inputs focused too much on weaker learners, although the paper was meant to cater for all learners across the spectrum. The focus was also on awarding as many marks as possible, and not on analysing the learners' answers for correctness. The 2011 paper had been unfairly criticised. The effect of too lenient marking and poor marking had not been considered. There were several errors that compromised the cognitive level of the Afrikaans papers. The chief marker blamed the editors, but five days had been allowed for checking by the chief marker and internal moderator. This has become an embarrassment to the external moderators. During discussions the panel was too dependent on the external moderators. The panel relied too much on one or two study guides for alternative answers. The panel was still grappling with the higher-order questions, and often it depended on the

external moderators to come up with proposals.

Regarding the marking standards in different provinces, even though the marking notes are quite clear about the allocation of part marks, this discussion will come up again in the future.

The fact that a poor example of scripts was provided delayed the discussions. It had to be replaced the next day.

There is still a notion among delegates that original answers that do not appear in a textbook must be wrong.

There are those who cling to textbooks, even though some of the information is incorrect or obsolete. This was a problem particularly when middle to higher-order comprehension questions were involved.

It appeared that delegates had reached an agreement on how to mark certain questions, e.g. Q5. However, it was found that the CS1 headings were correct, but the information was incorrect or mixed.

Recommendations: The criticism of the 2011 question paper by the Director: National Examinations and Assessment needed to be investigated as three provinces had done very well and the rest below average. The question is whether moderation was done consistently in all provinces.

Civil Technology

Comments: There was too little time between the writing of the exam and the memo discussion to allow for written reports.

Recommendations: It would be a good idea to allow a little more time in between.

Computer Applications Technology P1

Comments: Not all software programs required to set papers in formats according to the curriculum are available in the setting rooms.

Chief markers and internal moderators have no input in the appointment of markers and cannot ensure that competent people are appointed as required by the DBE.

Sometimes there is no Afrikaans translation for new English terminology and Afrikaans learners are then at a disadvantage.

One of the images was not clear in the KZN paper, which affected the candidates' interpretation.

The readability level of the question paper might disadvantage poor readers.

There is not enough time between the writing of the exam and the memo discussion. The result is that markers come unprepared.

People leave before the end of the session due to flights that have been booked for 17:00, and the discussion is scheduled to finish at 16:30. This is true even of the bookings made for panel members by the DBE itself.

Recommendations: The DBE must ensure that all this software is available so that the questions can be tested to eliminate errors.

The teacher unions still have a major voice in who is appointed as markers. This is to the detriment of learners, as an incompetent marker cannot interpret answers.

It would help if both English and Afrikaans versions could be supplied to candidates, with English and Afrikaans on facing pages.

The provinces should apply quality control to printing procedures.

Word provides a grade reading level index which could be used to advantage by the examiners.

At least five working days should be allowed between the two dates.
The practical problem regarding bookings should be solved by the DBE so as to ensure that no one leaves before the end of discussions.

Computer Applications Technology P2

Comments: Competent markers are not always appointed
There was too little time between the writing of the examination and the memo discussion for pre-marking to be done effectively.
Recommendations: The appointment of markers should be carefully monitored by the DBE.
Sufficient time should be allowed when planning the next timetable.

Consumer Studies

Comments: The pre-memo discussion meeting was very helpful.

Dance Studies

Comments: It is of great concern that there were provinces that did not send delegates to the memorandum discussion.
Some of the chief markers are not dance instructors.
The practical component, which counts 50% of the marks, is not monitored properly. There is no consistency and several discrepancies have been reported.
Recommendations: Practicals and SBA should be moderated to ensure that all provinces maintain high standards of performance and that the principles of integrity and credibility for the examinations required by the DBE are achieved.

Design Studies P1

Comments: There was a problem with the colour of Gauteng's printing.
Recommendations: The poor quality of printing in Gauteng will be addressed by the DBE.

Dramatic Arts

Recommendations: A textbook selection panel should be constituted as soon as possible as provinces have to place their orders.
Final examination: It is requested that Dramatic Arts should not be timetabled with Languages. This places undue pressure on learners because the subjects require similar approaches.
It is also requested that Dramatic Arts be positioned near the beginning of the examination period and in the morning.
An increase in the size of the examining panel is required – there are 15 prescribed texts to cover.

Electrical Technology

Comments: Owing to the challenges experienced in the logistical arrangements around the venue, most persons who were supposed to attend, were not properly informed.

Another issue that should be taken cognisance of concerns the time between the writing session and the memo discussion meeting.

When conducting memorandum discussions it is imperative that the whole exam panel must be present. The reason for this is that different members set different parts of the question paper according to their areas of expertise and it is unfair and unwise to exclude panel members as they are crucial to providing their expertise during the preparation of the panel for the memorandum discussion meeting.

Marking and moderation, being extremely subjective, rely heavily on the interpretation and application by the subject matter expert. If this is conducted in isolation a myriad of direct interpretations will arise from marking sessions and the result will be that the standard of marking will be compromised. Moreover, if the chief marker and internal moderator of a province are excluded from the discussions on the basis of costs, the integrity and reliability of the NSC are at stake.

Recommendations: It is recommended that in future an appropriate contact list of stakeholders is drawn up so that all can be involved.

It is suggested that in future at least two to four days be allowed for the chief marker and internal moderator to mark sample scripts, prepare alternative responses and make a detailed analysis. This would ensure that a more informed process could be followed, which would at the same time contribute meaningfully to the integrity of the examination process as a whole.

Taking the credibility of the process into account, it is recommended that both the chief marker and the internal moderator of every province participate in the indaba that precedes marking. Again, the more these high-level stakeholders are involved in the memo discussion, the less the possibility of misinterpreting the memorandum and its intent.

Alternatively it would be recommended that the marking and moderation of smaller subjects, such as technical subjects, be centralised for the whole country and that this marking be managed and controlled by the national examination panel. In this way a smaller marking team under the direct control and management of the exam panel could work centrally, with the best markers from individual provinces being flown in. This would ensure a higher level of marking and moderation and would facilitate standardisation.

English FAL P1

Comments: Although representatives from the various provinces stated that the paper was accessible; it was found that learners' performance indicated otherwise.

Although the memorandum discussion was conducted thoroughly, possible alternative answers were offered by learners and the markers needed to use their discretion advisedly. Having said this, the representatives must carry out particular instructions/recommendations that have been approved by the external moderators with regard to alternative responses.

Recommendations: It is suggested that the following be inserted in the instructions in future Paper 1: All answers must be in full sentences unless otherwise stated.

Classroom teaching, intervention and support at school level are needed.

Representatives from the various provinces need to be open-minded when marking their province's answer books.

Some provincial internal moderators and chief markers need to develop their self-confidence if they are to take charge of their province's marking processes.

English FAL P3

Comments: There was too little time between the date of the exam and the memo discussion to allow for meaningful pre-marking.

Recommendations: There is a need to revise and refine the creative writing rubric.

An extra day or two are needed between the exam and the memo discussion to allow for pre-marking.

English HL P2

Comments: The literary essay memoranda are in far too much detail. While this helps the weaker marker, it also limits the answer to certain points.

Recommendations: A new style of memo should be used, where only key points are given and the answers are more open-ended. This requires markers to have more knowledge of the text.

Geography P1

Comments: There is still a problem with printing in some provinces.

Recommendations: The DBE should do the printing centrally to control the quality, or deploy the internal moderator to check the quality in the provinces.

Geography P2

Comments: The map was inaccurate, and actual features were recorded differently.

Recommendations: Specifications for printing must be given, because if maps and diagrams are not clear they influence the learners' interpretation of questions.

The internal moderator should be in a position to visit the mapped area to verify that the descriptions are valid.

Hospitality Studies

Recommendation: Minutes should be made available to delegates after the discussion.

Information Technology P1

Recommendations: The examining panel should be enlarged, so as to form one team for Paper 1 and another for Paper 2.

Question papers and memoranda should be sent to the chief markers and moderators electronically before the start of the memo discussions.

More time is needed between the writing of the examination and the memo discussions.

IsiNdebele FAL P1

Comments: Chief markers from the provinces did not have their scripts with them.

Recommendations: The chief markers from different provinces should bring their scripts with them to the memo discussion.

IsiNdebele FAL P3

Recommendations: Some marking symbols were added for marking this question paper.

IsiNdebele HL P1

Comments: The Limpopo chief marker transferred marks to the cover incorrectly.

Recommendations: The chief marker for Limpopo should make sure that the transfer of marks to the cover of the script is done correctly.

IsiNdebele HL P2

Comments: Gauteng did not send a representative, and the Limpopo representative had not marked any scripts.

Recommendations: Attendance at the memo discussion is imperative, and chief markers and others should be well prepared for the discussion.

IsiNdebele HL P3

Comments: Candidates selected mainly Q1.1, 1.2 and 1.6. They obviously found these most understandable.

Recommendations: Additional symbols for marking P3 should be added.

IsiNdebele SAL P1

Comments: The current system of conducting a memorandum discussion has affected the credibility of the system.

Recommendations: The memo discussion system should be revised.

IsiNdebele SAL P2

Comments: The current system of conducting a memorandum discussion has affected the credibility of the system.

Recommendations: The memo discussion system should be revised.

IsiXhosa FAL P1

Comments: The examination panel was not available for a pre-marking discussion meeting.

Recommendations: Dates for these meetings ought to be published.

IsiXhosa FAL P2

Comments: The examination panel was not available for a pre-marking discussion meeting. Question papers and marking guidelines were not ready for the meeting and this caused a great deal of delay.

Recommendations: These meetings should be arranged so that they can be attended by the DBE panel.

Logistical arrangements should be in place so that discussions are not delayed.

IsiZulu FAL P1

Comments: A limited number of representatives attended from the PEDs.

The chief marker was concerned about the candidates' ability to interpret visuals.

It was a cause for concern that errors that had been corrected were still in the final paper.
The chief markers should be given copies, not original scripts, to pre-mark.

IsiZulu HL P1

Comments: One instruction in Section B was incorrect.

IsiZulu HL P2

Recommendations: Memo discussions should be extended so that delegates are not pressurised by having to catch flights.

IsiZulu HL P3

Comments: There was initially some inconsistency in the awarding of marks.
Recommendations: Candidates should not be expected to write a creative paper like P3 in the afternoon.

IsiZulu SAL P2

Comments: There were no representatives from the provinces.
It was a grave cause for concern that errors that had been corrected still appeared in the final question paper.
No bar-coded paper was provided for the memo discussion.
SAL was not recognised in the provinces, and there was no support to get the chief markers to attend.

Life Sciences P1 Version 1

Comments: There was no printer at the memo discussion, and this delayed the work somewhat.

Life Sciences P2 Version 1

Comments: The practice marking session was very successful.
Limpopo has appointed only one internal moderator for four papers. This is bound to affect the quality of marking.
Recommendations: The sample of scripts to be marked by each representative should be taken from different centres.

Life Sciences P1 & P2 Version 2

Comments: The fact that part-time candidates receive no tuition impacts negatively on their performance.
Recommendations: From discussions at this meeting it became clear that there was a need for some kind of forum, like the old QPA meetings, where LS teachers could talk about learning, teaching and assessment.

Mathematical Literacy P1& P2

Recommendations: A printer is needed in the room, or at least in the building, to facilitate speedy printing. At the moment this aspect causes delays.

Mathematics P1 & P2

Comments: There were wide complaints that Umalusi reports had not reached the chief markers and internal moderators.

The practice marking would go a long way towards standardising marking across the provinces. It was a very successful exercise.

NB: There was a problem in Mpumalanga with Mathematics P2 where part of a diagram had not been printed. The DBE insisted that they had sent a hard copy to the provinces as well, precisely to prevent a situation like this, and it may have been that the copies were not compared. After a long discussion with the full meeting, it was decided that candidates may have been prejudiced by 11 marks as a consequence of the omission.

It was decided that Q6.4, 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9 should not be marked by the province, and that marks should be calculated out of 139. The decision would lean slightly towards advantaging the candidates, but this was fair as their confidence would have been influenced negatively by the situation.

The province indicated that the file was not compatible with their program, but it was sent as a print-ready file and there should have been no need to convert it. The typist indicated that the diagrams were saved as packages and could not have been changed unless someone had attempted to tamper with them.

Mathematics P3

Recommendations: Teachers need more training on probability and geometry to improve teaching.

Mechanical Technology

Comments: Many learners are not taking Mathematics but Mathematical Literacy. It therefore seems that they have problems with the manipulation of formulae.

Learners do not know how to interpret the mechanical drawings that were used to define some questions. There is no standard textbook for Mechanical Technology.

Teaching and learning support material (LTSM) is a cause for concern: there is a shortage of the LTSM and resources needed to teach the curriculum to defined standards.

Recommendations: Teachers need capacity building in the new programs. This was reiterated by the DBE curriculum representative.

Physical Sciences P1

Recommendations: Provinces should have all teaching and moderation in place to give candidates the best chance to pass the subject.

Learners should be pre-tested to determine their readiness to write the examination before being allowed to enter for the final examination.

Q7 had an error only in Gauteng and the Western Cape, where "width" was replaced with "with". Unwarranted provincial editor interference? It should be investigated whether learners were disadvantaged in the process.

Physical Sciences P2

Recommendations: Equivalent answers should not be marked wrong because they are not worded precisely as in the memorandum.

In the case of any uncertainty the external moderators should be contacted.

The memorandum should not be changed at the marking centres.

Religion Studies P1 & P2

Comments and recommendations: More time should be allowed for memo discussions, including pre-memo discussions. Pre-memo discussions did not take place on the 25th as planned.

A table to indicate the spread of religions in the question paper should be included in the moderation submission.

Booking the flight back on the day of the discussions meant that one moderator had to leave in the early afternoon.

Better coordination and cooperation is required from the DBE. The March papers were only signed off on 26 November 2012, the day of the memorandum discussions!

Sepedi FAL P1, P2 & P3

Comments: There are serious concerns about how the 20 pre-memo discussion scripts are handled. Mpumalanga does not make scripts available to chief markers and it is not known whether Mpumalanga is still writing this subject.

Recommendations: The procedure needs to be standardised. If the subject is still being written in Mpumalanga, the marking will have to be closely monitored to ensure that the markers implement the adapted memorandum.

Sepedi HL P1, P2 & P3

Comments: There are serious concerns about the way the 20 pre-memo discussion scripts are handled.

Mpumalanga does not make scripts available to chief markers.

Gauteng did not cooperate or make scripts available for pre-marking.

The learners in the available sample performed very poorly.

The reason appeared to be poor teaching.

Recommendations: The marking in Gauteng should be closely monitored to ensure that the correct memorandum is used.

An upward adjustment of marks may be necessary.

Sepedi SAL P1 & P2

Recommendations: It is recommended that an investigation be conducted into why SAL is not registered in Sepedi as in other languages.

Sesotho FAL P1, P2 & P3

Comments: The time allowed for the memo discussion was too short.

Recommendations: It would be appreciated if more time for the memo discussion could be made available.

Sesotho HL P1

Recommendation: Memo discussions should be attended by all provinces.

Sesotho HL P2 & P3

Recommendations: The initial marking of scripts should be extended to include the DBE panel and external moderators to broaden the basis of discussion.

Training of chief markers and internal moderators in marking should be extended to African Languages.

Sesotho SAL P1 & P2

Comments: The fact that all the language levels were discussed on the same date and in the same time slots created a lot of confusion and the teams had to split in order to ensure that the two sessions progressed concurrently.

Recommendations: It would be greatly appreciated if the duration of this meeting could be scheduled for two days, as is the case with other languages such as English and Afrikaans.

Setswana FAL P1, P2 & P3

Recommendations: Photocopies of marked scripts should be brought to the memo discussion, not the originals.

It is recommended that representatives from the provinces attend this discussion.

Setswana HL P1 & P2

Recommendations: All provinces where this language is taught should send representatives to the memo discussion.

Siswati FAL P1, P2 & P3, HL P1, P2 & P3, SAL P1 & P2

Recommendations: It is strongly recommended that all the Siswati P1, P2 and P3 discussions not be held simultaneously. When one is responsible for all three/both it becomes an impossible task. Material for the discussions should be ready when the representatives arrive.

Tourism

Comments: The English terminology is often used in the classroom, and it would be to learners' advantage to have both the English and Afrikaans versions available.

Recommendations: It is suggested that the question paper be made available to candidates in both English and Afrikaans.

Tshivenda FAL P1

Comments: There was a problem with the printer throughout the Tshivenda memorandum discussion, as it did not have the capacity to print the Venda language. Some of the provincial representatives did not come well prepared, and had illegible memos.

