



## Report on the Quality Assurance of the IEB Examination of the GETC: ABET L4

UMALUSI



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

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

---

NOVEMBER 2013

PUBLISHED BY:



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training

---

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

COPYRIGHT 2014  
UMALUSI COUNCIL FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE  
IN GENERAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING.  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

*While all reasonable steps are taken to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the information contained herein, Umalusi accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever if the information is, for whatsoever reason, incorrect, and Umalusi reserves its right to amend any incorrect information*

# Table of Contents

---

Table of Contents.....	iii
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ACRONYMS.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. MODERATION OF QUESTION PAPERS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Scope and Approach.....	1
3 Findings.....	2
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	3
5 Areas for Improvement.....	3
6 Recommendations.....	4
7 Conclusion.....	4
<b>CHAPTER 2. MODERATION OF SITE-BASED ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Scope and Approach.....	5
3 Findings.....	6
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	7
5 Areas for Improvement.....	7
6 Recommendations.....	7
7 Conclusion.....	8
<b>CHAPTER 3. MONITORING.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1 MONITORING OF THE WRITING PHASE OF THE EXAMINATION.....	9
1.1 Introduction.....	9
1.2 Scope and Approach.....	10
1.3 Findings.....	11
1.4 Areas of Good Practice.....	11
1.5 Areas for Improvement.....	11
1.6 Recommendations.....	12
1.7 Conclusion.....	12
2 MONITORING OF THE MARKING CENTRES.....	13
2.1 Introduction.....	13
2.2 Scope and Approach.....	13
2.3 Findings.....	13
2.4 Areas of Good Practice.....	15
2.5 Areas for Improvement.....	15
2.6 Recommendations.....	15
2.7 Conclusion.....	15

<b>CHAPTER 4. MODERATION OF MARKING</b> .....	<b>16</b>
1 MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS.....	16
1.1 Introduction.....	16
1.2 Scope and Approach.....	16
1.3 Findings.....	16
1.4 Areas of Good Practice.....	18
1.5 Areas for Improvement.....	18
1.6 Recommendations.....	18
1.7 Conclusion.....	18
2 VERIFICATION OF MARKING.....	19
2.1 Introduction.....	19
2.2 Scope and Approach.....	19
2.3 Findings.....	19
2.4 Areas of Good Practice.....	20
2.5 Areas for Improvement.....	20
2.6 Recommendations.....	20
2.7 Conclusion.....	21
<b>CHAPTER 5. STANDARDISATION OF RESULTS</b> .....	<b>22</b>
1 Introduction.....	22
2 Scope and Approach.....	22
3 Decisions: IEB.....	22
4 Areas of Good Practice.....	23
5 Areas for Improvement.....	23
6 Recommendation.....	23
7 Conclusion.....	23
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>24</b>

# Executive Summary

---

Umalusi quality assures the assessment for the General Education and Training Certificate (GETC) for Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET L4) – hereinafter referred to as GETC: ABET L4.

This report presents an analysis of the assessment practices for the purposes of quality assuring the October/November 2013 examination cycle for the GETC: ABET L4 conducted by the Independent Examination Board (IEB).

The process of quality assuring the examination includes moderation of question papers, moderation of site-based assessment, monitoring of the conduct of the examination, moderation of marking, and standardisation of results.

Eight question papers were set for the GETC: ABET L4 by the IEB and all were submitted for moderation. Each of the papers required only a first moderation to gain approval by the relevant Umalusi moderator. The scoring system showed that the question paper for Human and Social Sciences (HSSC) was excellent and met the criteria in nearly every respect, earning a score of 34 out of a possible 36, while the Natural Sciences (NTSC) and Technology (Tech) question papers were very close to meeting all expectations in respect of standard and quality. Only one question paper, Economic and Management Sciences (EMMS), did not receive full approval for meeting the required standards. The paper was given a conditional approval as it was not fully original and amendments had to be made to ensure compliance with cognitive skills and marking memorandum criteria, and the weighting of Specific Outcomes (SOs) and Learning Outcomes (LOs).

Moderation of Site-Based Assessment (SBA) took place at the centralised marking venue from 23 to 24 November 2013. The findings of Umalusi moderators that SBA had been conducted in a relatively fair, valid and reliable manner were based largely on their analyses of learner portfolios as, in the majority of cases, educator portfolios were not provided to the moderators.

It was, however, found that SBA was not being correctly implemented by some of the facilitators. It was recommended that the IEB require that all facilitators or educators undergo training in the management of SBA portfolios for IEB assessment. The most disturbing finding was the evidence that learners in a centre in Atteridgeville in the Masithuthuke district had copied answers but had signed and submitted declarations of authenticity.

Moderation of marking took place in two stages: firstly, observing the memorandum discussions and, secondly, the verification of marked scripts. Four learning areas (LAs) were selected for marking moderation: Natural Sciences; Economic and Management Sciences; Life Orientation; and Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises.

