

Some issues

Certificates

I see the letter from Struwig asking for different kinds of certificates for the Kha Ri Gude staff (Coordinators, Supervisors and Educators) and for the people doing the Verification (moderators, verifiers and senior verifiers) as well as for the Learners.

Can we look at the past examples of certificates and suggest changes?

The Training Guide

I have looked at last year's Training Guide and, with some minor changes I think it should be fine.

I do not think we should include in it the new more intense scrutiny of a set of LAPs.

It should simply contain the following:

Special activities

Verifiers may be asked to nominate a small number of moderators from their group to work in a special group using some different verification forms.

We would design a new mini-guide for this group.

The rooms and the LAP distribution arrangements

I make the assumption that we will be St George's again. It is a good venue.

Some matters:

a) Given that after the presentations and plenary people tended to do a lot of table moving for large working groups, I think we must brief the Verifiers to take control of this. It might even be helpful to have some signs on stands indicating where each language group would be (in the hall and in the breakaway rooms).

b) The LAPs must all be in place divided by language, not province before people come into the hall for the training session.

c) Staff (from SAB&T or DBE) to distribute the LAPs must be in place before the training session and the first normal session. They must have all the forms to be signed when a person takes a pack/or returns it ready. [In 2010 there was an almighty shambles because these staff arrived late and were not prepared]. Simple control forms must be designed [my impression in 2010 was that there were different forms and they asked for too much information].

d) there must be boxes for the completed LAPs to be placed in so that they can be removed as soon and as steadily as possible.

The special activity

You have been selected to do a more intensive verification of one pack of LAPS.

You will use Date sheet 3.

Kha ri gude Learner Assessment Portfolio verification:
data sheet 3 – **individual LAP**

Question	✓	Comment
Administration		
Did the educator fill in the learner's unique number on the front cover?		
Did the educator fill in the learner's personal details correctly on page I?		
Did the educator transfer all the marks correctly to the mark sheet on page ii?		
Did the educator, supervisor and coordinator all sign the LAP on page ii?		
Has the date been written for each completed activity? (See pages 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34)		
<p>For each activity did the educator add up the "ticks" correctly? (See pages 3, 4-5, 7, 8-9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20-21, 22-23, 24-25, 26-27, 29, 30-31, 32-33, 34)</p> <p>Were only some ticks added up?</p> <p>Were the ticks from both pages of a double page activity added up?</p>		
Validity		
<p>Has the educator used the Mark Criteria correctly? (See pages 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34)</p> <p>Does the educator's assessment accurately match the criteria set out in the LAP.</p>		
Do you think the mark should be changed upwards or downwards?		
Has the marker been too lenient or too harsh?		
Does the marking seem to have been done in a careless way?		

Appropriateness of learner corrections		
Learners were allowed /encouraged to correct and improve their work at a later stage – have such corrections been made?		
If changes/corrections were made, do these look as if they were genuinely the learner's work?		
Do any corrections appear to reflect genuine growth of competence in the learner?		
Growth and consistency		
Does the LAP show that the learner has continuously improved?		
Is any inconsistency of performance within portfolio not explainable by development through programme?		
Are there fluctuations of standard in the LAP?		
Problems are signalled by answers that stand out as much better in a set of poor answers.		
Any sense that the educator or a relative or friend has intervened to influence the result should be seen as problematic.		
Is the handwriting genuinely the learner's handwriting? Or did someone else write for the learner? [Handwriting may improve, but not change unrecognisably, nor be highly variable so that it looks as though several people have done the writing.]		
Where there are chances for personality or opinions to show through, there should be some sense that they are the work of the same person.		
Does it seem that learner or a group of learners copied the answers off the board?		
Mistakes or formulations that are found repeatedly in a class or district (suggesting copied or dictated responses) all signal problems that might need to be investigated further.		
Reliability		
When working through a class set of LAPs has the educator made the same sort of judgement for the same kind of work?		

General comment	
-----------------	--