Recommendations: It is recommended that a sample of scripts be marked prior to the memorandum discussion as this would inform the changes made according to responses from the learners' scripts.

Tshivenda FAL P2

Comments: A sample of marked scripts shows the panel what the performance was like and which questions were more challenging to learners. Providing alternative answers helps accommodate all learners.

Recommendations: In future the DBE should ensure that all provincial representatives receive scripts before coming to the memo discussion venue.

Xitsonga FAL P1 & P2 & P3

Comments: No provincial representatives attended, as all memo discussions in Xitsonga were held simultaneously and all representatives opted to attend HL.

Recommendations: It would be a good idea to place all the Xitsonga levels at one venue. This would make it possible to consult with chief markers and internal moderators. As there were few FAL candidates, the representatives preferred to attend HL.

The chairperson emphasised the importance of pre-marking, even at the marking centre, to achieve comparable standards of marking.

Xitsonga HL P2

Comments: Some candidates did not prepare for the examination. They did not even know the names of the characters in the networks.

Xitsonga SAL P1 & P2

Recommendation: It would be a good idea to place all the Xitsonga levels at one venue. This would make it possible to consult with chief markers and internal moderators. As there were few FAL candidates the representatives preferred to attend HL.

The chairperson emphasised the importance of pre-marking, even at the marking centre, to achieve comparable standards of marking.

ADDENDUM 4

VERIFICATION OF MARKING

(To be read in conjunction with chapter 4 of the main report)

1 ACCOUNTING

1.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The marking memoranda were adhered to during marking. Alternatives had been added to the memoranda during the memo discussion. The practice marking and training at the memorandum discussion over the past four years has contributed to the high standard of marking in the country at present. A subsequent document sent to provinces served to clarify the memo and not to change it.

1.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was moderate consistency in the allocation of marks and the recording of results was relatively accurate. Internal moderation took care of most discrepancies and the examination assistants checked carefully for any errors in the recording of marks.

1.3 Quality and standard of marking

Average to good

Accounting (Eastern Cape, on site): There were some discrepancies but as this was the first day of marking, these problems would be sorted out.

1.4 Internal moderation

There was evidence of sufficient internal moderation being done. Errors were picked up and corrected.

Accounting (Eastern Cape, on site): As it was early in the marking session, there were no fully moderated batches.

1.5 Unfair questions

Questions were all fair and pitched at the appropriate cognitive levels.

1.6 Candidates' performance

Generally, candidates found the question papers to be fair, although their performance was variable, from very poor to very good.

Accounting (Eastern Cape, Gauteng and Limpopo on site): Many candidates had not attempted all the questions.

1.7 Findings and suggestions

Internal moderation was fair.

Markers had difficulty awarding method marks and penalising the inclusion of foreign items, but they were improving. They also had difficulty interpreting answers in words other than those in the memorandum.

Candidates were found to be still experiencing problems responding to ratio and analysis-type questions.

Suggestions:

The current examination panel should be retained as it was doing good work and the paper was improving.

1.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question papers were fair and any discrepancies in marking were not significant enough to warrant an adjustment of marks.

Amount of external moderation done in Accounting

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape		26	26	19
Gauteng		24	24	22
Limpopo		28	28	18

Details not provided for centralised moderation.

2 AFRIKAANS FAL PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

On site

2.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The marking memoranda and rubrics (P3) were adhered to. All possible alternatives had been discussed and added at the memo discussion.

However, this was not applicable to P3, as answers were not provided, only guidelines.

2.1.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marking of both papers was accurate and consistent. There were no changes to the marking memorandum at the marking centre. It was clear that the training of chief markers and internal moderators, and the thorough memo discussions had raised the standards of consistency and accuracy.

KwaZulu-Natal (on site): There were a few discrepancies in P3, mostly in the order of 3 to 4 marks. In extreme the cases the range was between –8 and +12.

Northern Cape (on site): There were a few discrepancies in P3, mostly in the order of 3 to 4 marks. In extreme the cases the range was between –7 and +10.

2.1.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking were rated as “good” to “very good” in terms of mark allocation, interpretation of candidates’ responses, application of the rubrics, and totalling of marks.

KwaZulu-Natal, Northern Cape (on site): Not all errors were indicated in P3.

2.1.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation was very good, although there were few scripts in the sample that had not been through at least one level of moderation. Where adjustments were required these had been done. Internal moderators are commended on their good work.

2.1.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions, although candidates had difficulty with some questions, and misinterpreted some topics.

2.1.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates found the question papers "difficult" (KwaZulu-Natal). Accordingly, they performed poorly, with many of them achieving below 40%, and many in the 0 to 29% range. In other provinces the paper was found to be fair.

P3: Generally, a lack of vocabulary and limited knowledge of grammatical structures inhibited the expression of candidates' thoughts.

2.1.7 Findings and suggestions

There was sufficient evidence of internal moderation at all levels, and no evidence of shadow-marking. A high degree of consistency was maintained in marking and internal moderation.

It was suggested that when selecting texts for setting question papers, greater cognisance should be taken of the fact that these are first additional language learners. Accordingly, vocabulary should be appropriate and there should be fewer texts in Section C. Straightforward topics should be set in P3.

In the case of P3, candidates' responses are assessed by means of three rubrics and accompanying guidelines – and not by means of a memorandum.

Section-by-section marking was implemented, and this contributed to the consistency in marking.

The importance of memo discussions cannot be over-emphasised, as the benefits of professionally conducted memorandum discussions and training are now being reaped. Provincial standardisation is also taking place, and this is perhaps making the biggest contribution to the improved standard of marking.

Submission: Rubrics.

The interpretation of a rubric, where marks are grouped in codes and where the descriptors of codes are often vague and tend to overlap, can lead to marks being awarded subjectively. It is therefore imperative that a system of double marking be

adopted by all provinces for P3, to counter the element of subjectivity and to ensure that standards are maintained in a uniform way.

The external moderators are of the opinion that the current rubrics need to be reviewed further with regard to the clarity of descriptors and the weighting of marks for the structure elements. We appeal to Umalusi to intervene and ensure that a more appropriate tool is developed.

Norm time: The current norm time of 18 minutes should be extended. This is a two-hour, 80-mark question paper.

2.1.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The paper and the marking were fair and some candidates in the samples demonstrated an ability to do well.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
KwaZulu-Natal	1		20	20
	3		12	20
Northern Cape	3		30	20

Centralised: Six scripts per paper per assessment body

3 AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES PAPERS 1 AND 2

3.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was adhered to, and it made provision for candidates to answer in their own words. Provision had also been made for alternative answers.

3.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was consistency in most cases and errors were identified and corrected. No changes were made to the memorandum at the marking centre.

3.3 Quality and standard of marking

The standard and quality of marking was good and there was an acceptable level of accuracy. Correct totals were recorded. A few errors were found which were corrected during moderation.

3.4 Internal moderation

Errors in marking were corrected in internal moderation process.

3.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

3.6 Candidates' performance

Candidate's performance was fair. All questions were attempted by all candidates, although Q2, 3 and 4 in papers 1 and 2 were found to be difficult.

3.7 Findings and suggestions

Internal moderation was well done. It is very important that markers be well trained.

3.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The paper and the marking were fair.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape	1	20	20	18
Gauteng		20	20	18
Northern Cape		20	20	15
Northern Cape	2	20	20	15

4 BUSINESS STUDIES

4.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was as approved by the external moderator.

4.2 Consistency and accuracy

The overall marking was consistent and accurate.

NB: Novice markers needed more training.

4.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking were good. The few anomalies that were found were not significant in the long run.

NB: Not all markers were marking accurately. Novice markers need more training.

4.4 Internal moderation

Both the internal and external moderators showed an average increase. However, the discrepancies were not significant.

4.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions

4.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair. They did well in Q1, but most battled with higher-order questions.

NB: In some instances alternative answers were not acknowledged.

4.7 Findings and suggestions

Where noticeable variances appear in the different levels of moderation markers should be monitored.

Marks were sometimes awarded for answers that were too vague and incomplete. The principle of part marks had not yet been mastered.

4.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. Judging from the sampled scripts, variance between markers and moderators was not significant.

NB: Upward adjustment – there was significant variation in marking of up to 4%.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape		20	20	40
Free State		20	8	40
North West		20	15	40
North West		20	15	40

5 COMPUTER APPLICATIONS TECHNOLOGY PAPER 1 AND 2

5.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

It appeared that there was adherence to the marking memorandum, as the discrepancies were insignificant. Provision had been made for alternative answers. In P2 there was no evidence of any deviation from the memorandum.

Western Cape P2: No problems were experienced in interpreting the memorandum.

5.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was consistency and accuracy in the awarding of marks.

Free State (P1): An error of 9 marks was discovered in one script.

Northern Cape: There was a variance of 6 marks in one instance between marker and moderator.

5.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good. Changes made were mostly insignificant.

Western Cape and Northern Cape P2: The scripts submitted for moderation had all been marked by either the chief marker or the internal moderator.

5.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation was thoroughly done and errors had been corrected.

5.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions. Any unfair questions would have been addressed at the memorandum discussion.

5.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair, with the pass rate of the sample being over 60%.
Western Cape P2: In this paper, the three candidates whose scripts were moderated achieved above the average of a sample of 27 candidates from all provinces in all questions except Q1.

Northern Cape and North West P2: The three candidates whose scripts were moderated achieved below the average of a sample of 27 candidates from all provinces in four out of seven questions.

Mpumalanga: The three candidates whose scripts were moderated achieved below the average of a sample of 27 candidates from all provinces in five out of seven questions.

Limpopo P2: The three candidates whose scripts were moderated achieved above the average of a sample of 27 candidates from all provinces in only one out of seven questions.

KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng and Eastern Cape P2: In the three moderated scripts the learners performed below the average of the total moderated in five out of seven questions.

Free State P2: The three candidates whose scripts were moderated achieved above the average of a sample of 27 candidates from all provinces in five out of seven questions.

5.7 Findings and suggestions

It is a concern that these submitted scripts had been "window-dressed", and one was not sure whether this was the standard of internal moderation throughout.

More time needs to be spent on spreadsheets and databases. However, the word-processing section is one of the successes.

The verification of the marking process probably followed too soon after the beginning of the marking session, when not much pre-marking had been done and it was difficult to find a representative sample.

Provinces should be reminded of the correct procedure to follow when a problem is experienced with the marking guidelines, that is, external moderators should not be contacted directly; the problem should be dealt with via the DBE.

Western Cape and Northern Cape P2: Markers were advised to read learners' answers very carefully, as there might be more ways to arrive at correct solutions than those described in the memorandum.

5.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The paper and the marking were fair. As there were more sources of marks than this one paper, it did not make sense to propose an adjustment based on just this.

Amount of external moderation done

Three scripts out of the 20 received from each province were moderated, at a rate of 25 to 30 minutes per script.

6 ECONOMICS

6.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

There was variable adherence to the marking memorandum as agreed upon at the national memorandum discussion meetings. Some markers were more flexible than others in allocating discretionary marks for alternative substantive facts put forward by candidates. The majority of markers allocated marks to candidates for expressing the core elements of the desired responses in their own words.

Limpopo and Mpumalanga: Markers compromised the integrity of the subject by allocating marks inconsistently and indiscriminately.

6.2 Consistency and accuracy

Mark allocation at all levels was generally consistent. The errors in recording marks were corrected by the examination assistants.

The Northern Cape should use a consistent system of entering marks in the right-hand margin.

6.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking varied from unsatisfactory to very good. Individual markers were generally consistent and accurate in the allocation of marks to the questions in the answer scripts that they were responsible for.

Limpopo and Mpumalanga: Variances were unacceptable.

6.4 Internal moderation

There was evidence of thorough internal moderation at all centres.

6.5 Unfair questions

No unfair questions were found.

6.6 Candidates' performance

The distribution of marks indicated that the candidates found this paper fair, although many struggled with the data-response question in Section B. The long response question was answered better than it had been in the past.

6.7 Findings and suggestions

A large number of candidates' responses indicated that certain sections of the syllabus had not been taught properly by educators.

The appointment of markers remains a concern. In some cases, it was found that markers did not have the necessary ability and experience to handle higher cognitive-level questions that required insight and logical reasoning.

Limpopo: Some markers found it difficult to apply an acceptable level of discretionary marking. There was also some evidence of 'scan-reading' of candidates' responses in Section C of the answer scripts.

Gauteng and Mpumalanga: Assessment bodies should encourage markers to make use of mark ticks (✓✓) when allocating marks, instead of using a numerical notation (viz. 1, 2, 3, etc.), as this creates unnecessary confusion with regard to sub-totals allocated for questions.

There was an improvement in the standard of marking as a result of the training introduced by the DBE and the PDEs. This process should be reinforced further in future. The markers' interpretation of the memorandum and the context of candidates' responses have improved.

6.8 Adjustment of marks

No mark adjustment was proposed.

Amount of external moderation done

Examining body	No. of scripts	
	Submitted/received	Externally moderated
Gauteng (on-site)	20	20
Eastern Cape (on-site)	30	30
KwaZulu-Natal (on-site)	18	18
Limpopo (on-site)	30	30
Northern Cape (on-site)	26	26
Mpumalanga	20	20
North-West	20	20
Free State	20	20
Western Cape	20	20

7 ENGINEERING GRAPHICS AND DESIGN PAPERS 1 AND 2 (CENTRALISED MODERATION)

7.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was adhered to throughout. Answers in candidates' own words were considered.

7.2 Consistency and accuracy

Awarding of marks was mostly consistent. Inaccuracies had an insignificant impact.

7.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good and generally consistent.

7.4 Internal moderation

The internal moderation was good and thorough. Moderation was taking place at all the various levels, and errors were corrected.

7.5 Unfair questions

None of the questions were unfair.

7.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates appeared to find the paper fair, and performed better on the whole in both papers than the previous year.

7.7 Findings and suggestions

The memoranda were faxed to some of the provinces, which distorted the marking templates and could have caused problems at the marking centres. Provinces need to be advised via DBE to print to the required scale.

Internal moderation was good. The assessment tool was well thought out and applied efficiently.

7.8 Adjustment of marks

An upward adjustment of 5% was proposed, after taking the SBA and PAT into consideration.

Amount of external moderation done

P1 20 + P2 20 = 40 per province = 360 in total.

8 ENGLISH FAL PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

8.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was adhered to. Alternative answers had been added at the memo discussion.

Mpumalanga P2: While alternative answers had been provided, many markers revealed an inability to think creatively and give credit for correct answers stated in other words.

8.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marks were accurately captured and totalled. No changes were made to the memo at the marking centre.

Mpumalanga P3: Markers were inclined to inflate marks, mainly because they did not understand the rubrics.

8.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was average. By the second day of marking, however, the markers were settling into correct and standardised marking.

Mpumalanga P2: It was clear that some markers had difficulty thinking “out of the box” and evaluating answers that were offered in different words to those in the memorandum.

Limpopo P3: Some markers were too lenient in the beginning and one marker did not indicate errors. The external moderator advised the chief marker to insist that she do so.

Western Cape P1, 2 and 3: Marking was good.

8.4 Internal moderation

There was ample evidence of internal moderation at all levels.

8.5 Unfair questions

All questions were fair and set at the correct levels.

8.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was found to be fair; the majority of the sample appeared to have fared fairly well

Eastern Cape: At Cape Recife School, all the candidates appeared to have learning problems. Their writing was not too bad, but there were serious problems with spelling. No concessions appeared to have been made for these candidates.

8.7 Findings and suggestions

The internal moderator had trained the markers well.

Internal moderation was competently done.

Mpumalanga P3: Markers had difficulty interpreting the rubrics. More training was probably needed.

8.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question paper and the level of marking were fair.

Amount of moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape	1	Random	17	30
Mpumalanga		20	20	23
Western Cape		20	20	23
Mpumalanga	2	20	20	30
Western Cape		20	20	30
Eastern Cape	3	Random	17	28
Limpopo		Random	20	30
Mpumalanga		20	20	28
Western Cape		20	20	28

9 ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

9.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The marking memorandum had generally been adhered to. Alternative answers were provided for in the memorandum, although in P2, the literature paper, it is not possible to provide every possible alternative. Markers should be knowledgeable and able to critically analyse, have an extensive knowledge of the prescribed literature, and be able to recognise valid answers.

Free State P1: A query from the chief marker was answered by the internal moderator in a way that contradicted what had previously been decided and implemented in the provinces.

Mpumalanga and North West P1: Valid and alternative answers were generally not credited (mainly in Q1), and this accounted for the great discrepancies in the allocation of marks.

Western Cape P1: The memorandum was adhered to, but markers were inclined to be lenient and awarded more marks than deserved in open-ended questions.