Centralised moderation took place at St John's College in Johannesburg from 23–24 November 2013. It was found that meetings were well attended and that generally the examiner and internal moderator were well-prepared to conduct the meeting. However, as minutes were taken in only two of the four learning area discussions that were observed, two learning areas had no formal record of proceedings, changes made and motivations for such changes.

There were some concerns about the way in which the SMME marking memorandum discussion was conducted, but the other learning area discussions were well-managed. These succeeded in meeting the desired outcomes of developing a comprehensive marking memorandum that was well understood by all markers who also displayed competence in the use of the marking memorandum.

The verification of marking confirmed that the marking process was sound; that question papers were marked in accordance with the marking memoranda; and that marking was, therefore, fair, valid and reliable.

The pre-standardisation and standardisation meetings for the IEB took place on 19 and 20 November 2013 respectively. Eight learning areas were presented for standardisation: Communication in English; Economic and Management Sciences; Human and Social Sciences; Life Orientation; Mathematical Literacy; Natural Sciences; Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises; and Technology. Raw scores were accepted in all instances.

# Acronyms

---

ABET	-	Adult Basic Education and Training
AET	-	Adult Education and Training
ASC	-	Assessment Standards Committee
CASS	-	Continuous Assessment
CLC	-	Community Learning Centres
DHET	-	Department of Higher Education and Training
EC	-	Eastern Cape Province
EAG	-	Examination and Assessment Guideline
EOR	-	Examinations on Request
FS	-	Free State Province
GETC	-	General Education and Training Certificate
GP	-	Gauteng Province
IEB	-	Independent Examinations Board
KZN	-	KwaZulu-Natal Province
LA	-	Learning Area
LP	-	Limpopo Province
MP	-	Mpumalanga Province
NC	-	Northern Cape Province
NQF	-	National Qualifications Framework
NW	-	North West Province
PALC	-	Public Adult Learning Centre
PED	-	Provincial Education Department
QAA	-	Quality Assurance of Assessment
SAQA	-	South African Qualifications Authority
SBA	-	Site-Based Assessment
UMALUSI-	-	Quality Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training
WC	-	Western Cape Province



## List of Tables

---

TABLE 1:	IEB ABET L4 LEARNING AREAS.....	1
TABLE 2:	APPROVAL STATUS OF QUESTION PAPERS MODERATED.....	3
TABLE 3:	SAMPLE FOR IEB SBA PORTFOLIO MODERATION.....	5
TABLE 4:	MODERATION OF LEARNER PORTFOLIOS.....	6
TABLE 5:	EXAMINATION CENTRE RATING SCALE.....	10
TABLE 6:	EXAMINATION CENTRE KEY MONITORING AREAS.....	11
TABLE 7:	MARKING CENTRE RATING SCALE.....	13
TABLE 8:	MARKING CENTRE KEY MONITORING AREAS.....	14
TABLE 9:	VERIFICATION OF MARKING MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS.....	17
TABLE 10:	VERIFICATION OF MARKING.....	19
TABLE 11:	LEARNER PERFORMANCE.....	20
TABLE 12:	STANDARDISATION STATISTICS.....	23

# Moderation of question papers

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Quality assurance of the assessment for the GETC requires an engagement with every process in the examination cycle. The intention of such quality assurance activities is to determine whether all assessments and all assessment processes in the examination cycle have met the required standards. The examination cycle commences with the preparation of question papers for the written examination. The first step in the process of quality assurance is, therefore, the external moderation of question papers. The Umalusi moderator is a specialist in the content of the learning area and the assessment thereof and is appointed specifically to undertake the task of moderation prior to the printing of question papers.

Moderation is essentially a matter of judgement based on specialist knowledge, but in order to ensure a fair and uniform approach across all learning areas, Umalusi has recently developed a scoring system for the final stage of moderation. Once moderators have made their judgements on the criteria, these judgements are translated to a score that determines whether the question is approved, conditionally approved or rejected. Four of the eight Umalusi moderators utilised the newly implemented scoring system, which quantifies the quality of the question paper, while four moderators simply indicated approval or rejection.

## 2. SCOPE AND APPROACH

The GETC: ABET L4 has 26 learning areas, but the IEB offers examinations for only eight learning areas, as detailed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: IEB ABET L4 Learning Areas**

LA No	LEARNING AREAS	LA CODE
1	Communication in English	A4CENG
2	Economic and Management Sciences	A4EMSC
3	Human and Social Sciences	A4HSSC
4	Life Orientation	A4LIFO
5	Mathematical Literacy	A4MATH
6	Natural Sciences	A4NTSC
7	Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	A4SMME
8	Technology	A4TECH

The IEB presented eight question papers and the accompanying marking memoranda for moderation by Umalusi in preparation for the October/November 2013 GETC examinations.

All question papers were moderated according to the 2013 Umalusi Instrument for the Moderation of Question Papers, which requires that moderators assess the question papers according to the following criteria:

- Technical;
- Internal moderation;
- Content coverage;
- Cognitive skills;
- Marking memorandum;
- Language and bias;
- Adherence to Assessment Policies & Guidelines;
- Predictability;
- Overall impression.

Specific evidence must be provided to prove that the criteria have been met and the moderator assesses the extent to which the assessment body has complied with the minimum standard of each criterion against a four point scale:

- No compliance: less than 50%;
- Limited compliance: between 50% and 80%;
- Compliance in most respects: equal or greater than 80% but less than 100%;
- Compliance in all respects: 100%.

Each criterion is awarded a score of between 1 and 4, depending on the degree to which each criterion is compliant. A score of 28 to 36 is required for full approval of a question paper, whereas a question paper that scores 9 or under is rejected. A score of 10 to 27 will result in a conditional approval with those question papers scoring 10 to 18 requiring re-submission to the Umalusi moderator. It must be noted that four of the Umalusi moderators used the older moderation tool, which does not quantify the result of the moderation.

### **3 FINDINGS**

Question papers and marking guidelines were generally of a high standard. The eight question papers that were submitted by the IEB required only a first moderation to gain approval. The scoring system showed that the question paper for Human and Social Sciences (HSSC) was excellent and met the criteria in nearly every respect, earning a score of 34 out of a possible 36, while the Natural Sciences (NTSC) and Technology (TECH) question papers were very close to meeting all expectations.

Only one question paper, Economic and Management Sciences (EMSC), was conditionally approved, with no second moderation required. This question paper did not show compliance in respect of cognitive skills and the marking memorandum. Overall, it lacked originality and adherence to the weighting of SOs and LOs.

**Table 2: Approval Status of Question Papers Moderated**

Learning Area Description	LA Code	Moderation	Status
Communication in English	A4CENG	First	Approved
Economic and Management Sciences	A4EMSC	First	Conditionally approved - no re-submission required
Human and Social Sciences	A4HSSC	First	Approved
Life Orientation	A4LIFO	First	Approved
Mathematical Literacy	A4MATH	First	Approved
Natural Sciences	A4NTSC	First	Approved
Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	A4SMME	First	Approved
Technology	A4TECH	First	Approved

#### 4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- With one exception, the question papers showed a high level of commitment to good practice by both the examiners and the internal moderators.
- There was evidence that internal moderators had contributed positively towards the high standard of well-balanced question papers.

#### 5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- There were a number of areas in which improvements could be made. The lack of originality in the questions set for the Economic and Management Sciences question paper was problematic. It was not acceptable for examiners to rely on questions in the guidelines and for the internal moderator to approve this practice.
- Questions, especially those that set a scenario, must be short, simple and direct to give candidates the best chance of responding correctly to the questions.
- Marking memoranda remain a weakness. Examiners and internal moderators still need to understand that the marking memorandum forms an integral part of the assessment tool and that a question paper has little value without a detailed and accurate marking guideline that adheres to guidelines and policy. A rough and inaccurate draft of a marking memorandum is not acceptable.
- It was noted that the assessment guidelines for Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises require an update that should include clear directives and measurable standards.

## **6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The IEB must find ways of identifying examiners and internal moderators who do not meet the standard set by the majority of IEB examiners and internal moderators, and provide additional training where necessary.
2. The issues of inadequate marking memoranda and of assessment guidelines for Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises have been raised previously. Mechanisms should be put in place to deal with these as soon as possible.

## **7 CONCLUSION**

Umalusi moderators indicated that all question papers met the required standards for the GETC: ABET L4 in respect of all criteria pertaining to question papers, including content, unit standards and assessment guidelines.

# Moderation of Site-Based Assessment

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Umalusi moderates Site-Based Assessment (SBA) as it contributes towards the final mark for each candidate writing the GETC: ABET L4. As SBA comprises 50% of the final mark and is not undertaken under examination conditions, it is imperative that moderation of SBA be thorough.

The IEB is responsible for presenting SBA marks that have been quality assured and which accurately reflect the competency of each candidate. To manage the SBA process, the IEB develops SBA tasks that must fulfil all requirements of the relevant unit standards and assessment guidelines, and that encourage authenticity. The IEB must also ensure that the tasks are internally moderated once candidates have completed these. Managing valid, reliable and authentic SBA is not an easy task, but the value that correctly conducted SBA adds to the teaching and learning process is so great that SBA cannot be overlooked.

The moderation of SBA is an important aspect of the quality assurance process because such moderation:

- Ensures that the SBA tasks comply with national policy guidelines and Umalusi directives;
- Establishes the scope, extent and reliability of SBA across all assessment bodies offering the qualification;
- Verifies internal moderation of both the set tasks and the completed tasks;
- Identifies challenges to this aspect of assessment and recommends solutions;
- Reports on the quality of SBA within the assessment bodies.