Western Cape P3: There were some large discrepancies in the awarding of marks for good essays in particular.

Free State P3: Markers and moderations were not all at the same level of competency, and the awarding of marks was sometimes inconsistent, particularly in Section C.

9.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marking was generally consistent and accurate, and no changes to the memorandum were made in the provinces. In P2 there was great consistency and variances were insignificant, except in one script in the Free State. In P3 marking was consistent, except for Section C in the Free State.

9.3 Quality and standard of marking

Paper 1:

	POOR	AVERAGE	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT
Free State					
Comprehension		X			
Visual literacy			X		
Summary				X	
Language (Q5)				X	
Mpumalanga					
Comprehension	X				
Visual literacy		X			
Summary				X	
Language (Q5)			X		
North West					
Comprehension		X			
Visual literacy			X		
Summary			X		
Language (Q5)					X
Western Cape					
Comprehension	X				
Visual literacy			X		
Summary			X		
Language (Q5)					X

Marking was not consistent across all markers in a province, as some remained unable to recognise alternative answers.

Paper 3:

	POOR	AVERAGE	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Western Cape		X		
Mpumalanga			X	
North West			X	
Free State	Section C	Sections A and B		

9.4 Internal moderation

Scripts were moderated and it was hoped that errors were being brought to the attention of markers.

9.5 Unfair questions

There was no evidence of unfair questions.

9.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance in P1 was fair and there was evidence of an acceptable range of marks. However, candidates struggled with higher-order questions. In Q5 (grammar) performance ranged from poor to excellent. At the lower range of performance there was a lack of engagement with the texts. Candidates need to be taught critical-thinking skills, and the ability to substantiate an argument from the text and not from general knowledge.

In P2 candidates performed better in the lower-order questions. Candidates who performed poorly displayed an inability to critically analyse texts, and to express themselves adequately in the language.

In P3 performance was fair, spread across all performance levels. Some candidates' writing abilities were so limited that one wondered why they had opted for the home language option.

9.7 Findings and suggestions

Not all markers were competent. Markers appeared to be "strict" with better-performing candidates (withholding full marks for excellent answers) and too lenient with weak candidates (awarding marks for substandard answers). Markers should be better trained. Free State P2: Moderators should guard against over-moderation, and rather moderate different questions over a wide variety of scripts. Uniformity in technical aspects of marking should be established and three markers should mark a script, rather than two.

For P3 the rubrics should be mediated more conscientiously, and the markers should be better trained.

9.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks.

Amount of external moderation done

Twenty scripts were received per province, from nine to 12 were moderated, and 20 to 25 minutes per script was spent on moderation. In P2 the marking was as follows:

	No. of scripts moderated		
	Poetry	Novel	Drama
Western Cape	12	9	9
Free State	11	11	11
North West	10	10	10
Mpumalanga	10	10	10

10 GEOGRAPHY PAPERS 1 AND 2

10.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

Markers followed the standardised marking guideline and moderation revealed quality marking. A range of alternative answers to cover all aspects had been included.

10.2 Consistency and accuracy

Most markers were accurate in the allocation of marks and in totalling. No changes were made to the memorandum at the marking centre.

10.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was rated as "average". All markers had not yet come to grips with the memorandum. Moreover, they were unsure when it came to concepts like global climate change and drought.

Northern Cape P2: The marking was rated as "good". Markers did not deviate from the marking memorandum, and their content knowledge was good.

10.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation had a positive impact because candidates' marks were verified and marking errors corrected so that learners were not disadvantaged.

10.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions. All questions were within the syllabus.

10.6 Candidates' performance

According to evidence in the scripts, the candidates found the question paper "fair". Candidates' performance was variable, depending on their preparation for the examination.

10.7 Findings and suggestions

The standard of internal moderation was commended. Markers were encouraged to keep on marking accurately.

10.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The paper was fair and the questions were within the parameters of the examination guidelines.

No of scripts moderated:	10
Time spent per script:	3,5 hours for 10 scripts.

Northern Cape:

No of scripts moderated:	15
Time spent per script:	2 hours for 15 scripts.

11 HISTORY PAPERS 1 AND 2

Centralised moderation

11.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The marking guidelines were to a great extent applied consistently and effectively. Alternative answers had been captured in the marking guidelines.

Eastern Cape P1: The scripts at one of the centres had not been marked according to the memorandum. They had to be redone.

NB: Eastern Cape P2: External moderation was not done. There was a major problem at the marking centre when the provincial officials did not put in an appearance and the marking memoranda and question papers were not available. Despite the best efforts of the centre manager, the training started a full day late. The result was that marking only started on 5 December, the day when external moderation was supposed to take place. At that time not a single representative of the Assessment and Examinations Directorate had put in an appearance. The work was also delayed because the signed memorandum had not been sent with the scripts.

The moderator and chief marker were most distressed about the situation, and this might have had a negative effect on the marking process for P2.

11.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marking was generally consistent and accurate. Some markers were inclined to generosity when marking the essay questions, even when the essay was not focused. A fear of awarding too high or too low marks led to some bunching in the middle range.

11.3 Quality and standard of marking

In general the standard of marking was good and markers adhered to the marking guidelines.

Eastern Cape and Gauteng P1: A question-by-question method of marking was used to good effect.

11.4 Internal moderation

Vigorous internal moderation at all levels was visible in the scripts from most of the assessment bodies.

11.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

11.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair, although extended writing was still a concern. However, performance in the source-based questions was satisfactory.

Candidates' inability to answer extended writing questions, paragraphs or essays as well as an inability to remain focused on the topic are causes for grave concern.

11.7 Findings and suggestions

Although concerns about marking had been addressed the previous year and again at the memo discussion, there were still some centres where markers did not mark strictly according to pages 4 to 7 of the marking guidelines. For example, more ticks were awarded than provided for in the memo for essays. Nevertheless, most markers did adhere to the guidelines.

Markers, chief markers and internal moderators had to ensure that the marking guidelines mentioned above were applied consistently.

Some essays that did not fulfil the requirements were awarded very high marks, but most markers showed an improved understanding of the matrixes used to mark extended writing.

Candidates needed to be taught how to write essays, for example to include a good introduction and conclusion, and how to structure an argument.

On-site moderation

The on-site moderation was a successful exercise. It gave the external moderator the opportunity to select a variety of scripts from various centres which had been moderated at the different levels at the centres. The interaction with the marking teams at the centres also helped to address difficulties immediately at the beginning of the marking period.

The marking and internal moderation were done very well by most of the assessment bodies. A minority of the assessment bodies need to address the concerns and recommendations mentioned above.

11.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks.

Amount of external moderation done:

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape	1	Randomly selected	10	25
Gauteng		24	15	25
Centralised		20 centres	10 x 9 per centre = 90	

12 ISINDEBELE HL PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

12.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The memorandum was adhered to. All alternatives had been provided for at the memorandum discussion.

Gauteng P3: One marker did not adhere to the memo and had to re-mark.

12.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was consistency throughout in mark allocation. No changes to the marking memorandum were made at the marking centre.

12.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality of marking was rated as "good" and marking was found to be accurate throughout.

12.4 Internal moderation

The internal moderator acted as both marker and moderator.

12.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

12.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was described as "fair". All questions were attempted.

P1: Candidates had difficulty with the language section.

P2: Candidates could not answer the poetry section.

12.7 Findings and suggestions

The internal moderator was also the chief marker and marker.

12.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question paper and the marking were fair.

Amount of moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Gauteng	1	16	16	20
	2	15	15	15
	3	40	19	20
Mpumalanga	1	40	21	20
	2	40	4	20
	3	40	19	20

13 ISIXHOSA HL PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

13.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The memorandum was adhered to. Very few errors of judgement were found.

13.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was consistency in mark allocation and accuracy in the totalling of marks.

13.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good, although there were a few minor discrepancies.

Northern Cape P2: Quality and standard of marking was average, with some discrepancies being found of up to 8 marks.

13.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation was being done, and any errors were corrected. Feedback was given to enhance marking.

13.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

13.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was found to be fair. In P1 candidates had some difficulty with the language questions.

Western Cape P2: It would appear that poetry analysis is not being taught.

13.7 Findings and suggestions

Western Cape P1: Learners lost marks because they did not use their own words.

Western Cape and Northern Cape P3: It was important to give constant feedback to markers. It would seem that writing is not being taught very well.

13.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question paper and marking were fair.

Western Cape P1: An upwards adjustment was suggested because of Section A where candidates were losing marks for quoting.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Gauteng	HL P1	174	11	-
KwaZulu-Natal		265	6	-
Northern Cape		187	13	-
Western Cape		4	4	35
Northern Cape	HL P2	187	13	-
Western Cape		10	10	50
Northern Cape	HL P3	187	13	-
Western Cape		7	7	40

14 ISIZULU HOME LANGUAGE PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

14.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was generally adhered to, although there were some answers where the markers were not adhering precisely to the prescripts. Alternative answers had been added at the national memo discussion.

14.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was consistency in the marking, even in the summary which markers often find difficult. Differences were insignificant. No changes had been made to the memo.

Gauteng (P1): There was some inconsistency in marking, with some markers battling with the summary.

14.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good. Although there were a few minor mistakes, marking improved as time went on.

Gauteng P1: Some markers were too lenient and too generous with marks.

14.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation was being done at all levels.

14.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

14.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair. Question 1 was answered very well, but candidates experienced problems with the visuals and the grammar question.

Gauteng P1: Candidates' performance was above average, but the language question brought down their marks.

14.7 Findings and suggestions

All questions should be moderated, and all markers should be acquainted with the memorandum. Markers should be able to use their professional judgement when candidates express their own opinion.

More appropriate material could have been selected for the question paper.

14.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. There were no unfair questions to warrant adjustment.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Gauteng	1	Sampled from many	20	25
KwaZulu-Natal		20	20	25
Mpumalanga		Sampled from many	21	25

15 LIFE SCIENCES (VERSIONS 1 AND 2) PAPERS 1 AND 2

15.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The approved marking memorandum was adhered to and there was no evidence of any changes. Alternatives had been added to the memorandum at the memo discussion.

KwaZulu-Natal P1 V2: Where candidates had phrased their answers differently to those in the memorandum, answers could not always be interpreted by the marker.

NB: Northern Cape P1 and 2 V2: One set of markers marked both Version 1 and Version 2. The old content paper is only marked once the new version marking has been completed. There were therefore no marked scripts to be moderated at the external moderator's visit.

15.2 Consistency and accuracy

Generally, accuracy and consistency were good. No changes were made to the memo, although some changes were made to the memorandum at the marking centre, on the instructions of the national internal moderator, who communicated the changes to all provinces. Accordingly, two alternatives were added.

KwaZulu-Natal P1 V2: Umalusi marks differed by between -5 and $+3$ in 20 of the 40 scripts moderated. In some cases correct answers had been marked incorrect, even in scripts that had been re-marked by a second marker/internal moderator. The chief marker was alerted to certain questions that were presenting a challenge.

Mpumalanga P1 V2: Umalusi marks differed from those of provincial markers by between -1 and $+3$ in 11 of the 20 scripts that were moderated. In some cases, correct answers were

marked incorrect after the scripts had been looked at by at least one other level of provincial check.

15.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good, although there were minor adjustments. Markers were challenged by the answers of open-ended questions and answers in learners' own words.

Western Cape P1 and 2 V2: Marking was good and the adjustments were insignificant. KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo P1 V2: The quality of marking was average. There were some discrepancies.

KwaZulu-Natal P1 V2: The quality of marking was average. The internal moderator had only managed to moderate 17 scripts over the three days of marking.

Mpumalanga P1 V2: Markers need to be encouraged to read for the sense of an answer. Some learners gave correct answers which were not recognised by the markers.

Gauteng P2 V2: The quality of marking was average. Markers had to learn to look for the sense of the answer and not the precise words.

15.4 Internal moderation

There was evidence of internal moderation in the bundle moderated by Umalusi.

Western Cape P1 and 2 V1: There was no evidence of multiple levels of internal moderation.

North West P1 and 2 V1: There was ample evidence of multiple levels of internal moderation.

15.5 Unfair questions

P1 V1: One question was problematic owing to a poor Afrikaans translation. All the other questions were fair.

In the other question papers there were no unfair questions.

15.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was found to fair, although there was a wide distribution of marks.

North West P1 and 2 V1: The marks ranged between 23 and 129/150 in P1, and between 45 and 130/150 in P2.

Western Cape P1 and 2 V1: There was a wide range of marks, in P1 from 24 to 133/150, and in P2 from 15 to 140/150.

Gauteng P2 V1: Candidates found the paper difficult. Essay writing was a particular problem.

KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga P1 V2: Candidates found the paper difficult. The part-time candidates do not seem to be able to cope without proper teaching.

Gauteng P1 V2: Candidates found the paper difficult.

15.7 Findings and suggestions

Moderators were doing a sterling job, and it was clear that the training was having the desired effect. Both moderated and unmoderated scripts had to be moderated in order to monitor the standard of internal moderation at various levels.

Western Cape P1 and 2 V1: Internal moderators should also be moderating to provide an additional level of moderation, and to verify the moderation of the chief marker.

15.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The papers were fair.

Gauteng P2 V1: Marks were adjusted upwards because it was believed there were too many paragraph questions in the paper and this had disadvantaged the candidates.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape	P1 V1	20 bundles	20-24	25
Gauteng		40 (random)	40	22
KwaZulu-Natal		40 (random)	40	22
Limpopo		240	40	22
Northern Cape		10 bundles	22	25
Gauteng	P2 V1	20	20	20
Northern Cape		10 bundles	22	25
KwaZulu-Natal	P1 V2	40	40	8
Mpumalanga		20	20	8

Gauteng	P2 V2	20	20	8
Western Cape	P1 and 2 V1	20 + 20	40	25
North West	P1 and 2 V1	20 + 20	40	25

16 MATHEMATICAL LITERACY PAPERS 1 AND 2

Centralised and on-site moderation

16.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was generally adhered to. Provision had been made for alternative responses in the marking memorandum.

Limpopo (P2): The paper was not properly adhered to and variations from -4 to +10 were found in 50% of the scripts.

Eastern Cape P1: A few instances were discovered in the sample where markers and moderators did not adhere to the memorandum.

16.2 Consistency and accuracy

A fair amount of consistency and accuracy in the marking was found.

KwaZulu-Natal P1: The external moderator was not happy with the consistency and accuracy of the marking. Twenty discrepancies were found in 10 scripts that had already been moderated.

Limpopo P1: There were also some inaccuracies in the calculation of marks. Problems were still being experienced with CA.

16.3 Quality and standard of marking

Marking was generally of a good standard. There was generally a smaller variation in marks than in the past.

Limpopo P2: This province was the exception, as more marking errors were made.

Eastern Cape P1: Marking was rated as average. Seven errors were found in four scripts, 80% of them due to non-adherence to the memo. Two of the scripts were error-free.

KwaZulu-Natal P1: The quality of marking was very poor and moderation revealed many errors. It appeared that norms for the appointment of mathematics markers were not adhered to.

16.4 Internal moderation

It was clear that moderation was being done and the levels could be distinguished.

Northern Cape: An instruction was given by the CES (Examinations) that all scripts had to be re-marked when moderating. This would be addressed.

Limpopo: The moderation by senior markers and deputy chief markers was not satisfactory.

Eastern Cape P1: The chief marker and deputy chief marker were sometimes simply shadow-marking and failing to spot errors.

KwaZulu-Natal: Internal moderation was not done well. Many errors were discovered after internal moderation. Apparently promotion depends on experience, not expertise.

16.5 Unfair questions

No unfair questions and no errors were found in the paper.

16.6 Candidates' performance

In the samples submitted, Limpopo and Mpumalanga performed just below the average of 52,9% in P1. Northern Cape achieved the highest percentage.

In P2 Eastern Cape performed well below the average, while Western Cape performed best.

16.7 Findings and suggestions

More attention should be paid to consistent accuracy in marking during memorandum discussions, and this should be applied at the marking centres.

Northern Cape applies re-marking instead of verification at moderation.

With the exception of Limpopo, adherence to the memorandum was of a good standard.

Eastern Cape P1: The training of chief markers was inadequate, and the appointment of deputy chief markers has to be revisited.

Some provinces should install a system by means of which an external moderator can distinguish at which level moderation is taking place.

16.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question paper was fair and those students who had prepared coped with the questions.

Amount of external moderation done

P1: 125 moderated

P2: 115 moderated.

KwaZulu-Natal: No. of scripts received:	16
No of scripts moderated:	10
Limpopo: No. of scripts received:	20
No of scripts moderated:	20
Time spent:	15 min per script.