## 2 SCOPE AND APPROACH

A selection of portfolios was chosen for moderation by Umalusi moderators. Four learning areas were moderated and in each, four centres were moderated. The number of learner portfolios moderated per centre varied. Only one educator portfolio was specifically assessed and the findings noted. In other cases, educator portfolios were not made available.

**Table 3: Sample for IEB SBA Portfolio Moderation**

Learning Area Description	Learning Area Code	No of Centres Moderated	No of Learner Portfolios Moderated
Economic and Management Sciences	A4EMSC	4	8
Life Orientation	A4LIFO	4	18
Natural Sciences	A4NTSC	4	16
Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises	A4SMME	4	15

Umalusi moderators perform a qualitative task in respect of the quality of responses to the tasks and the marking of the tasks. The report is also quantitative in that it reports on evidence provided, or not provided, to support the SBA processes.

SBA moderation takes into account the following criteria:

- Adherence to assessment guidelines & policies;
- Internal moderation;
- Content coverage;
- Structure/content of learner portfolios;
- Assessment tasks;
- Learner performance; and
- Quality of marking.

### 3 FINDINGS

The findings of Umalusi moderators were mostly limited to their analyses of the learner portfolios as, in the majority of cases, educator portfolios were not provided.

The most disturbing finding was evidence that learners in a centre in Atteridgeville in the Masithuthuke district had copied answers, basically word for word, and had omitted the required case study. These learners had signed and submitted declarations of authenticity. The evidence of fraud had been noted in the internal moderator's report.

It was also found that SBA was not being correctly implemented by some of the facilitators. The IEB indicated that these facilitators had not responded to offers of training.

**Table 4: Moderation of Learner Portfolios**

CRITERION	FINDINGS/COMMENTS
1. Structure and Content of Learner Portfolios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Umalusi moderator for LIFO was satisfied with the completion and inclusion of required documents in the learner portfolios;</li> <li>• EMSC and SMME learner portfolios were missing critical documents in respect of the identity of learners and authenticity of work, i.e. identification documents, authenticity documents, assessment plans, assessment tools and marks allocated;</li> <li>• NATS portfolios moderated were completely inadequate in providing required evidence.</li> </ul>
2. Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMSC: learners were able to perform the SBA tasks but work showed lack of attention to specifics and detail;</li> <li>• LIFO: The moderator could not make an informed decision as tasks and rubrics/memoranda were not supplied;</li> <li>• NATS: learners were able to respond appropriately, except as far as the critical review of articles was concerned. The requirements here were not properly understood and the tasks were not correctly</li> </ul>

CRITERION	FINDINGS/COMMENTS
2. Performance	performed; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SMME: the business plan tasks were reasonably performed but there was little evidence of collection of data for reports.</li> </ul>
3. Quality of Marking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMSC: The quality of marking varied, but there were instances where learners were awarded more marks than were allocated to the question; and where marks and ticks did not correspond;</li> <li>• NATS: The quality and standard of marking was acceptable, but could be improved;</li> <li>• LIFO: The quality and standard of marking was satisfactory;</li> <li>• SMME: the Umalusi moderator could find no evidence on marked tasks, such as rubrics or allocation of marks, which could have assisted in judging the quality of marking. It was therefore impossible to comment on the quality of marking of SMME SBA tasks.</li> </ul>
4. Moderation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderation at assessment body level was satisfactory, albeit late in the process, after all SBA had been completed.</li> <li>• There was no worthwhile feedback to learners.</li> <li>• Consistency of marking across centres was not monitored.</li> <li>• It was unclear whether moderation at lower levels was taking place consistently.</li> </ul>

#### **4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

- The inclusion of rubrics in learner portfolios was noted as good practice since those learners understood what was required of them to complete the tasks and to attain the available marks.

#### **5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Facilitators or educators need to be more fully informed about the purpose and process of moderation so that they understand the need to provide evidence of processes.
- Correctly completed educator portfolios must accompany the learner portfolios.
- It is imperative that educators or facilitators understand the role that they must play in SBA. This includes ensuring that all required documentation is contained in the portfolios.

#### **6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The IEB should ensure that portfolios provided for moderation are accompanied by educator portfolios; and that tasks, rubrics, marks per task and so forth are available to the Umalusi moderators to ensure that the moderation results in specific findings.
2. The case of probable fraud at the centre in Atteridgeville noted in the SMME report must be



thoroughly investigated and the results dealt with in the light of the findings of the investigations.

## **7 CONCLUSION**

Overall, it appeared that learners participated relatively well in the SBA tasks. It was unfortunate that the system, especially at centre level, did not fully support this process. Apart from the centre in Atteridgeville, it appears that despite the inadequate provision of documentation and evidence, SBA had taken place in a relatively fair, valid and reliable manner.

# Monitoring

Umalusi conducted a site visit during the last quarter of 2013 to verify the assessment body's application for full accreditation to assess the GETC: ABET L4 qualification. The purpose of this report is not to report on that particular process, but deems it necessary to capture some of the findings relevant to sections of the verification report.