17 MATHEMATICS P1 AND P2

17.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

In some cases the marking memorandum was not adhered to, and correct answers were marked wrong and vice versa. However, no changes were made to the memorandum.

Eastern Cape P2: Serious discrepancies in marking and moderation were found where one marker and one moderator were making serious mistakes. The external moderator contacted the internal moderator at the marking centre, and they discussed the scripts telephonically. It later appeared that the batch sent had been extracted from the first batch of marking, and that the marking had later improved.

North West P2: The scripts arrived for centralised moderation with a list of alternative answers that had been accepted. However, one of these answers was totally wrong. The external moderator immediately faxed an urgent note to the centre to warn against accepting this incorrect solution.

Gauteng P1: The marker responsible for marking Q1 was not adhering to the memorandum and not applying CA marking consistently. This was brought to the attention of the chief marker.

Western Cape and Gauteng P2, Northern Cape P1 and P2, Free State P2: The external moderator believed that the memorandum was too strict and that the able candidates were being penalised for leaving out steps when they could work out the calculations in their heads. However, he had been outvoted at the memorandum discussion in the interests of a simpler memorandum.

Free State P1: Markers marked consistently according to the marking guidelines.

KwaZulu-Natal P1: In 10 scripts 20 variations were found. Fifty-five per cent of these were mostly due to failure to adhere to the memorandum. This reflects poorly on the level of training that had taken place.

Mpumalanga P2: Ten errors were found in four scripts.

17.2 Consistency and accuracy

Generally, the marking was consistent and accurate.

Western Cape P1: In the three scripts that were thoroughly re-marked, nine errors were found. There various reasons for these discrepancies. Q3.2 was poorly marked.

Western Cape and Gauteng P2: There was a high level of consistency in the awarding of marks. The external moderator differed with 1 or 2 marks out of 150.

Northern Cape P1 and 2: Marking was consistent and accurate. There were no significant variations.

Mpumalanga P2: The chief marker and senior markers were marking accurately.

Mpumalanga P1: Markers were marking consistently, but were not accurate in the allocation of marks.

17.3 Quality and standard of marking

Few errors were found in the marking. The marking was rated good to excellent.

Gauteng P1: A full day had been spent on training, and the marking was going well.

Western Cape P1: Quality of marking was found to be average. There were errors in marking.

North West P1: In four papers moderated, 10 errors were found.

Mpumalanga P2: The marking was average. A senior marker was found not to be able to adequately handle a solution that was not in the marking memorandum. This reflects poorly on the quality of the pre-marking training that had taken place. Sixty per cent of errors found were a result of not adhering to the agreed marking memorandum. In two instances markers awarded marks for completely wrong answers.

Mpumalanga P1: Marking was average.

17.4 Internal moderation

Western Cape P1: Internal moderation was found to be average.

Northern Cape P1 and P2: Very few differences were found between the marks awarded by the internal and the external moderators.

Eastern Cape P2: The standard of marking was lower than that of the other provinces moderated so far. At the beginning of the session internal moderation should be particularly strict.

KwaZulu-Natal P1: As many as nine errors in two scripts were overlooked by the deputy chief markers.

North West P1: Internal moderation was average.

Mpumalanga P2: Internal moderation was average.

Mpumalanga P1: Internal moderation was poor. In four scripts nine errors were found, eight of which had been made by the senior markers.

Free State P1: Internal moderation was good.

17.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions, or questions with errors in them.

North West P2: It appeared that there was a better spread of marks than in past years, which proved that there were sufficient level-1 questions.

Mpumalanga P2: The question paper in this province differed from the one issued by DBE. The diagram in Q6 was absent, so candidates were disadvantaged. After widespread consultation, it was agreed that 11/24 marks would not be marked and the percentage mark would be calculated using the reduced total, namely, 139.

17.6 Candidates' performance

No comment.

17.7 Findings and suggestions

Western Cape P1: The training of senior markers was inadequate, although more care needs to be taken.

KwaZulu-Natal P1: Markers who applied to mark Mathematics P1 had to send in their solutions to the problems in the question paper. Accordingly, only 150 out of 338 applicants responded. It was not clear, however, whether these solutions were put to any further use, or whether markers' performance had been used to allocate markers to particular questions. Their placement appeared to be totally random.

Northern Cape P1 and P2: The external moderator could make his own selection of scripts and moderated a wide selection.

Mpumalanga P1: The poor moderation reflected negatively on the training done. More attention should be paid to the selection of senior markers in the province.

Free State P1: Marking in this province was well on track.

18 MATHEMATICS P3

18.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The chief marker and the internal moderator understood the memo properly and ensured that markers adhered to it. Detailed alternative answers were provided.

Eastern Cape: Because the Eastern Cape did not send representatives to the memo discussion, their scripts were marked in Gauteng.

Free State: The internal moderator and chief marker marked all the scripts themselves.

Western Cape: There were no significant inconsistencies in adherence to the memorandum. In most cases markers were able to recognise alternative answers and award marks accordingly.

Northern Cape: The papers submitted to Umalusi were marked by the chief marker and the internal moderator only. The chief marker appeared not to grasp the memorandum very well.

Limpopo: The chief marker and the internal moderator ensured that markers adhered to the marking memorandum.

18.2 Consistency and accuracy

The awarding of marks was consistent and accurate, and where a marker made mistakes, these were immediately rectified by the moderators.

Free State: CA or follow-up marking sometimes gave problems.

Northern Cape: The variance between the chief marker and the internal moderator was far too great.

18.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was found to be excellent. Markers understood the memorandum and moderation rectified any minor errors.

Northern Cape: The marking was average. The memorandum was not applied consistently throughout by the chief marker.

18.4 Internal moderation

There was clear evidence of thorough moderation across all levels.

Northern Cape: Internal moderation was competently done, and the errors made by the chief marker were corrected.

Mpumalanga: Internal moderation was very competently done.

18.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

18.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair. Candidates struggled with higher-order questions and proofs.

Eastern Cape: A sample of 20 scripts was sent through. The highest mark was 98%, while 13% failed. The lowest mark was 10%.

Free State: A sample of 20 scripts was sent through. The highest mark was 92%, while 20% failed. The lowest mark was 17%.

Western Cape: A sample of 20 scripts was sent through. The highest mark was 86%, while 20% failed. The lowest mark was 13%.

Gauteng: A sample of 20 scripts was sent through. The highest mark was 94%, while 15% failed. The lowest mark was 10%.

Northern Cape: A sample of 20 scripts was sent. The highest mark was 93%, while 15% failed. The lowest mark was 14%.

North West: A sample of 20 scripts was received. The highest mark was 75%, while 25% failed. The lowest mark was 21%.

Mpumalanga: A sample of 20 scripts was sent in. The highest mark was 92%, while 5% failed. The lowest mark was 18%.

Limpopo: Of the sample of 20 scripts that was sent in, the highest mark was 94%, while 15% failed. The lowest mark was 22%.

KwaZulu-Natal: 20 scripts were sent for moderation. The highest mark was 94%, no candidates failed, and the lowest mark was 30%.

18.7 Findings and suggestions

The standard of moderation was high.

The question paper adequately assessed the core assessment standards.

Markers do not apply CA marking consistently. The geometry should be marked by experienced markers.

Western Cape: The scripts that were submitted for moderation were picked from only two examination centres.

Northern Cape: Senior markers must apply the memorandum meticulously.

18.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question paper was fair and the marking was good. The cognitive level of the paper was in keeping with the SAG.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Eastern Cape	3	20	8	15
Free State		20	20	15
Gauteng		20	5	15
Western Cape		20	5	15
Northern Cape		20	6	15
North West		20	5	15
Mpumalanga		20	5	15
Limpopo		20	5	15
KwaZulu-Natal		20	5	15

19 PHYSICAL SCIENCES PAPER 1 AND 2

19.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

The maximum difference in mark allocation between markers through to the external moderator was 2 to 4 marks (P2). Where alternatives were required they had been provided at the national memo discussion. The senior markers and internal moderator understood and applied the memorandum.

KwaZulu-Natal (P1): Of the 15 papers moderated, only three did not have their marks changed.

North West P2: There was a very slight difference between the marks awarded by markers and those awarded by moderators – just 1 mark.

19.2 Consistency and accuracy

There was a satisfactory level of accuracy and consistency in the allocation of marks. No changes were made to the memo at the marking centre.

19.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was found to be good to excellent. There was a high level of consistency, with the variance being insignificant.

Gauteng: The marking of P2 was excellent.

Northern Cape: The marking of P1 was excellent.

19.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation was mostly effective.

Western Cape: Errors were identified and corrected.

Mpumalanga: Errors were identified and corrected.

Eastern Cape P2: Internal moderation was competently done and errors were identified and corrected.

19.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions.

19.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was found to be fair. The average mark per question per province, per sample of 20 scripts provided (P2), exceeded 50% except in Q5, 6, 7, 9 and 11. The external moderator predicts that this pattern will be similar in the rest of the provinces. The average candidate who had prepared for this examination was justly rewarded.

19.7 Findings and suggestions

A few errors in marking were pointed out for the internal moderators in the Western Cape, Eastern Cape, Free State, Limpopo, Mpumalanga, and North West to take note of.

Internal moderation ensured that the memorandum was adhered to. Better training also led to a better understanding of the contents of the memorandum.

19.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The papers were fair and marking was good. All candidates completed the papers. The general performance according to the sample was better than the previous year.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Gauteng	1	15	15	7
	2	20	11	30
KwaZulu-Natal	1	15	15	9
Northern Cape	1	15	15	9
Western Cape	2	20	5	30
Limpopo	2	20	11	30
North West	2	20	5	30
Mpumalanga	2	20	5	30
Free State	2	20	5	30
Eastern Cape	2	20	5	30

20 SESOTHO HOME LANGUAGE PAPER 1

20.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The marking memorandum was adhered to.

Free State and Gauteng: Errors in marking were discovered.

NB: The marking memorandum sent to the provinces did not have all the alternatives decided on at the memo discussion. Therefore, a new copy had to be sent, but this one, too, did not have all the alternatives. The use of both the old (incorrect) memorandum

and the new (also incorrect) memorandum was subsequently authorised by the external moderator.

20.2 Consistency and accuracy

Markers were alert and meticulous, and marking was consistent. Marks were handled with accuracy.

KwaZulu-Natal: Marking was found to be inconsistent and there were many inaccuracies in the totalling of marks.

20.3 Quality and standard of marking

The standard of marking ranged from average (KwaZulu-Natal) to excellent (Free State and North West)

20.4 Internal moderation

There was evidence of internal moderation and the internal moderators were present throughout.

20.5 Unfair questions

Three errors were picked up in P1. Learners' responses were accepted.

20.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair. They did fairly well in the comprehension test, but the summary and language questions posed problems for most candidates.

20.7 Findings and suggestions

It is important that the internal moderator moderate scripts that have already been moderated by the senior markers in order to verify that they are being meticulous in their moderation.

Careful supervision would have to be maintained over the marking of the summary.

20.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The paper was fair and the marking accurate.

KwaZulu-Natal: Adjust upwards with 5 raw marks. It was found that 13 of the 15 externally moderated scripts were marked too low.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Free State	1	15	9	15-20
Gauteng		14	14	20
KwaZulu-Natal		20	15	20
North West		12	7	15-20

21 SETSWANA HOME LANGUAGE P1, 2 AND 3

21.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The approved marking memorandum was used, but there were some inconsistencies with open-ended questions and markers experienced difficulties marking these. As provision had been made for alternative answers at the memo discussion, no changes to the marking memorandum were effected at the marking centre, except to provide alternative phraseology with the same meaning.

21.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marks were awarded consistently, except in the case of open-ended questions. Markers tended to be lenient regarding spelling mistakes.

21.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good. Marks were correctly totalled and transferred. In some cases subtotals were written in the right-hand margin, which caused a little confusion. The sampled scripts showed compliance with the memorandum. Different coloured pens were used to signify different levels of marking and moderation. Markers at all the centres had problems marking open-ended questions and the summary, as learners' responses had to be interpreted and not merely marked strictly according to the memorandum.

21.4 Internal moderation

Different coloured pens were used so the distinction between moderation levels was easy. Where marks differed it was by 1 to 3. The internal moderator re-marked the entire script. Northern Cape P1: The problem of consistency was solved by allowing senior markers to "specialise" in moderating certain questions.

21.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions. Questions were within the syllabus, and at appropriate level.

21.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair. Performance across the exam centres was fairly consistent.

21.7 Findings and suggestions

Internal moderation was thorough, although not all chief markers and markers were equally accurate.

North West P1: External moderation revealed some errors, mainly with open-ended questions.

21.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The question paper was fair and the spread of marks was appropriate.

Amount of moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Free State	HL P1	10	10	30
Northern Cape	HL P1	10	10	30
North West	HL P1	20	20	25
Gauteng	HL P2	10	10	30

22 SISWATI HOME LANGUAGE AND FAL PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

22.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

There was no deviation from the approved marking memorandum and no changes were made at the marking centre, as provision had been made for alternative answers at the memo discussion.

22.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marks were awarded consistently, and the totalling and transferral of marks, having been corrected by the examination assistants, were accurate. No changes were made to the memorandum at the marking centre.

22.3 Quality and standard of marking

Marking was rated as “good”. The sampled scripts showed compliance with the memorandum. Marking and totalling were done correctly.

22.4 Internal moderation

There was only one marker for the six HL and 23 FAL scripts, so there was no internal moderation.

22.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions. All questions were within the syllabus and at the appropriate level for Grade 12.

22.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' experience of the paper was rated as “fair”. Those who had prepared were able to answer the questions pitched at the higher cognitive levels. Some performed very well in the comprehension section. Q5 (language) gave the learners problems.

22.7 Findings and suggestions

This was a good, challenging paper. The panel was doing a good job.

22.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The candidates' performance was a true reflection of their ability. The paper was fair and they were not disadvantaged in any way. All learners completed the paper.

No. of scripts received for moderation:	31
No of scripts moderated:	12
Time spent per script:	15 min.

23 TOURISM

Northern Cape

23.1 Adherence to marking memorandum

There was no deviation from the marking memorandum. During the memorandum discussion alternative answers were added.

23.2 Consistency and accuracy

The allocation of marks and marking was accurate. No changes to the memorandum were made at the marking centre.

23.3 Quality and standard of marking

The marking of the sample submitted was done very well.

23.4 Internal moderation

There was very little variation among the markers, internal moderator and external moderator, an indication that good work was being done.

23.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions. Any ambiguities were removed at the memo discussion.

23.6 Candidates' performance

No patterns emerged that could point to whether candidates found the paper fair or difficult.

23.7 Findings and suggestions

All markers should be aware that the use of Tippex is prohibited at marking centres. Markers could not always identify whether an answer that was presented in other words to those in the memorandum was correct or not.

23.8 Adjustment of marks

With such a small sample a valid opinion could not be expressed.

Amount of external moderation done

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Northern Cape		20	20	25

24 TSHIVENDA HOME LANGUAGE PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

24.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

There was no deviation from the approved marking memorandum and no changes were made at the marking centre. Provision had been made for alternative answers at the memo discussion.

24.2 Consistency and accuracy

Marks were awarded consistently, and the totalling and transfer of marks was accurate. Marks were awarded according to the number of ticks on the paper. There were no changes to the memorandum at the marking centre.

Limpopo P2: A change was effected at the marking centre. During the marking session it was discovered that learners who answered the two novels, Tshi do lilwa (Q7) and Bulayo lo talifhaho (Q9) were awarded insufficient marks when awarded 1 mark per tick. Learners who answered Mafeladambwa (Q11), on the other hand, had fewer points but got more marks because it was agreed at the DBE memo discussion that 2 marks would be awarded per point given because the book had fewer points. A resolution was taken by the external moderator, after discussing the issue with the internal moderator and the chief marker, that learners should be awarded 2 marks per point in all the books, so as not to disadvantage any of them.

These changes were communicated to the Gauteng province, chief marker and internal moderator. The marking of this question went well with no challenges being experienced in either Gauteng or Limpopo.

24.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was good. The sampled scripts showed compliance with the memorandum. Marking and totalling were done correctly.

Limpopo P2: Marking was found to be good to excellent.

24.4 Internal moderation

Internal moderation was diligently done.

24.5 Unfair questions

There were no unfair questions. All questions were within the syllabus and at the appropriate level for Grade 12.

24.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was found to be fair. Those who had prepared were able to answer the questions pitched at higher cognitive levels. Some performed very well in the comprehension section (P1).

24.7 Findings and suggestions

This was a good, challenging paper (P1). The marking and internal moderation were good.

Whole-script moderation should be done to get a better idea of the candidates' ability.

24.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The candidates' performance was a true reflection of their ability. The paper was fair and they were not disadvantaged in any way.

Amount of moderation done: Tshivenda

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Gauteng	HL P1	245	22	30
Limpopo		245	20	30
Mpumalanga		40	20	15
Gauteng	HL P2			
Limpopo		61	21	30
Limpopo	HL P3		20	30

25 XITSONGA HOME LANGUAGE PAPERS 1, 2 AND 3

25.1 Adherence to the marking memorandum

The original memorandum was used and no alterations were made. Provision had been made for alternative answers at the memo discussion. Markers adhered to this memo during marking.

25.2 Consistency and accuracy

The use of ticks maintained consistency. Calculations were accurate. No changes were made to the memorandum at the marking centre and the decisions made at the memo discussion were upheld.

25.3 Quality and standard of marking

The quality and standard of marking was found to be good and complied with the memorandum. Care had to be taken with alternative answers.

25.4 Internal moderation

There was evidence of moderation. Different coloured pens were used. Errors corrected earlier were not repeated.

25.5 Unfair questions

Questions were fair and within the curriculum. Nevertheless, candidates had to be well prepared.

Limpopo P1: Q5 was open to misinterpretation.

25.6 Candidates' performance

Candidates' performance was fair. Those who had not prepared fared badly.

Gauteng P2: Out of a sample of five one was rated "good", two "fair", and two "poor". Problems appeared to have been experienced with Sections B and C.

25.7 Findings and suggestions

The examination was fair, but candidates performed poorly. Some did not do the summary (P1). Most performed poorly in the language section.

Educators should be offered workshops on teaching these sections properly.

Findings at the marking centre should be cascaded down to teachers.

Limpopo P3: The moderator had to ensure that candidates were not penalised twice, and markers were able to distinguish between language and content.

25.8 Adjustment of marks

Raw marks. The paper was fair, but it is thought that learners are not taking their home language seriously.

Amount of moderation done: Xitsonga

Province	Paper	No of scripts		Time spent on each script (min)
		received	moderated	
Gauteng	1	137	20	23
	2	137	20	23
Limpopo	1	10	10	15
	2	5	5	20
	3	5	5	20

ADDENDUM 5

MONITORING OF THE CONDUCT OF THE EXAMINATION

(To be read in conjunction with chapter 5 of the main report)

5.1 EXAMINATION CENTRES

Most of the criteria for conducting the examination were met, and only the criteria that were not met are listed below.

5.1.1 General management of the examination

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
Eastern Cape	<p>At Keiskammahoek circuit office, where question papers were stored before distribution to the schools, there was no security, guards, burglar proofing or strong room, and only one senior accounting officer to handle the distribution.</p> <p>All question papers were received in time and were sealed in their packages.</p> <p>Fifty per cent of the schools kept irregularity files. Others did not make copies of the irregularity reports sent to the District Office.</p> <p>At some schools candidates had to remain in the examination room until the end of the session, and in others they were allowed to leave after an hour.</p> <p>All chief invigilators were principals, and had been appointed in writing.</p>
Free State	<p>At three centres (Iphateleng, Libertas and Harmony Bridging) question papers were stored in steel cabinets in the administration blocks before the commencement of the examinations. This was not secure enough.</p> <p>At all but 11 of the centres, more officials than chief invigilators had access to examination material, which was a security risk.</p> <p>At Harriston and Harmony Bridging, the appointment of chief invigilators and invigilators was not confirmed in writing. At Harmony Bridging the invigilators were not trained.</p> <p>At Ithabeleng, Steynsrus and Tikwane, question papers were signed for on arrival, but not checked.</p> <p>Iphateleng, Calculus and Libertas did not keep records of examination material/stationery.</p> <p>There were no standardised procedures in place for dealing with unregistered candidates.</p> <p>Respondents did not know how to deal with candidates who had changed levels or subjects.</p> <p>At Harriston, candidates who arrived more than 30 minutes late were not allowed to write, nor were they allowed to do so at Harmony Bridging.</p>

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
	<p>There was no uniformity regarding the amount of time after which candidates were allowed to leave the examination centre.</p> <p>There were no contingency plans in place to deal with crises or disruptions at Harmony Bridging, Matseripe, lphateleng, Nanabolela, Nkgopoleng or Tikwane.</p>
Gauteng	<p>Appointment letters for chief invigilators could not be produced in a few centres, but this was fewer than 5%.</p> <p>There were no serious irregularities, but there were a few technical ones, which would be officially reported in due course once investigations have been finalised by the province.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Charlestown did not have access control.</p> <p>In many centres measures to deal with crises had not been well thought out. Many had evacuation plans in place but no drills had taken place.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Some schools, especially those visited in October and the beginning of November, e.g. Nakgwadi, Hlomela and Nkateko, had not yet received plastic satchels for packaging scripts.</p> <p>Measures for dealing with crises were not very explicit at some schools.</p> <p>DBE schools did not keep attendance registers for invigilators.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Examination centres did not have contingency plans in place for any crises.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Owing to unrest in the JT Gaetsewe District, about 391 candidates from 10 schools were removed to another district to write the exam. Accordingly, they were bussed to examination centres every day from the Warrenton Cultural Resort. A large group from one school wrote in the hall at the cultural resort.</p> <p>Some security measures were in place, although some were better than others, at all schools except Port Nolloth, where there were no security measures at all.</p> <p>At Concordia High all members of the management team had access to the space where the question papers were stored.</p> <p>There were no guards at Warrenton Primary. Although some arrived later, they had not been trained.</p> <p>At Paballelo High the chief invigilator had not received an appointment in writing.</p> <p>At Thlwahalang High the replacement for the principal, who had been suspended, had not been properly trained.</p> <p>At the intervention centres (Warrenton), external invigilators were used, but their training was insufficient.</p> <p>At Thlwahalang High seating plans were not displayed, and things were chaotic on the day of the visit.</p> <p>At Warrenton Primary there was no examination manual in the file.</p> <p>At Martin Oosthuizen High question papers were received from the District Office only 15 minutes before the commencement of the examination on the first day.</p> <p>It would appear that adequate arrangements had been made for learners with special needs.</p>

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
	Some schools had contingency plans in place.
North West	All arrangements were in order.
Western Cape	The examination timetable was prominently displayed. Question papers were stored safely with limited access. Chief invigilators were trained in September. Internal and external invigilators were used, the latter being trained locally. A stock register of examination material was kept.

5.1.2 The examination room – general

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
Eastern Cape	At Lukhanyiso High the centre number and start/finish times were not displayed. Internal and external invigilators were used, but neither of the two groups wore any form of identification.
Free State	The locations of the examination rooms were not indicated at Sasamala, Libertas, Taung, Winburg, Matseripe, Iphateleng, Nanabolela, Calculus, Nkgopoleng and Harmony Bridging. At Seotlong and Tikwane noise levels were high at the end of the school day. The centre numbers were not displayed at Harriston, Harmony Bridging, and Steynsrus. Start/finish times were not displayed at Moriting-wa-Thuto, Ithabeleng, Steynsrus, and Tikwane.
Gauteng	At a few centres the location of the examination rooms was not indicated – fewer than 30%.
KwaZulu-Natal	The location of examination rooms was not indicated at most of the centres.
Limpopo	At Mpandeli one examination room had a terrible smell caused by mites in the roof.
Mpumalanga	At Secunda there were computer charts all over the walls.
Northern Cape	Arrangements for communication between the invigilator on duty and the chief invigilator were not satisfactory.
North West	Directions to the examination rooms were not indicated at any of the centres, for various reasons. Few centres had thought comprehensively about contingency plans in case of crises. Some centres in Bojanala and Dr RS Mompoti districts were in disrepair and not suitable to be used as examination venues.
Western Cape	Outside candidates were not directed to the examination rooms, but had to report at reception and be escorted to the examination room. The examination rooms were in order.

5.1.3 The examination room – seating of candidates

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
KwaZulu-Natal	At Sesiwabonga High the computers were very close to each other. Guidance was given that the centre should rather make use of two sessions in future, with the isolation procedure being followed. At Sarel Cilliers a candidate had to be relocated to another place because she experienced problems with her computer five minutes before the end of the session.
Mpumalanga	At Letshele computers were too close together and the tables/desks did not have side flaps.
Northern Cape	At some schools the seating arrangements were not displayed and this led to chaos.
North West	At Motswedi High School the tables were too close together due to lack of sufficient classrooms to accommodate the large number of candidates.
Western Cape	Seating plans were pasted up outside the venues so there could be no confusion. Seating was in numerical order as on the mark sheets.

5.1.4 Prior to the commencement of the examination

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
Eastern Cape	The identification of candidates was not consistent across examination centres. This should be attended to. In other respects the regulations were followed.
Free State	IDs and examination permits were not checked at Mamello, Harriston and Ithabeleng. At Tikwane examination permits only were checked.
Gauteng	Some chief invigilators allowed mobile phones into the examination venues but with the proviso that they be switched off completely. Others did not allow cell phones at all in the examination rooms.
KwaZulu-Natal	Cell phones were not allowed in the examination room at some centres, while at others they were allowed in, with candidates being told to switch them off.
Limpopo	At the rural schools invigilators did not check whether all candidates had the right question paper. At the rural schools candidates did not go through the question paper page by page to check for technical errors or blank pages.
Mpumalanga	At two centres candidates arrived late but were treated according to the rules. There appeared to be a great deal of confusion about who was supposed to present identification documents, and whether it was required of full-time candidates as well.
Northern Cape	Various strategies were employed regarding the checking of candidates' identity documents, and some chief invigilators appeared not to be fully informed about the requirements. For example, at Aggeneys High the chief invigilator did not know that candidates had to complete affidavits if they

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
	<p>arrived without identification.</p> <p>The ratio of invigilators to candidates was maintained except at Warrenton High where the ratios varied among 1:41, 1:35 and 1:47. It was recommended that three more invigilators be appointed.</p> <p>At Warrenton Primary one invigilator had his cell phone on and received a call while invigilating. This was reported to the chief invigilator.</p> <p>Rules were read out to candidates at most schools before the commencement of the examination, but not at Warrenton Primary.</p> <p>The whereabouts of the examination rooms were not displayed at NababEEP High and Garies in the interests of security.</p> <p>At Tlhwalang High the examination rooms were not cleaned regularly, and at Veritas the room where candidates did their Engineering Graphics and Design drawings was very hot with inadequate ventilation and no ceiling fans.</p> <p>At Port Nolloth, Garies and Loeriesfontein the toilet facilities were dirty and smelly.</p> <p>At Warrenton Primary there was no clock, and start–finish times and the centre number were not displayed.</p>
North West	<p>The policy on identification of candidates is not uniformly understood and different practices were found. At some centres they were adamant that the policy applied to part-time candidates only.</p>
Western Cape	<p>The use of name tags for invigilators was not universal.</p> <p>Invigilators were on duty at least 30 minutes before the start of the session.</p> <p>As in other provinces, there was inconsistency in the requirements for identification of candidates.</p> <p>No cell phones were allowed on the person of candidates.</p>

5.1.5 Writing of the examination

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
Eastern Cape	<p>Correct procedures were followed.</p> <p>Invigilators collected scripts at the desks, except at Lukhanyiso High where candidates handed in at the desk and the cover page was checked.</p>
Free State	<p>At Mamello, Ithabeleng, Steynsrus and Tikwane, candidates were not instructed to verify that they were writing the correct paper.</p> <p>At Nkgopoleng candidates were given between 5 and 23 minutes reading time.</p> <p>IDs and examination permits were not displayed at Harriston, Harmony Bridging and Ithabeleng. At Libertas, Moriting-wa-Thuto, Mamello, Iphateleng and Nanabolela only permits were displayed. At Tikwane only one out of five displayed their ID and at Matsripe one out of 35 did not display their ID.</p> <p>At nine centres daily reports were not prepared, and at seven centres they were only prepared when there were irregularities or something extraordinary to report.</p> <p>Steynsrus, Tikwane, Iphateleng, Libertas and Taung did not have irregularity registers.</p>
Gauteng	<p>There were no serious irregularities reported during this period, except for a few technical ones which would be reported after they had been discussed at a full National Meeting on 18 December 2012. A full report on the irregularities would be forwarded to the Umalusi offices electronically, soon after the meeting.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>At some centres some of the activities, such as checking whether candidates had the correct question papers and checking the filling in of the answer books, were omitted.</p> <p>At some centres a daily report was completed and returned to a nodal point only if there had been an incident.</p>
Limpopo	<p>On 5 December 2012 it was very hot in Vhembe District and, as a result, the principal at Mpandeli High School provided big fans in each examination room to reduce the heat. Two candidates had to receive first aid but were able to continue writing.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Most chief invigilators did not page through the question papers with the candidates to detect any technical errors.</p> <p>There appeared to be contradictory instructions regarding reading time, so that some centres allowed 10 minutes and others 15 minutes.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>At Tlhwalang High the correctness of the paper was not checked with the candidates.</p> <p>At Warrenton Primary almost no reading time was given, due to the inexperience of invigilators. At Port Nolloth 20 minutes was allowed instead of 10.</p> <p>At Okiep High one invigilator sat down for quite a while. At Warrenton Primary an invigilator used a cell phone while invigilating, and at FJ Smit Combined School the chief invigilator occupied himself with administrative work instead of assisting the invigilator in a venue where 50 candidates were writing.</p>

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
	<p>At Tlhwahalang High there were several scripts the cover page of which had not been filled in after the scripts had been collected.</p> <p>Also at Tlhwahalang High, candidates started leaving as soon as their scripts had been collected. The monitor requested that they be brought back and that the correct procedure be followed.</p> <p>In some districts daily reports were submitted, while in others reports were submitted at the end of each week.</p> <p>At Warrenton Primary invigilators were unfamiliar with procedures for handling irregularities. Retraining was requested and was carried out.</p> <p>There were several technical irregularities, but in each case the candidates were permitted to write and the incidents were reported to the examination section.</p>
North West	<p>There was no clarity or uniformity on how long the reading time should be, and what could not be done during this reading time.</p> <p>Reports were only sent to the PDE when there was an incident or irregularity to report.</p> <p>Schools neglected to record technical or administrative irregularities.</p>
Western Cape	<p>An interesting innovation was the register to be signed by two candidates, verifying that the correct package of question papers had been brought to the examination room.</p> <p>Papers were checked for technical errors.</p> <p>Ten minutes' reading time was allowed throughout.</p> <p>Verbal guidance was given for the completion of the cover pages of candidates' scripts.</p>

5.1.6 Packaging and transmission of answer scripts

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
Eastern Cape	All regulations were followed.
Free State	<p>At three of the centres unused examination material/stationery was collected by the departmental official and taken back to the district office.</p> <p>At the remaining 18 they were kept at the centre.</p>

5.1.7 Monitoring

Province	Findings: Criteria not met
Free State	At Harriston, Harmony Bridging, Libertas, Ithabeleng, Tikwane, Winburg and Matseripe, there was no evidence to show that any monitoring had taken place.
Limpopo	There were no entries in the irregularity registers.
Mpumalanga	Monitors appeared not to have been trained.
Northern Cape	Most centres received visits from monitors, but their efficiency was questioned. At Aggeneys High four monitors had visited the centre without pointing out the obvious shortcomings discovered by the external monitor. At Warrenton Primary it had not been picked up that the invigilators were inadequately trained. A register of monitors' visits was not commonly in use, and it was suggested that this be kept.
North West	Monitoring of examinations by the district was not consistent. At the beginning of the examination monitoring was slack. Monitors seldom arrived in time for the beginning of the session.
Western Cape	Monitoring was more common at some centres than at others. Monitors were required to sign a register.

5.2 MONITORING OF MARKING

5.2.1 Planning for marking

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	There were 15 marking centres in the province, of which 11 were monitored. Marking centres were located in schools and former colleges of education. In many cases markers were accommodated on the premises. Classrooms were used for marking and the hall or another facility as a control room. The offices were also used. A manual, "Managing marking centres", was used and all the centres were managed according to this manual. At some centres the marking memoranda were delivered late.
Free State	All the centres had different plans on different aspects of what had to be planned for. All the centres followed the provincial marking model. The model was used because it ensured easy control and minimised risk. The centres had appropriate measures in place to support the marking model. Marking commenced as planned at all the centres.