The assessment body conducted credible external examinations in that it was effective and efficient in the management of all administrative and logistical processes associated with the conduct of examinations. Learners were registered for the examination at the commencement of the qualification by the private assessment body. Security systems with a low tolerance for irregularities were implemented and irregularities were reported and dealt with as required in Umalusi policy.

The assessment body met all Umalusi's requirements in the registration and resulting system and was able to submit learner datasets that met Umalusi specifications. The assessment body had efficient and reliable systems for the capture, storage and management of learner achievement data and was ethical in reporting and safeguarding the accuracy and security of learner results.

The assessment body ensured that it had full ownership of its data from inception. All the requirements of regulations pertaining to the conduct, administration and management of an examination for a qualification were applied and met. Delivery of the examination was monitored and evaluated, with the purpose of supporting continuous improvement.

Monitoring comprised two phases, i.e. the writing phase and the marking phase. This report will first reflect on the writing and then the marking phase.

## **1 MONITORING OF THE WRITING PHASE OF THE EXAMINATION**

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

The conduct of examinations involves not only candidates who write the examination but also those who facilitate the examinations, inter alia centre managers, chief invigilators, invigilators and officials.

External monitoring quality assures all processes and procedures by these participants during the actual conduct of the examination, by observing administrative practices as well as invigilation practices, to ensure that all policies and Umalusi directives are adhered to during the conduct of the examinations.

External monitors are appointed by Umalusi to visit examination centres during the writing of the examinations. Monitors carry Umalusi identification and identify themselves before entering the examination venue.

Chief invigilators are therefore fully aware that they are being monitored and it can be expected that they perform their duties as well as they are able during the time of monitoring. Errors and inadequacies observed during monitoring would, in all probability, be prevalent throughout the conduct of the examinations.

## 1.2 SCOPE AND APPROACH

Umalusi sent monitors to three different examination venues in Gauteng: Lekato in Benrose; Kloof Writing College in Westonaria; and SAPS Centre in Parktown. Dates of monitoring ranged from 31 October 2013 to 7 November 2013.

Each monitor was required to complete an Umalusi monitoring instrument, which required both observation and responses from the centre manager and chief invigilator to a wide range of questions about procedures.

The monitoring instrument is intended to evaluate six key areas:

- General management of the examination;
- The examination room;
- Before commencement of the examination;
- The writing of the examination;
- Packaging and transport of answer scripts; and
- Internal monitoring,

Each area is rated in terms of compliance. Ratings from 1 to 4 show unacceptable standards at the lower end of the scale, and high standards at the top end of the scale.

**Table 5: Examination Centre Rating scale**

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

### 1.3 FINDINGS

The first monitor visited the Lekato Examination Centre in Benrose, Johannesburg, on 31 October 2013. The centre manager informed the monitor that the centre had received permission from the IEB (and Umalusi) to write the Communications in English examination on 6 November 2013.

The ratings awarded below for each of the key monitoring areas were, therefore, based on the visits to Kloof College, Westonaria and Masithuthuke Centre, the SAPS centre in Parktown.

**Table 6: Examination Centre Key Monitoring Areas**

<b>KEY MONITORING AREAS (KMAs)</b>	<b>RATING SCORE</b>
1. General management of the examination	2
2. The examination room - seating of candidates	2
3. Before the commencement of the examination	3
4. The writing of the examination	3
5. Packing and transmission of answer scripts	3
6. Monitoring	2
<b>OVERALL JUDGEMENT:</b>	<b>2</b>

### 1.4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- Chief invigilators and invigilators arrived at the centre timeously and were keen to do their best.

### 1.5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Chief invigilators were verbally appointed and no letters of appointment were issued. The basis for appointment was so vague that, in one case, a principal believed that she was appointed as chief invigilator on the basis of “the passion” that she has for her job.
- Training of invigilators was said to have been conducted, but no proof of this training could be produced. There was no attendance register and no specific programme had been developed. It was clear that a lack of training resulted in differing conditions for candidates. At one centre, candidates were not allowed to enter after the first half hour had passed, whereas at another centre the chief invigilator allowed candidates to enter the room up to one hour after the commencement of writing.
- The Kloof College venue was clearly unsuitable. The Umalusi monitor reported: “There was no sharing of the small tables used by candidates, but the tables were so close to one another that even a human finger would not separate them.” Such conditions cannot be described as examination conditions, nor did they adhere to the prescribed distance between desks for an examination.
- Seating plans were not prepared, or were not used. Seating plans not only assist in the

orderly conduct of an examination, they are vital should an irregularity take place.

- The collection and packaging of scripts was not an orderly process.
- The lack of security in respect of question papers was unacceptable. In the case of the SAPS Centre in Parktown, the examination question papers were delivered to the chief invigilator's home in Soweto the night before the examination, and he transported them to the venue by taxi. This negated all the security put into place to protect the question papers prior to the writing of the examinations. This practice must change.