Province	Findings
	All the centres received marking guidelines before the commencement of marking.
Gauteng	<p>All centres visited by Umalusi monitors had well typed-out plans for marking. The Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) centres followed the Provincial Marking Model.</p> <p>Some of the aspects contained in the plan were training of examiners, appointment of markers, marking procedures, transferring of marks and understanding irregularities.</p> <p>No marker was allowed to mark the scripts of their own centre.</p> <p>Chief markers kept lists of all markers.</p> <p>Control was very strict.</p> <p>The GDE followed the staggered method of marking and there were ten marking centres.</p> <p>The GDE drew its markers from within the boundaries of Gauteng.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>The centres had marking plans in place.</p> <p>Marking was done at 28 decentralised marking centres. All the papers were marked in the same time period.</p>
Limpopo	<p>The marking process for the 2012 NSC examination scripts was managed in two sessions. The first session commenced on 17 November 2012 and continued to 28 November 2012.</p> <p>During this session marking took place at two centres, namely, Tivumbeni for marking scripts for Mathematics P1 and Mathematical Literacy P1 and at Makhado for Agricultural Sciences P1 and P2.</p> <p>The second session started on 1 December 2012 and ended on 12 December 2012 at all the twenty centres.</p> <p>Each centre was allocated one or more subjects depending on the number of entries for each subject.</p> <p>All marking centres had a marking plan in place supplied by the provincial department of education, indicating how marking should be managed</p> <p>Limpopo province had 20 marking centres and different subjects were allocated to each centre. One of the 20 centres was allocated to the marking of ABET Level 4 scripts for all learning areas (Northern Academy). Scripts were marked at these centres only and nowhere else.</p> <p>All the centres had communication systems in place and accommodation for markers.</p> <p>All staff at the marking centre, rooms/halls for the marking of scripts, storerooms and suitable furniture were used for both administration and marking.</p> <p>All marking centres ensured through the chief markers that, when allocating scripts to markers and senior markers, teachers did not mark scripts from their own schools.</p> <p>The main marking session was planned to start on 1 December 2012 and to end on 12 December 2012.</p> <p>On 1 December 2012 scripts arrived after 14h00 at Ben Viljoen and Settlers, but markers were able to do the work scheduled for the day.</p> <p>Marking memoranda were available to chief markers on the day</p>

Province	Findings
	<p>scheduled for memorandum discussions for deputy and senior markers.</p> <p>All marking centres were given memoranda on 2 December 2012 in order to train deputy chief markers and senior markers, and on 3 December 2012 the markers were given memoranda and were trained.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Of the 18 marking centres, 14 were monitored. Two of the sites were used for ABET.</p> <p>The marking centres were well organised by the PDE and were housed at schools and former colleges of education.</p> <p>Hostel accommodation at Dr CN Mahlangu FET College was not appropriate, as there were problems with water and geysers and the accommodation was not in regular use.</p> <p>All plans were in place.</p> <p>Appointment of markers, senior markers, and examination assistants commenced in August.</p> <p>No more than 600 markers were permitted per venue.</p> <p>Dietary needs were provided for.</p> <p>Daily attendance registers were kept.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>The marking centres were located at three schools in Kimberley which made easy management possible.</p> <p>Arrangements were set out in a manual.</p>
North West	<p>Extensive plans were in place to control the marking at all 12 marking centres.</p> <p>The plans also supported the development of competent officials to manage the marking process.</p>
Western Cape	<p>A detailed plan was available.</p> <p>All marking was done at one centre.</p> <p>All paperwork was ready the day before the beginning of the marking session.</p>

5.2.2 Marking centres

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>All marking centres were housed at schools and former colleges of education.</p>
Free State	<p>All the marking centres were housed at secondary schools, and halls and classrooms were used as venues for marking.</p> <p>Communication facilities, ablution facilities, accommodation for markers and furniture used were all of an acceptable standard.</p>
Gauteng	<p>The marking centres were well organised; classrooms and lecture halls were set aside for the marking of the NSC scripts.</p> <p>Most of the venues had the requisite communication facilities.</p> <p>There were sufficient ablution facilities for all those who came to mark, as well as the staff members. They were always kept clean as cleaners had been hired.</p>

Province	Findings
	<p>The markers who were not provided with accommodation were promised that they could claim expenses at the end.</p> <p>All GDE centres opened at 7h00 in the morning and closed at 19h00 in the evening. Provision was made for special dietary requirements.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>The marking centres were housed at schools with hostels.</p> <p>Classrooms were used for marking.</p> <p>Communication facilities, such as telephones, faxes and the internet, were available and functional.</p> <p>Ablution facilities and accommodation were generally of an acceptable standard. At Port Shepstone Primary conditions in the women's accommodation were not acceptable.</p> <p>Furniture used by markers was appropriate.</p> <p>All staff signed attendance registers daily – in the morning and the afternoon.</p> <p>At all the centres the food was of good quality. Three menus, as prescribed, were used. Special provision was made for alternative dietary requirements.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Marking centres in Limpopo were either high schools with boarding facilities or former colleges of education.</p> <p>The centres had classrooms and boarding facilities and were in good condition. They had clean ablution facilities and the necessary furniture for marking. Some centres had air conditioned halls used for marking, for example Ben Viljoen and Ben Vorster.</p> <p>Provision was made for special dietary requirements.</p> <p>The menu was prescribed by the provincial department of education.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Accommodation had been arranged at various hostels.</p> <p>Communication facilities were available.</p> <p>Provision was made for various dietary requirements.</p> <p>Attendance registers were signed.</p>
North West	<p>All the amenities were utilised at the boarding schools used as marking centres.</p> <p>The centres fulfilled all aspects of the requirements for marking centres.</p> <p>Daily attendance registers were signed by all markers and officials.</p>
Western Cape	<p>A "command centre" was available at the marking centre for the marking centre manager and his staff, with all the necessary communication facilities.</p> <p>Accommodation was arranged on the campus for out-of-town markers, and dietary preferences were catered for.</p> <p>A daily attendance register was signed by markers and other officials.</p>

5.2.3 Security

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>Security at the marking centres was tight.</p> <p>Scripts were handled with very securely, being signed for every time they</p>

Province	Findings
	changed hands.
Free State	<p>Access to the marking centres was controlled by security guards and there were guards at the entrances of all the venues.</p> <p>The chief markers and security guards ensured the security of answer scripts, and no one was allowed to remove scripts from the venues.</p> <p>Scripts were transported to and from the marking centres by trucks with tracking systems. The trucks were escorted by departmental officials.</p>
Gauteng	<p>Access to the marking centres was strictly controlled by security personnel. At some marking centres additional security staff were employed.</p> <p>Security at the centres was tight. When markers left the centres in the evenings, their bags and briefcases were opened and searched by the security personnel.</p> <p>No unauthorised persons were admitted to any of the centres.</p> <p>Nobody was permitted to take scripts out of any classroom.</p> <p>The transportation of scripts to and from the marking centres was the responsibility of the GDE.</p> <p>Centre managers kept a full typed list of chief markers, markers, internal moderators and examination assistants.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Access to marking centres was not strictly controlled.</p> <p>Markers were expected to wear identity tags.</p> <p>At Umlazi Comtech and Eshowe High searches were not very thorough.</p> <p>Inside centres there were security guards on duty 24 hours a day. Each centre had a complete list of all those involved in the marking process.</p> <p>Scripts arrived at the marking centres in covered trucks with security in attendance.</p> <p>Script control was very strict, with every movement of every script recorded and controlled.</p> <p>Marking took place in designated marking rooms only.</p> <p>The flow of scripts was carefully controlled during all the stages of the marking process and security guards escorted the scripts as they were moved from one point to another.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Access to the marking centre was controlled by security guards.</p> <p>Security at the main gate and at strategic points, as well as the entrances to marking venues, was very tight. All visitors were searched at the main gate</p> <p>Chief markers signed for the scripts that were marked by senior markers during memorandum discussions.</p> <p>There was a register to control the movement of scripts.</p> <p>Dummy scripts were used to train markers so as to strengthen the security of scripts.</p> <p>Markers were searched as they left the marking venue to make sure no scripts were removed from the marking centre.</p> <p>At Merensky High School the security at the marking rooms allowed some visitors to enter without being searched.</p> <p>Scripts were transported to and from the marking centre by outsourced</p>

Province	Findings
	trucks with security guards and surveillance systems. Control of the movement of scripts at the marking centre was very tight, with scripts being signed for in a register at every change of hands.
Mpumalanga	Access control and security was tight. Guards were on duty in two shifts, night and day. There were unspecified security lapses at Rob Ferreira, Lydenburg and Sybrandt van Niekerk high schools. Strict measures were in place regarding the control of scripts at all levels. Registers were signed whenever scripts changed hands. No scripts were allowed to leave the centre.
Northern Cape	Security was tight at all three centres. Guards were on duty day and night. Markers and officials were issued with identity cards. Strict control was exercised over scripts at every point. There were registers to sign when scripts changed hands. Scripts that were taken for pre-marking were subject to strict security. Photocopies were made for the memo discussion.
North West	Security was very tight and all vehicles were searched. All officials wore name tags for identification. Scripts were handled with utmost security. Copies or dummies were used for training purposes.
Western Cape	Security was tight. Access to the marking centre was limited to one side gate where only people with accredited identity tags were allowed to enter. All bags and briefcases were searched to ensure the security of scripts. Additional measures were put in place to control any disruption that might occur as a result of the closing of some schools. The delivery and collection of scripts to and from various marking points, as well as their storage, were carefully monitored and documented. Scripts and documents were transported to and from the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) offices by contracted couriers. A member of the WCED examinations staff accompanied each consignment. New WCED regulations were in place to control and document the flow of scripts. Each marker had a computer-generated code number which was used throughout so that the marker(s) of any batch could be identified.

5.2.4 Appointment of markers and administrative/examination assistants

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	Unemployed youths, unemployed teachers and tertiary students were employed as examination assistants. Applications for markers were advertised by circular.

Province	Findings
	Appointments were confirmed in writing.
Free State	<p>To be appointed the examination assistants had to be in at least the second year of their studies at an institution of higher learning. They should be studying Accounting, Mathematics, or for a teaching qualification. They should also preferably reside in the vicinity of the marking centre.</p> <p>To be appointed, the markers had to have at least a second-year-level qualification in the subject in question. They should also have experience in teaching the subject at Grade 12 level.</p>
Gauteng	<p>All examination assistants were students studying at tertiary institutions and they were checked for criminal records.</p> <p>The preferred faculties from where these students were drawn were Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, as well as the Accounting discipline.</p> <p>Markers had to be teaching the subject at Grade 12 level and must have taught the subject for at least the past two years. These markers had to be equipped with a qualification which would enable them to teach at that level, for example at least at second-year degree level.</p> <p>There is a system for evaluating markers as they carry out their duties. This system makes it easy to reappoint experienced markers.</p> <p>None of the marking personnel were subjected to any competency test.</p> <p>The criteria for the appointment of examination assistants and markers were adhered to except for the competency test which was not done.</p> <p>All appointments for both markers and examination assistants were made three weeks before the commencement of the marking process. Letters were sent out to inform all those who were successful to report to the marking centres on the dates reflected in the letters.</p> <p>The Assessment Unit Section of the GDE was also responsible for the finalisation of all the appointments.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Examination assistants were appointed after a competency test.</p> <p>The examination assistants were trained in general and also in detail concerning the various scripts.</p> <p>There was no competency testing for markers.</p> <p>All appointments for markers were done in writing but examination assistants were informed by SMS three days before marking commenced.</p> <p>Only teachers teaching the subject were appointed as markers.</p> <p>Appointments were made strictly according to the criteria set.</p>
Limpopo	<p>In Limpopo, markers and administrative/examination assistants were appointed centrally by the Head of Department.</p> <p>Markers were appointed three months in advance while examination assistants for some centres like Ben Viljoen were appointed two days before the day scheduled for marking.</p> <p>Examination assistants were unemployed graduates and university students, who responded to an advertisement. Gender was taken into account.</p> <p>Strict selection procedures were in place.</p> <p>Markers were not subjected to competency tests.</p>

Province	Findings
	At Merensky, some markers did not arrive in time because of non-receipt of letters of appointment. This affected the marking pace, but not the period of marking as planned by the provincial department of education.
Mpumalanga	<p>Strict and consistent criteria were maintained for the appointment of markers and examination assistants.</p> <p>Ten per cent of markers were appointed from Grade 11 teachers.</p> <p>No competency tests were administered.</p> <p>Tests were written by markers not for appointment purposes, but to identify gaps in their knowledge and training.</p> <p>Appointment letters for markers were sent out on 2 November, but appointment of examination assistants was done very late.</p>
Northern Cape	The criteria for the appointment of examination assistants and markers were strictly applied.
North West	<p>Tertiary students and unemployed educators were used as examination assistants.</p> <p>Markers were appointed from teachers currently teaching the subjects, or with extended experience of the subject.</p> <p>Between 10 and 40% were novice markers. The intention was to build a pool of competent markers for the future.</p> <p>Competency testing was not done during recruitment, but during training.</p>
Western Cape	<p>Examination assistants had to be at least second-year students at tertiary institutions, and had to be computer literate. Appointments were made in writing in October 2012.</p> <p>Marking posts were advertised and teachers applied with a CV. These were sifted and the most suitable were appointed. Previous performance in marking was taken into account.</p> <p>In 2012, competency tests for the 18 largest subjects were undertaken between February and August.</p> <p>Appointment was by means of a contract between the marker and the WCED, which included a confidentiality clause.</p>

5.2.5 Training of markers

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>Training was mostly in the form of memo discussions.</p> <p>Markers had to prepare their own memoranda beforehand. These were exchanged, discussed and corrected, and then the scripts and memoranda were distributed and discussed, and some practice marking was done.</p> <p>It appears that this provincial education department did not make use of dummy scripts so that all markers of a subject could practise on the same scripts.</p>
Free State	During the national memorandum discussions the chief markers and internal moderators were trained on the content of the memorandum and every aspect to do with the allocation and transfer of marks. They were

Province	Findings
	<p>also trained on how to deal with irregularities.</p> <p>Discussions were held about the scripts that had been pre-marked. Dummy scripts were then marked, followed by another round of discussions.</p> <p>After the discussions the final memorandum was prepared and signed off.</p> <p>The chief markers and internal moderators cascaded the training to the senior markers at the marking centres before the arrival of markers.</p> <p>The senior markers, assisted by the chief markers and internal moderators, then cascaded the training to the markers. The training took about five hours.</p>
Gauteng	<p>Markers were trained in preparation for marking. All markers were trained by chief markers, deputy chief markers, senior markers and internal moderators on the first day of the marking process.</p> <p>The general training was always led by the chief markers and internal moderators and then markers were divided into groups of five with a senior marker as the head of the group.</p> <p>Further and detailed training then continued in these smaller groups. These groups are usually easy to manage.</p> <p>Exemplars were used where each marker answered the whole paper and then discussions would follow where additions or synonyms were added if necessary and agreed upon by the examiner, the internal moderator and the external moderator, who would be informed because in very many cases he/she did not attend such discussions.</p> <p>Novice markers were monitored very closely during the entire process.</p> <p>Markers were made to understand where to put ticks as well as how to add and transfer marks properly.</p> <p>Markers who could not cope with the workload or who were seen to be underperforming were usually taken aside by their seniors and retrained on a one-on-one basis until their skills improved.</p> <p>If they continued making mistakes, they were given questions which were easier to mark.</p> <p>The duration of training differed from subject to subject but on the average it was between three and six hours.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Markers were trained on 2 December 2012 by chief markers, senior markers and moderators.</p> <p>Training involved a memo discussion, methods of marking, mark allocation, alternative answers, irregularities, script control and practice marking.</p> <p>Minutes or notes were kept.</p> <p>Each training session took about a day.</p>
Limpopo	<p>After the memorandum discussion markers were given a dummy script to mark for further training.</p> <p>Examination assistants were given orientation on the entire process of marking and capturing of marks both inside and outside the scripts.</p> <p>Markers were appointed three months before the start of the marking and both examination assistants and markers were informed in writing of their appointment by the Head of Department.</p> <p>At Settlers and Ben Viljoen the provincial department requested centre</p>

Province	Findings
	<p>managers and administration to conclude the process and inform the examination assistants of their appointment, as the department's telephones were not working.</p> <p>Markers arrived in the morning of the day of the start of marking, that is, 3 December 2012. The training for markers started at 12h00 at all centres in Limpopo (3 December 2012). They were then trained by the chief marker and deputy chief markers.</p> <p>The first session of marking training for markers at Tivumbeni and Makhado started on 19 November 2012; it lasted for six hours at Tivumbeni and eight hours at Makhado.</p> <p>After the memorandum discussion markers were given a dummy script to mark. After marking this script, markers assembled and went through the marked script with the chief marker and the moderator.</p> <p>Training included a discussion of the marking code of conduct.</p> <p>Markers were also trained in the handling of irregularities.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Training of markers began on arrival and continued for the whole day.</p> <p>This consisted of comprehensive memo discussions and practice marking of dummy scripts.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Training at the national memorandum discussions were cascaded to the marking centres on the first day.</p> <p>Marking practise was done as part of training.</p> <p>Training lasted up to eight hours.</p>
North West	<p>Training began as soon as markers had arrived and lasted from two hours to a full day.</p> <p>The national memorandum discussions were conducted question by question.</p> <p>At the provincial discussions no changes were made.</p> <p>Incompetent and novice markers were given support throughout.</p>
Western Cape	<p>A "Manual for marking officials" had been developed.</p> <p>The Director: Assessment Management held a briefing session with the chief markers.</p> <p>Training of markers was provided on 4 and 5 December 2012.</p> <p>Markers were required to mark three dummy scripts for discussion.</p>

5.2.6 Marking procedure

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>Training took place on the first day.</p> <p>Dummy scripts were used for this purpose.</p> <p>Practise marking took place to ensure consistency.</p> <p>The flow of scripts was strictly controlled.</p> <p>Moderation was done continuously from the first day.</p> <p>The examination assistants checked scripts to ensure that everything had been marked and that totals were correct.</p>

Province	Findings
Free State	<p>At provincial level the memorandum discussions were held first as the basis for the training of markers</p> <p>Minutes of the memorandum discussions were not kept.</p> <p>At the marking centres answer scripts were received and checked by the chief markers.</p> <p>From the chief markers the scripts went to the examination assistants, then to the senior markers who distributed them to the markers.</p> <p>The centres in the province followed a question-by-question approach to marking.</p> <p>The senior markers, chief markers and internal moderators were there to supervise marking. They also ensured that marks were allocated correctly and they were assisted in doing so by the examination assistants.</p> <p>The scripts followed the same route back to the chief marker and they were checked at every point and signed for as they changed hands.</p>
Gauteng	<p>Memorandum discussions were held on the first day of the marking process. Minutes are usually not kept but notes are written on the copies of the memorandum. No changes were made to the original memorandum.</p> <p>On the first day of the marking process, the chief marker, assisted by the other markers, counted and recorded all the answer books that they were about to mark. The exact figure was reported to the centre manager immediately.</p> <p>Marking was done strictly question by question, except at the Krugersdorp centre where section-by-section marking was adopted.</p> <p>All centres visited by Umalusi monitors had control rooms from where centre managers operated.</p> <p>Each subject or chief marker had a smaller control room from where they also operated. This made the entire organisation manageable.</p> <p>There was strict supervision at all the centres. If the internal moderator found that candidates had been either advantaged or disadvantaged, they would first consult with the senior and the chief markers in charge and, if they agreed, the moderator would then order that the batch be re-marked and the marks be adjusted if necessary.</p> <p>Markers initialled the answers books.</p> <p>All errors in calculations and on the mark sheet were corrected by the examiner or the chief marker.</p> <p>Capturing of all marks took place at the GDE assessment unit.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>No changes were made to the marking guidelines.</p> <p>The flow of scripts into, within and out of the marking rooms was very strictly recorded and controlled in all instances.</p> <p>All centres had a script control room managed by the script control manager in administration. Marking venues all had script control rooms/areas, depending on the number of scripts being marked, from where control was exercised by chief markers or deputy chief markers.</p> <p>During the entire process the exact location of every individual script could be identified. Script control was very precise, with the exact location of every individual script known through the route form.</p>

Province	Findings
	<p>Scripts were marked question by question. If a candidate answered both optional questions, the first one would be marked and the second one cancelled. If a question was answered twice, the first one was marked. Correct allocation of marks was checked during the various levels of moderation and also by the examination assistants.</p> <p>The marking process was supervised by the chief markers, deputy chief markers, senior markers, internal moderators and then finally checked by the examination assistants. All those who marked or moderated attached a code or signature which identified them.</p> <p>When errors were picked up they were corrected and the batch rechecked.</p> <p>For underperforming markers remedial action was taken and if there was no improvement a change in the tasks given was recommended.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Markers received training on marking before going into memorandum discussions; no changes were made to the memorandum as they were made in Pretoria during the training of chief markers.</p> <p>The minutes of these discussions are kept at Pietersburg High School. Centre management had meetings every morning at 07h30 to discuss daily reports, if any.</p> <p>The chief marker collected and signed for the scripts from the storeroom control manager.</p> <p>Various registers were kept to control the flow of scripts from the storeroom to chief marker to deputy chief marker and from senior markers and internal moderator back to the storeroom.</p> <p>Marking was done question by question but markers were trained in all questions before they were allocated to a question.</p> <p>In some subjects a group marked more than one question as some question were short, for example at Ben Vorster.</p> <p>If a candidate answered both optional questions the first to be answered was considered. And if a question was answered twice the first was also considered.</p> <p>The senior markers supervised the marking with the help of deputy chief markers and chief markers through the moderation of scripts.</p> <p>Markers/senior markers/chief markers attached their signatures on answer scripts. At Pietersburg High school the markers, deputy markers and senior markers were given codes to enter, in addition to their signatures.</p> <p>Errors in marking which were detected were corrected at every stage of checking and ultimately approved by the chief marker. The examination assistants only check the transfer of marks to the cover page but do not make any changes.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>The appropriate procedures were followed, with each senior marker taking responsibility for a group of markers.</p> <p>Where errors were found scripts were referred back for re-marking, and the marker was retrained where necessary.</p> <p>Examination assistants played an important role in ensuring that no questions were overlooked, or errors made in adding and transferring of</p>

Province	Findings
	marks.
Northern Cape	<p>Marking was done under the supervision of the senior markers, chief markers and internal moderators.</p> <p>Examination assistants checked every script to ensure that all answers had been marked.</p> <p>They also checked the totalling and transfer of marks. Many errors were found and it appeared that markers had not checked their own work.</p>
North West	<p>Each senior marker worked with five markers.</p> <p>The flow of scripts between the control room and markers was handled with extreme care.</p> <p>Depending on the question paper, the marking was done question by question or section by section.</p> <p>All officials signed each script they had marked or moderated.</p> <p>Examination assistants checked that all questions were marked and that all marks were totalled and transferred correctly.</p>
Western Cape	<p>Marking was done under the supervision of senior markers, chief markers and internal moderators.</p> <p>All scripts were checked by examination assistants to ensure that all questions had been marked and that totalling and transfer of marks were correct.</p>

5.2.7 Internal moderation

Province	Finding
Eastern Cape	<p>Internal moderators were present at the marking centres throughout.</p> <p>Internal moderation was conducted on the chief markers', senior markers' and markers' work.</p> <p>Batches were returned for re-marking if consistent errors were found.</p> <p>Three levels of moderation took place.</p> <p>Internal moderators moderated scripts of markers, but also those from each of the other levels of moderation.</p>
Free State	<p>The internal moderators were present at the marking centres all the time during marking.</p> <p>The internal moderators were responsible for moderating scripts, monitoring markers' performance and writing reports.</p> <p>The internal moderators had to moderate a minimum of 10% of all the scripts, which included scripts of high, medium and low achievers.</p>
Gauteng	<p>The GDE internal moderator was expected to be at the marking centre on a daily basis from the first to the last day of the marking process.</p> <p>The role of the internal moderator was to quality assure the entire process of marking, that is, to make sure that marking is undertaken fairly, accurately and according to regulations laid down by the DBE.</p> <p>Almost all internal moderators who moderated the GDE scripts preferred the question-by-question model of moderating.</p>

Province	Finding
	<p>There were four levels in the moderation of scripts: senior marker, deputy chief marker, chief marker and internal moderator. The internal moderator moderated the scripts of all markers using a random sampling method to reach every marker in the room.</p> <p>The minimum percentage of scripts to be moderated by any internal moderator would be 10%, but at this became impossible then the scripts exceeded a total of 65 000. All final marking memos were signed by either examiners or external moderators or both.</p> <p>The memoranda used were signed copies.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>The internal moderators were available during the entire marking process. They moderated 100 scripts that had been marked and covered a spread of marks (0–39; 40–69; 70–100) and writing centres.</p> <p>The quality and accuracy of marking was checked.</p> <p>Moderators also analysed the performance of learners and evaluated the papers.</p> <p>From this analysis two reports were written: one was sent to the province, which, in turn, provided feedback to educators and subject advisors of problem areas in the various subjects. The second report went to the DBE for standardisation purposes.</p> <p>Moderation was usually done per answer script; although at there was a focus on a specific question.</p> <p>Moderation was also done at various levels by chief markers, deputy chief markers and senior markers.</p> <p>The final memoranda used were signed off and dated.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Internal moderators take responsibility for the quality of marking.</p> <p>They moderate scripts that are both moderated and not moderated, taking 10% as a quota that should be moderated.</p> <p>In some subjects, for example languages such as English, Sepedi, Xitsonga and Tshivenda, one moderator was moderating P1, 2 and 3. This led to the internal moderator for English having to moderate at three centres, Ben Vorster, Merensky and Tivumbeni.</p> <p>The following levels of moderation of marking were observed: senior markers moderating scripts of markers, and chief markers checking the accuracy of marking by markers and senior markers.</p> <p>Moderators moderated the whole script, sampling 10% of the marked scripts by looking at the different levels of performance. The sample included moderated scripts and scripts not moderated.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Internal moderators were present throughout.</p> <p>Between 10 and 20% of scripts were moderated, with some focus on difficult areas of the memorandum, and weaker markers.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Internal moderators were present throughout.</p> <p>Their task was to check and control the quality of marking.</p> <p>Approximately 10% of scripts was moderated.</p>
North West	<p>The regulations were followed by the internal moderators who moderated random selections from markers, senior markers and even from chief markers.</p>

Province	Finding
	This was a vital quality assurance exercise, to ensure that the seniors were carrying out their task properly.
Western Cape	Each moderator was expected to be present for eight hours of every day of the marking session. The internal moderator was the chief quality assurance officer and moderated random samples of scripts. There was continuous interaction between the internal moderator and the chief marker.

5.2.8 External moderation

Province	Finding
Eastern Cape	The samples for external moderation were selected in accordance with criteria set by Umalusi. When selecting samples, the criteria were adhered to without deviation The final marking memorandum was always included with the selected samples.
Free State	The samples for external moderation were selected in accordance with criteria set by Umalusi. When selecting samples, the criteria were adhered to without deviation. The final marking memorandum was always included with the selected samples.
Gauteng	The marking centres sampled the scripts according to the categories defined by Umalusi. The criteria were adhered to and the final marking memorandum was included in the box or boxes containing the scripts. A different approach was adopted by Umalusi this time around with Umalusi moderators coming round to the centres to moderate the scripts.
KwaZulu-Natal	For external moderation 20 scripts were selected with a specified spread of marks from top, middle and the low achievers. External moderation was carried out on site at Eshowe High, Inanda Seminary, Port Shepstone Primary and James Nxumalo High. These external moderators were from Umalusi and DBE and the duration of their stay varied between two and five days. The final marking memorandum is included.
Limpopo	Samples for external moderation were selected according to the Umalusi guidelines and criteria. As monitors were at the centres they were shown requests for sampled scripts to be submitted to Umalusi. The Umalusi monitor for Business Studies arrived at Hoërskool Warmbad to moderate the scripts.
Mpumalanga	Scripts were sent to Umalusi as per their criteria.
Northern Cape	On-site verification was done by Umalusi so scripts did not have to be submitted for external moderation.

Province	Finding
North West	Samples were selected according to Umalusi's criteria and couriered to them for external moderation.
Western Cape	Twenty scripts per paper were selected according to Umalusi's criteria, as well as six unmoderated scripts. These were forwarded to Umalusi by courier.

5.2.9 Monitoring of marking

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	The monitoring of marking was done by the senior markers, chief marker and internal moderator. Under-performing markers were taken in hand and given more training. If this did not help they were replaced or moved to another aspect of the assessment function.
Free State	The performance of markers at all marking centres was monitored by the senior markers, internal moderators and chief markers. A template/form for evaluating the performance of markers was completed for each marker at all centres. Monitoring and evaluation of markers was also done through the moderation of scripts. Markers who were found to be underperforming were assisted by the senior markers for development purposes. The process of evaluation could lead to markers being promoted to chief markers and internal moderators. Markers who consistently underperformed might not be considered for appointment for the next marking session and some might be dismissed from the centre.
Gauteng	Markers' performance was monitored by chief markers, deputy chief markers, senior markers and internal moderators. This process of monitoring was by way of moderating the scripts of the markers. All underperforming markers were quickly identified by their immediate seniors and they were then taken aside in order to be retrained. The training at this stage became one on one and they were then given another chance to continue marking. If they could still not cope with the workload, they were moved to questions which were easier to mark. The last resort would be for them to be requested to leave the marking centre. It was commonly known that if markers performed badly in their work they would not be considered for selection for the following marking session. The GDE has an evaluation form on which markers are judged.
KwaZulu-Natal	Monitoring of marking was done by chief markers, deputy chief markers and senior markers. The performance of markers was measured in terms of their accuracy, quality of marking, interpretation of answers and rate of marking.

Province	Findings
	<p>Discussions were held with underperforming markers, advice was given and other remedial action taken. There was also the possibility of changing marking tasks.</p> <p>It would seem that the performance of markers had no influence on the selection process for future marking of the main end-of-year examinations.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Markers' performance was monitored by the senior markers, deputy chief marker (where applicable), chief marker and internal moderator.</p> <p>Underperforming markers are retained but shifted to other sections of the marking process, for example as examination assistants.</p> <p>Chief markers and moderators report underperforming markers so that they may not be reappointed in future.</p> <p>A template is used to evaluate marker performance.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>The work of markers is monitored by senior markers, chief markers and internal moderators.</p> <p>If a marker was struggling, extra training was provided.</p> <p>Extra moderation was then done until the marker had caught up.</p> <p>If all else failed the marker was given lower-order questions to mark.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Monitoring was done by senior markers, chief markers and internal moderators through the moderation of scripts.</p> <p>Under-performing markers were monitored and sometimes given easier questions to mark.</p> <p>At the end of the marking session reports had to be submitted on the markers' performance.</p>
North West	<p>The senior staff were responsible for quality assurance, keeping a strict eye on the quality of work done at each level.</p> <p>Implementation of the marking plan ensured the maintenance of acceptable quality.</p>
Western Cape	<p>Monitoring was done by the management team for each subject.</p> <p>Poor markers were identified and required to re-mark whole bundles if necessary.</p> <p>Report forms on each marker were completed, and only the best markers would be considered for appointment in future.</p>

5.2.10 Handling of irregularities

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>There was a provincial Irregularities Committee in place, and an irregularity investigator for every two centres.</p> <p>Markers were trained to be aware of what constituted an irregularity.</p> <p>If an irregularity was suspected it was reported to the senior marker, and an irregularity report was completed.</p> <p>This report was investigated by the irregularity investigator, and if found to be significant, was reported to the Irregularities Committee.</p> <p>An irregularities register was kept at each marking centre.</p>

Province	Findings
Free State	<p>Markers were aware of what constituted an irregularity as they had been trained on this aspect of examinations during memorandum discussions. They were also aware of the procedures to be followed when they detected an irregularity</p> <p>Irregularity registers were kept at all centres.</p> <p>Irregularity committees were not set up at all the centres.</p>
Gauteng	<p>All markers were aware of what constitutes an irregularity.</p> <p>Markers were made aware of this when they were trained for the marking process. All markers were aware of the procedures to be followed once an irregularity had been identified or detected.</p> <p>The marker immediately informs his/her senior, the senior in turn informs the examiner/chief marker and the examiner/chief marker informs the deputy centre manager (professional) who is always in the main control room to receive this type of information. Finally the deputy centre manager (professional) immediately informs the chairman of the provincial Irregularities Committee by which time the information is already lodged in the irregularity register.</p> <p>There were some technical irregularities that were reported but the more serious ones were still in the process of being analysed by the committee. The final reporting would take place at a national meeting which would be held on 18 December 2012.</p> <p>Only one irregularity was found: a letter was found inside a candidate's script which was about the candidate's illness.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Markers were aware of what constituted an irregularity and the procedures to be followed. This had formed part of the training process.</p> <p>No irregularities were uncovered except at James Nxumalo where the chief marker was going through a script and crib notes were detected.</p> <p>All centres had an irregularities committee chaired by the responsible manager.</p>
Limpopo	<p>During memorandum discussions and training of markers the question of irregularities was discussed.</p> <p>All centres visited in the Limpopo Province had an irregularities register and an irregularities committee (professional), consisting of the chief marker and internal moderator (at the marking centre).</p> <p>For serious irregularities there was committee at the provincial level.</p> <p>Technical irregularities were solved at the marking centre but for serious irregularities, the irregularities committee, which included the centre manager (professional), was involved.</p> <p>Various forms were completed by the chief marker to report serious irregularities.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>The regulatory irregularities committee was in place.</p> <p>Markers were trained to recognise irregularities.</p> <p>Only one irregularity was reported, the use of Tippex in English FAL papers at Nelspruit Private College.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Markers were trained to recognise irregularities.</p>

Province	Findings
	An irregularities register was kept at each centre by the centre manager. Only one serious irregularity was reported at Kimberley Girls' High, others reported were mainly technical irregularities.
North West	The province had established an irregularities committee. Markers were trained to recognise irregularities. So far only technical irregularities had been detected.
Western Cape	Procedures for dealing with irregularities were captured in the training manual for markers. On suspicion of an irregularity, an irregularity form had to be completed and submitted for further investigation. A script replacement form was inserted in the bundle if a script had been removed.