## **1.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Centres should keep a daily record/inventory of examination material and stationery.
2. Centres should provide a written report each day on the activities of the day, including any irregularities.
3. The chief invigilator must be appointed in writing, and the letter confirming the appointment must be available for inspection by monitors.
4. All chief invigilators must receive training and training must be cascaded to invigilators. There must be evidence of such training.
5. All venues should be checked, especially in respect of the size of the venue against the number of candidates expected to write at a session.
6. A safe or strong room for the storage of question papers must be available at the venue.

## **1.7 CONCLUSION**

The centres monitored managed the examinations adequately and the chief invigilators and invigilators showed dedication to the task, but checks and balances designed to secure the examinations were not in place. The untrained, or inadequately trained, chief invigilators would be unable to deal with the situation should anything untoward occur.

The writing of the examinations proceeded in a credible manner. However, there was no evidence that the chief invigilator and Invigilators would be able to maintain credibility at all times.

## 2 MONITORING OF THE MARKING CENTRES

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

External monitoring of the examination marking session serves to assess the integrity of the process of marking. Marking practices are observed for any anomalies or challenges that may impact on the integrity of the process. At the same time, best practice that will enhance the marking process is identified.

### 2.2 SCOPE AND APPROACH

Umalusi monitored the marking phase of the IEB GETC: ABET L4 examination at St John's College, Johannesburg, from 23 to 24 November 2013. The scripts of EMSC and LIFO were marked at the centre during this time.

The monitor observed proceedings, held discussions with the centre manager and completed a comprehensive evaluation form containing 14 key monitoring areas (KMAs). The monitor commented on observations and evidence and rated each KMA according to a 4 point rating.

**Table 7: Marking Centre Rating Scale**

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

### 2.3 FINDINGS

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

**Table 8: Marking Centre Key Monitoring Areas**

No	Key Monitoring Areas (KMA)	Comments	Monitor's rating
1	Planning for marking	A national model of marking was in place and worked well because all scripts were kept at the national office.	3
2	Marking Centre	The marking centre was well equipped. Marking was done from 07:00 to 17:00 and no accommodation was provided.	3
3	Security	The marking centre was highly secure.	3
4	Appointment of markers and admin/exam assistants	All appointments were made according to set criteria and completed timeously.	3
5	Training of markers	Markers were trained for 2–3 hours by the chief markers.	3
6	Marking procedures	Marking procedures were in accordance with policy and directives, except that minutes were not kept of memorandum discussions.	3
7	Internal moderation	On average 10%–20% of scripts were moderated. Marking memoranda were not signed off by officials.	3
8	External moderation	Umalusi moderators were on site to undertake external moderation.	3
9	Monitoring of marking	Examiners/chief markers and internal moderators monitored the marking. All markers were graded at the end of the process.	3
10	Handling of irregularities	Procedures for the handling of irregularities were in place and understood by all markers.	3
11	Quality assurance procedures	Procedures were in place to ensure that all scripts were fully marked and checked.	3
12	Reports	Reports were compiled by examiners with input from internal moderators and markers. The reports were sent to all centres that participated in the examination.	3
13	Electronic capturing of marks	Marks were captured at the IEB headquarters using the double capture method.	3
14	Packaging and transmission of documentation	All scripts and documentation were returned directly to the IEB headquarters.	3
15	OVERALL JUDGEMENT	Fair and credible process	3

## **2.4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

- The marking process commenced on time and as planned.
- All processes of marking were consistent.
- The system of having external moderators on-site worked well.
- The experienced manager ensured a well-managed centre.

## **2.5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- The only concern was a single internal moderator who did not adhere to appropriate and expected practice.

## **2.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The internal moderator for EMSC should be required to stay for the entire marking session.

## **2.7 CONCLUSION**

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



# Verification of Marking

The moderation of marking is of critical importance as it largely determines the standard and quality of marking and ensures that marking takes place according to established practices and standards. Moderation of marking comprises two phases, i.e. memorandum discussions and verification of marking.

## 1 MEMORANDUM DISCUSSIONS

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The moderation of marking is a key function in the quality assurance process. It is important to establish that the assessment tasks set for candidates and moderated by internal moderators have been correctly marked and that the results of this process are fair, valid and reliable. Observing the memorandum discussions and the verification of marked scripts are inter-related activities, as the ability to apply the marking memorandum depends on a comprehensive memorandum and a clear understanding of the questions and answers.

### 1.2 SCOPE AND APPROACH

It was determined that 50% of the learning areas examined by the IEB would be moderated. The four learning areas selected were: Natural Sciences; Economic and Management Sciences; Life Orientation; and Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises.

Centralised moderation took place at St John's College in Johannesburg, from 23 to 24 November 2013.