5.2.11 Quality assurance procedures

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	The quality of marking and handling of scripts was assured by senior markers, chief markers and internal moderators, and checked by examination assistants. Copies were made of all mark sheets upon receipt and before the marking started. Scripts were checked to see that all questions had been marked and that calculations and transfer of marks were done correctly. The capturing of marks was done at a capturing centre.
Free State	The senior markers, chief markers, internal moderators and examination assistants were responsible for checking whether the entire script had been marked; each question had a total; marks were captured correctly; marks had been transferred to the cover; and the mark sheet was correct. The internal moderators and senior markers also quality-assured the marking and entry of marks as the scripts went through them. Scripts were transported by trucks fitted with tracker systems to and from the marking centre. The trucks were escorted by departmental officials. Mark sheets were transported by departmental officials to the provincial head offices where data capturing took place.
Gauteng	During moderation, senior markers and deputy senior markers went through the entire script. The examination assistants were employed to check that the entire script had been marked. They also totalled up the marks of the question and then controlled them. The senior and the deputy chief verified marking. The second controller was responsible for transferring marks from the cover page to the mark sheet. If a mark sheet was lost, the chief marker reported the matter to the centre manager and the centre manager in turn reported the matter to the assessment unit and a new mark sheet would then be generated.

Province	Findings
	The final capture of all marks took place at the GDE head office.
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Checking of the scripts took place at many levels. Scripts were checked by seniors and sometimes experienced markers were chosen as checkers. Through the moderation processes and the checking by the examination assistants, it was ensured that the entire script was marked, each question has a total, that the subtotals, totals and the final total were correct, that the transfer of marks to the cover was correct, and finally, that the transfer of marks to the mark sheet was correct.</p> <p>Team leaders instituted a control system to ensure that examination assistants went through the scripts during the last checking exercise and the team leader could tell at a glance which markers needed to make corrections. This was done at one of the marking centres.</p> <p>After the checking process, mark sheets were scanned at the marking centre, while the capturing of individual marks was done at provincial level. As soon as mark sheets became available they were photocopied; subsequently, one copy stayed with the batch and the originals were collected by provincial officials and taken by car to the data capturing centre. If a mark sheet was lost, a copy could then be obtained.</p> <p>At the end of the marking process, marked scripts were returned in covered trucks to the districts they had come from.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Quality assurance procedures were in place to ensure that the examination assistants had checked whether the entire script was marked, each question had a total, marks were captured per sub-question/item, subtotals, totals, and final totals were corrected and that the transfer of marks to the cover page was correct. Changes discovered would be effected by the chief marker only. Provisional mark sheets are used where original mark sheets were lost.</p> <p>The truck used to transport scripts was equipped with a tracking and surveillance system and Grade D security guards.</p> <p>The moderator checked that marks were allocated per sub-question or item, and together with the chief marker checked that sub-totals, totals and the final total were correct.</p> <p>The moderator checked to ensure that the transfer of marks to the cover and to the mark sheet was accurate and that there were provisional mark sheets for lost mark sheets.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Quality of marking and control were assured by the use of examination assistants.</p> <p>They checked every script to ensure that everything had been marked, totalled and transferred correctly.</p> <p>The staff from the senior marker up were responsible for the quality of marking as such.</p> <p>There were also visits from monitors, although the centres where AET scripts were marked received fewer visits.</p>
Northern Cape	Markers were expected to check that all questions had been marked and that the totalling and transfer of marks was correct.

Province	Findings
	<p>This was rechecked by the senior markers, chief markers, internal moderators and the examination assistants.</p> <p>While monitoring on 12 December 2012, the Umalusi monitor, was surprised to find that some chief markers and internal moderators were called back to re-check marked scripts in order to "quality assure" borderline scripts and level-1 marks.</p>
North West	<p>All officials worked together to ensure quality.</p> <p>A final check was done by the examination assistants to ensure that all totals were correct and had been transferred, and that all questions had been marked.</p>
Western Cape	<p>One method of quality assurance consisted of multiple layers of moderation.</p> <p>Each script was double-checked for completeness of marking and correct totalling before being forwarded to the IT section for capturing.</p>

5.2.12 Reports

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>At the end of the marking session, qualitative reports were completed jointly by chief markers and internal moderators. Markers also made written inputs.</p>
Free State	<p>Qualitative reports were completed jointly by chief markers and internal moderators. Markers also made an input into the reports.</p> <p>A template was used for compiling the reports to ensure that they met the minimum requirements.</p> <p>The reports were used to help schools in the teaching of the subjects. They were also used during standardisation.</p> <p>There was evidence of monitoring visits at Kroonstad, Eunice, Oranje Meisies, Unitas, Parys, Moroka, Unicom and Paul Erasmus. There was no evidence from the remaining six centres.</p>
Gauteng	<p>The chief marker and the internal moderator made absolutely sure that these reports and the information gathered met the minimum standards.</p> <p>The GDE sent copies of these reports to the DBE and to Umalusi offices.</p> <p>Some copies were sent to regions, district offices and schools.</p> <p>The aim of sending these copies to the places mentioned above was to draw the attention of all educators to strengths and weaknesses in the handling of the curriculum.</p> <p>Road shows are embarked on annually during February in order to inform teachers and to equip them for the task ahead of them for the new year.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Reports from the marking centre were sent to the province on a daily basis.</p> <p>Final qualitative reports were also sent by the chief markers and the internal moderators for each paper.</p> <p>One report went to the province and the other to DBE. The managers responsible controlled the receipt of these reports.</p> <p>The content of these reports was specific, following a template, and the</p>

Province	Findings
	<p>manager responsible checked the quality.</p> <p>The provincial report was used for guidance and feedback to educators, subject advisors and examiners on problem areas in the subjects.</p> <p>The report that went to DBE was used for standardisation purposes.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Markers did not write reports. The senior markers, deputy chief markers and chief markers collaborated with the internal moderator to prepare a report for the assessment body.</p> <p>A report format was supplied by the assessment body in order to cover all the aspects required to be reported on.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Qualitative reports were written by the chief markers and internal moderators using written inputs from the markers.</p> <p>These were handed in at the end of the marking session.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>At the end of the marking session the chief markers and internal moderators submitted qualitative reports that included written inputs from markers and senior markers.</p> <p>The reports were used at the standardisation meetings and made available to schools.</p>
North West	<p>Both the internal moderators and chief markers submitted qualitative reports at the end of the session.</p> <p>Analytical moderators also contributed reports.</p>
Western Cape	<p>Notes were kept every day, but reports were only submitted in the case of an irregularity.</p> <p>At the end of the marking process both the internal moderators and the chief markers had to submit qualitative reports on the session.</p> <p>Reports were used as a basis for improving practice in future sessions.</p>

5.2.13 Electronic capturing of marks

Province	Findings
Eastern Cape	<p>Marks were entered according to a dual system; one for entering and the other for verifying.</p> <p>The leader of the capturing team did spot checks for verification purposes.</p> <p>Mark sheets were collected periodically from the marking centres.</p>
Free State	<p>Scripts were transported by escorted truck to the place of data capturing, while mark sheets were transported by departmental officials.</p> <p>One person captured the marks and another verified the capturing.</p> <p>Capturing was done under very strict supervision.</p> <p>Mark sheets were collected for submission on a daily basis.</p>
Gauteng	<p>All scripts and mark sheets were transported by unmarked trucks and bakkies which were well secured and serviced. They were enclosed and could be locked securely.</p> <p>The double capturing method was used for data capturing at the GDE head office. Proper guidelines from the DBE were followed when they executed the above-mentioned duties. The GDE submitted its mark sheets</p>

Province	Findings
	daily to the assessment unit section when the work was completed.
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>Original mark sheets were transported by a provincial official to the provincial data-capturing centre as mark sheets became available, while the copies were kept at the marking centre. Mark sheets were also scanned into the system at the marking centres.</p> <p>Final checks by examination assistants ensured that marks were captured correctly. Checks comparing batch totals to the totals obtained during the capturing of marks.</p> <p>The system also flagged instances where marks were left out or when absent candidates were not indicated as such.</p>
Limpopo	<p>Capturing of marks was done at the head office of the Limpopo Department of Education in the examination section.</p> <p>Mark sheets were collected from centres by officials from head office every two days.</p> <p>The marks were captured per circuit/district and then counter-checked on the system.</p> <p>The examination assistants assisted in checking for marks captured and for gaps in the mark sheets.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>The mark sheets were signed off and collected regularly for data capturing. The control officer ensured that the work was correctly done.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Capturing of marks was done by a data-capturing team at the provincial offices.</p>
North West	<p>Marks were captured at Mahikeng.</p> <p>The mark sheets were used as source documents for capturing marks.</p> <p>The utmost care was exercised by officials (runners) when transporting the mark sheets to the capturing centre.</p>
Western Cape	<p>Data was captured at the marking centre in the university's computer laboratory.</p> <p>Marks were captured directly from the scripts, which eliminated one step where errors could occur – transfer of marks to the mark sheets.</p> <p>A hash total served as a control measure – if it did not agree the batch had to be entered again.</p>

5.2.14 Packing and transmission of documentation

Province	Finding
Eastern Cape	<p>Marked answer scripts were placed in clearly marked bins after being checked and counted.</p> <p>The bins were sealed and eventually collected from the centres by the PDE for storage.</p>
Free State	<p>Marked answer scripts were counted and recorded by chief markers and examination assistants.</p> <p>The mark sheets and reports were collected by departmental officials, and a dispatch register was completed.</p>
Gauteng	<p>All marked answer scripts were counted and recorded by chief markers/examiners and their teams.</p> <p>On completion of this process the scripts were scanned in one by one. Assessment body officials kept a record of the bags of scripts and the mark sheets that had been scanned.</p> <p>When the process had been completed assessment body officials dispatched the mark sheets and reports to the relevant higher offices. All mark sheet copies were kept at the assessment body's head office.</p>
KwaZulu-Natal	<p>The marked answer scripts were counted and recorded before being transported back to the districts.</p> <p>The examination assistants, script controllers and admin managers bundled the scripts together with the copy of the mark sheet.</p> <p>Records were kept of all dispatched material, including reports. Reports were sent by email or faxed. Mark sheets were transported by vehicle. Copies of the mark sheets were kept at the marking centre.</p>
Limpopo	<p>The scripts were counted and collected by the examination assistants in the presence of the security guards and recorded by the strong room control manager.</p> <p>Scripts were dispatched from the marking centres and, on arrival at the warehouse, they were checked and signed for by the provincial education officials and subsequently stored.</p> <p>A register was kept to record the dispatch of reports and mark sheets from the centre to head office. Copies of mark sheets were kept at the marking centre.</p>
Mpumalanga	<p>Tracking documents were completed to keep track of the scripts.</p>
Northern Cape	<p>Scripts were checked and packaged in clearly marked boxes for collection by the PDE.</p> <p>Mark sheets were collected for recording by PDE officials.</p>
North West	<p>The scripts were carefully counted and recorded before being dispatched to the PDE.</p>
Western Cape	<p>Proper controls were in place for the collection and transport of scripts to the WCED.</p> <p>Chief markers were not allowed to leave before all scripts submitted had been signed off.</p>

Acknowledgements

A special word of thank you goes to the following individuals and groups for their contribution in putting this report together:

Dr Laraine O'Connell who consolidated the individual reports from the external moderators and monitors into one report.

Staff of Umalusi Quality Assurance of Assessment (QAA) unit for evaluating, synthesising and consolidating the individual chapters and the final report:

- Mr Vijayen Naidoo
- Ms Confidence Dikgole
- Mr Andy Thulo
- Mr Siphmandla Nxumalo

The editor Ms Alexa Barnby for editing the report under tight time constraints.

Ms Annelize Jansen van Rensburg for the layout of the report.

The Umalusi team of external moderators for their tireless dedication to the moderation work, as well as developing the reports presented in this report:

- Ms Diane S Woodroffe
- Mr Jacob Mamaile
- Mrs Charmaine S Brits
- Prof. A Coetzer
- Mrs M Venter
- Mr Thebeyamotse A Tshabang
- Dr Fourten Khumalo
- Mr Stanley Gcwensa
- Mr S Naicker
- Mr Daniel MacPherson
- Dr Christian F van As
- Mr Trevor D Haas
- Mrs Wilma Uys
- Mr M J Chiles
- Ms Diana J Brown
- Ms CM Magdalena van Pletzen
- Ms S Botha
- Mrs G Cowan
- Dr Lorraine P Singh
- Mr Mohamed F Hoosain

- Mr EJ Pretorius
- Mr Sathiselan Ponen
- Mr Irwin E Hearne
- Mr Dirk Hanekom
- Mr Achmat Bagus
- Mr Merven P Moodley
- Mrs Fathima Suliman
- Dr Visvaganthie Moodley
- Ms MP Bembe
- Ms Elaine M Powell
- Ms Zama Shabalala
- Mr Quintin T Koetaan
- Mr Eddie Smuts
- Dr Surenda S Seetal
- Ms Sharifa Ismail
- Ms Cornelia E Koekemoer
- Mr Piet Jan Masilela
- Mr S Matsolo
- Ms Nombulelo B Ngomela
- Ms Nosisa WS Beyile
- Ms Phumla P Cutalele
- Dr Isaac K Mndawe
- Ms Cynthia N Maphumulo
- Ms Thembelihle Ngobese
- Ms Fikile Khuboni
- Ms Martha J Bernard-Phera
- Mr TP Merementsi
- Ms Farrah Hendricks
- Mr P. Preethlall
- Dr T. Isaac
- Mrs Anna Crowe
- Ms PB Majozi
- Mr Mogamat A Hendricks
- Mr Rakesh Singh
- Prof. Poobhalan Pillay
- Prof. NJH Heideman
- Dr C G Kriek
- Mr Rajen Govender
- Mr Pragasen Naidoo
- Mr Franklin A Lewis
- Ms Zoradah Temmingh
- Mr Don Francis
- Mr Piet Struweg
- Dr Willy L Willemse
- Ms Deborah M Mampuru
- Prof Mawatle J Mojalefa
- Dr Ntepele I Magapa

- Ms P Mohapi
- Dr Matilda Dube
- Mr Molapo P Thito
- Dr P Lubisi
- Prof. Phaladi M. Sebate
- Mr G Molaotse
- Ms Seanokeng FC Sehume-Hlakoane
- Dr M Lesete
- Mr Ludwig Punt
- Mr Rodney Johnson
- Ms Julia Nedzharata
- Prof. Karin M Skawran
- Ms Louisa Ndobela

The Umalusi team of monitors for the hard work put into the monitoring of the NSC examination, as well as providing Umalusi with the reports presented in this report:

- MS SS Nongogo
- Mr H E Franzsen
- Prof C Z Gebeda
- Mr A Moloabi
- Mr L J Moloji
- Ms EC Radise
- Mr MM Seitshiro
- Mr MJ Mofokeng
- Mr J J Mabotja
- Mr A Seckle
- Ms JN Mophiring
- Mr S Pillay
- Mr MK Kgole
- Mr BO Nzimande
- Mr LW Gwala
- Mrs N G Jafta
- Mr SM Zuma
- Mr C Maakal
- Mr Mamabolo
- Dr MN Rathando
- Mr S M Mafora
- Mr M T Magadze
- Mr MW Mokoena
- Mr SJ Hlatswayo
- Mrs M van Venrooy
- Mr SM Dlakude
- Mrs M C Motlhabane
- Mr M.R.C Setshogoe
- Mr JKO Sebitloane

- Mrs M A Venter
- Mr K P Spies
- Dr GJ Kotze
- Mr D R Sheperd
- Mr M S Nduna
- Mrs T Yawa
- Mrs V Hector

ISBN 978-0-620-55572-2



9 780620555722 >

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

UMALUSI



Council for Quality Assurance in
General and Further Education and Training