Moderators who attend the marking memorandum discussions assess adherence to agreed marking practices and standards, focusing on the following aspects:

- Processes and procedures followed during the marking memorandum discussions;
- Verification of Umalusi-approved question papers and marking memoranda;
- Attendance by examiners, internal moderators and markers;
- Pre-marking of sample scripts and marking of dummy scripts; and
- Changes to the marking memoranda and the impact of such changes.

### 1.3 FINDINGS

It was found that marking memorandum discussion meetings took place as indicated, and that there was a clear understanding of the purpose of the meetings and the role that these play in the assessment process.

**Table 9: Verification of marking memorandum discussions**

No	CRITERION	EMSC	LIFO	NATS	SMME
1	The examination question paper and memorandum are the final, approved versions	✓	✓	✓	✓
2	The chief marker/s marked a sample of scripts	✓	✓	✓	X
3	All markers/examiners and internal moderators attended the memorandum discussion	✓	✓	✓	✓
4	Markers had prepared for marking	✓	✓	✓	X
5	The chief examiners' report of the last examination was consulted	X	X	X	X
6	Changes and/or additions made to the marking memorandum during the memorandum discussion were appropriate and well-motivated	✓	✓	✓	✓
7	Minutes of the memorandum discussions were taken	✓	✓	X	✓

With one exception, i.e. the internal moderator for EMSC who left early, meetings were well attended and, generally, the examiner and internal moderator were well prepared to conduct the discussion. However, no sample scripts had been marked prior to the SMME marking memorandum session.

A dummy paper was marked after the SMME memorandum discussion but when the results were discussed, it was observed that there were a number of differences in results because some of the application questions in SMME proved difficult to mark.

Alternative answers were added to ensure that the learners were not disadvantaged in any way. The marking memorandum training session was not extended to ensure that markers could cope with the array of answers for application questions, nor was a second dummy script marked.

Attendees at the SMME meeting updated their own marking memoranda, which became their personal memos for the marking session. A revised marking memorandum was not produced, although the examiner indicated that a final marking memorandum would be produced for sign-off. The Umalusi moderator did not receive the memorandum for sign-off.

None of the learning area marking memorandum discussions referred to the reports of the previous examination, thereby negating any learning that may have been gained from such

feedback.

Minutes were taken in only two of the learning area discussions. SMME has no formal record of proceedings, changes made or the reasons for such changes.

#### **1.4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

- Pre-marking of scripts ensured that the examiners and internal moderators were able to guide the memorandum discussions with confidence.

#### **1.5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- Minutes must be taken of all decisions, and motivations for decisions, taken at marking memorandum discussion meetings.
- An accurate, revised copy of the revised marking memorandum should be approved by the Umalusi moderator, photocopied and distributed so that all markers work from the same marking memorandum. There cannot be personal marking memoranda.
- The examiner's report from the previous examination should be read so markers can learn from the experience of marking the previous examination.

#### **1.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. It was recommended that a scribe be appointed at the commencement of the session in each learning area to record decisions taken and the motivations for decisions. Discussions need not be recorded but the examiner must summarise the motivation for having made a change, and this should be recorded in the minutes.
2. The examiner's copy of the revised marking memorandum should be copied and used by all markers.
3. The examiner's report from the previous examination should be read at the commencement of the marking memorandum discussions.

#### **1.7 CONCLUSION**

There are some concerns about the way in which the SMME marking memorandum discussion was conducted, but the other learning area discussions were well-managed. These succeeded in meeting the desired outcomes of developing a comprehensive marking memorandum that was well understood by all markers, who also displayed competence in the use of the marking memorandum.

## 2 VERIFICATION OF MARKING

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

The moderation of marking is intended to ensure that marking takes place according to established practices and standards and that quality marking has taken place. Moderation also ensures adherence by all markers to the marking memorandum.

### 2.2 SCOPE AND APPROACH

The verification of marking took place in four learning areas: Natural Sciences; Economic and Management Sciences; Life Orientation; and Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises.

Centralised moderation took place at St John's College in Johannesburg from 23 - 24 November 2013.

The moderation process assesses adherence to agreed marking practices and standards. Moderation focuses on the following aspects:

- Quality and standard of marking;
- Adherence to marking memoranda;
- Consistency of allocation of marks;
- Accuracy of totals; and
- Internal moderation.

### 2.3 FINDINGS

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

**Table 10: Verification of marking**

Criterion	LEARNING AREAS			
	EMSC	LIFO	NATS	SMME
Adherence to memo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Consistency of marking	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Standard and quality	Good	Good	Good	Good
Internal Moderation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Performance of learners	Fair	Difficult	Fair	Difficult
No of scripts provided	86	21	169	20
No of scripts moderated	23	21	18	20
No of marks adjusted by > 5%	2	2	1	2

EMSC candidates continued to struggle with the accounting section in the paper and questions where learners had to discuss, explain or differentiate posed challenges for candidates. These were not issues that could be addressed in the marking process.

From the sample of SMME scripts moderated, it appeared that the learners found the question paper extremely difficult. However, this may not be a true reflection of the situation, as only 20 scripts were provided for marking moderation and they came from four centres. A larger sample may have indicated a different response by some candidates.

**Table 11: Learner Performance**

IEB: COMPOSITE LEARNER PERFORMANCE – MODERATED SCRIPTS											
Learning Area	Number of scripts moderated	Failures			Passes						Average %
		0 – 19%	20 – 29%	30 – 39%	40 – 49%	50 – 59%	60 – 69%	70 – 79%	80 – 89%	90 – 100%	
EMSC	20	4	1	6	3	4	2	0	0	0	38
SMME	20	1	1	5	7	1	0	4	1	0	38
LIFO	21	0	1	0	1	6	4	2	6	1	67
NATS	18	0	1	3	7	3	1	3	0	0	48

## 2.4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE

- The markers were alert to the possibility of irregularities in the answer script and responded to signs that may have indicated irregularities.

## 2.5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- As the moderator's input is very important, the internal moderator must be required to attend the full session.
- Marks must be tallied correctly and checks put into place to ensure that marks do in fact tally.
- Typographical errors on question papers, such as found on the EMSC question paper, should be corrected before question papers are printed.

## 2.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Examiners must take into account the possible responses to application questions when setting the question paper and ensure that markers will be able to mark such questions fairly and accurately.

## **2.7 CONCLUSION**

The moderation and verification of marking confirmed that the process was sound and that the marking of question papers adhered to the marking memoranda. It was, therefore, fair, valid and reliable.

# Standardisation of Results

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of the standardisation meeting is to mitigate factors that are outside the control of the learners and may have unintended consequences. Standardisation is therefore based on the application of the principles of fairness and consistency across past and future cohorts.

## 2 SCOPE AND APPROACH

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

The pre-standardisation and standardisation meetings for the Independent Examinations Body (IEB) took place on 19 and 20 November 2013 respectively. The primary purpose of the standardisation meeting was to mitigate factors outside of the control of the learners that may have had unintended consequences.

## 3 DECISIONS: IEB

Raw marks were accepted for the following eight learning areas:

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

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

**Table 12: Standardisation statistics**

Description	Numbers for Nov 2013
Number of learning areas presented for standardisation	8
Number of learning areas where raw marks were accepted	8
Number of learning areas for which marks were adjusted upwards	0
Number of learning areas for which marks were adjusted downwards	0
<b>Number of learning areas standardised:</b>	<b>8</b>

#### **4 AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE**

- The IEB had in place fairly reliable systems for the administration, conduct and management of the examination, assessment and resulting processes.

#### **5 AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

- There were no notable areas for improvement.

#### **6 RECOMMENDATION**

1. None

#### **7 CONCLUSION**

Evidence presented in this report suggests that the November 2013 examinations and assessments for the GETC: ABET L4 were administered in terms of policy requirements. There are currently no reports of any serious irregularities that could jeopardise the credibility of the examinations.



# Acknowledgements

---

A special word of appreciation to the following individuals and groups of people for their contribution in compiling this report:

Mrs Jenny Rault-Smith, who evaluated, synthesised and consolidated the individual reports from the external moderators and monitors into one report.

Staff of the Umalusi Quality Assurance of Assessment (QAA) Unit, for their guidance, support and advice, resulting in the final version of this report:

- Ms Eugenie Rabe, for overall quality assurance of the report;
- Mr Vijayen Naidoo, for his analytical eye and constructive feedback;
- Mr Desmond April, for assisting with the structural layout and design of the report;
- Ms Mmarona Letsholo, for administrative support and assisting with the logistical arrangements under difficult circumstances.

Ms Kathy Waddington, for the editing of the report under very tight time constraints.

Ms Annelize Jansen van Rensburg, for the efficient layout and typesetting of the report.

IE Communications, for the printing of this report under extremely tight time constraints.

The Umalusi team of external moderators, for their tireless dedication and personal sacrifices made in their endeavours to conduct the moderation work as best they can. Thank you for the comprehensive and analytical reports that resulted in the compilation of this report:

- Ms Elvie Alman
- Mr Jayprakash Chhana
- Dr Marimuthy Govender
- Dr Rajendran Govender
- Mr Donald Hanneman
- Mr Ishmael Kungwane
- Dr Reginald Monyai
- Mr Sylvester Sibanyoni

The Umalusi team of monitors, for their hard work and the dedication with which they embraced the monitoring of the GETC: ABET L4 examination, and for providing Umalusi with the comprehensive reports that resulted in the compilation of this report:

- Mr JJ Mabotja
- Ms JN Mophiring



37 General Van Ryneveld Street, Perseus Technopark, Pretoria  
Telephone: +27 12 349 1510 • Fax: +27 12 349 1511  
E-mail: [Info@umalusi.org.za](mailto:Info@umalusi.org.za) • Web: [www.umalusi.org.za](http://www.umalusi.org.za)

**UMALUSI**



Council for Quality Assurance in  
General and Further Education and Training