



South African Qualifications Authority

Guide for moderators and verifiers

Ascertaining the integrity of the marking of
Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign learner
assessment portfolios

29 March to 1 April 2012



South African Qualifications Authority
Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign South Africa

© South African Qualifications Authority and Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign
South Africa, 2012

South African Qualifications Authority
Postnet Suite 248
Private bag X06
Waterkloof
0145

Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign South Africa
Department of Basic Education
Private Bag X895
Pretoria
0001

Contents

The purpose and benefits of this verification	1
The three groups involved in this verification	1
What do the participants commit themselves to?	2
What do the senior verifiers do?	3
What do the verifiers have to do?	3
What do the moderators have to do?	4
The judgments the moderators have to make	4
The forms the moderators use	6
<i>General Checklist for verifying the marking of the LAPs</i>	7
<i>Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class set</i>	9
<i>Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 2 – sample from class set</i>	10
<i>Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 3 – detailed analysis of one sample per class set</i>	11
<i>Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4</i>	13
The moderation process using the first four data forms	14
The three activities chosen for special attention	15
The moderation process using the Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4	16
Outline of the verification process	18

The purpose and benefits of this verification

This verification exercise aims to ascertain the integrity of the marking of the Kha Ri Gude Learner Assessment Portfolios (LAPs).

This purpose will be achieved by:

- checking the authenticity of the marking of the LAPs, that is, that they have been marked and that the marking is generally reliable and valid.
- making a judgement on the quality of the marking so that a finding can be made on fairness and credibility of the assessments of learner achievement.

The benefits of the verification are that it will:

- Enable the public to have confidence that an external body has verified the results by examining a sample of portfolios in all languages and from all provinces.
- Give credit to the effort of all the participants in the Kha Ri Gude adult literacy campaign.
- Form an important part of the implementation of a full quality assurance system for the Kha Ri Gude campaign.
- Enhance the capacity of participants to be quality assurers within Kha Ri Gude.
- Make recommendations that can be incorporated into the future planning of Kha Ri Gude

The three groups involved in this verification

There are three groups of people participating in this verification::

- senior verifiers
- verifiers, and
- moderators.

The duties of the three groups are explained in this *Guide*.

What do the participants commit themselves to?

This verification is being carried out by the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) which has appointed three senior verifiers to oversee the process.

Each person, by participating in the exercise, commits her or himself to the highest level of professionalism and confidentiality in their conduct. Each moderator and verifier is accountable to SAQA for the duration of this exercise.

All moderators and verifiers are required to:

- Be unbiased and free of prejudice when moderating and verifying the LAPs.
- Complete all moderating and verifying according to these guidelines.
- Refrain from discussing and comparing learners' work and commenting on the work of classes and coordination districts.
- Recuse themselves from moderating or verifying any LAP or set of LAPs of which they have prior knowledge or responsibility or in which they have an interest.
- Refrain from altering the LAPs in any way.
- Abide by the arrangements made for the proper conduct of the verification sessions by adhering to instructions of and the times set by the senior verifiers

All moderators and verifiers are required to sign a commitment statement.

A Commitment Statement based on this page will be signed by each participant and handed in.

What do the senior verifiers do?

Three senior verifiers have been appointed by SAQA to be responsible for training and support in relation to the whole operation, and for guiding the verifiers in particular.

They are especially responsible for overseeing the smooth operation of the whole exercise, and for trouble-shooting and strategic adjustments where necessary.

It is their responsibility to ensure that the required number of LAPs in the particular languages are processed and that a fair proportion come from each province.

They will ensure that a suitable number of LAPs are compared with assessment results obtained from SAQA site visits to a sample of Kha Ri Gude classes.

What do the verifiers have to do?

The verifiers will oversee and advise a group of from ten to twenty moderators who will be working with the LAPs in the particular mother-tongue language.

They will answer queries, mediate in uncertain judgements and assist moderators who are struggling to find their level.

They will observe how the moderators are working and encourage them.

Later they will seek to check approximately 10% of the moderated LAPs.

They will in turn refer queries and problems to the Senior Verifiers – where they feel the need of a second opinion.

They will sign each completed data sheet and pass this on to the data capturers.

They will keep a tally of the number of portfolios they have processed and the provincial and language breakdown.

Where there is a large number of verifiers for a particular language a head verifier may be appointed for that group of verifiers.

What do the moderators have to do?

The moderators will do the actual checking of the marking of these LAPs. Their main task is to judge whether the marking has been done accurately.

The moderators will be issued with LAPs in a language in which they are competent. Their general task is to check all the required number of LAPs from all provinces (and not only from the province the moderators may come from).

A moderator must not moderate any LAPs coming from learners in the classes for which she or he is a coordinator or for which there is any possible conflict of interests.

The judgements the moderators have to make

The moderators have to make **three** types of **judgements**. The first judgment is really about the marker, the second is about the learner and the third is a comparison of two assessments. These judgements have to be indicated by you on the data forms.

Judgement One: Has the *marker* done the marking well?

The first judgement is on whether the educator who did the marking has done it well.

The moderator rates the **marking** as follows:

E = Excellent well judged accurate assessment.

A = Acceptable. There are differences between the mark given and the moderator's judgement on what should have been given, but this difference is not large nor serious enough to question the credibility of the overall result of the marking.

I = Inaccurate and/or inconsistent marking.

P = Problematic. Extremely questionable judgement by the marker that indicates either very poor marking or the marker has ignored problems or the possible indications of dishonest practice. (Note that if you give the marker such a negative rating it may need to be drawn to the attention of a verifier by a comment, for example in a case where the moderator may have suspicion of possible cheating or other dishonest practice.)

Please note well: this is a rating scale for the quality of the marking done **by the educator**. It is *not* a rating of how well the learner has done. Understand that one is rating the marker, *not* the learner.

If the educator gives the learner a mark that reflects “correctness”, but you see many errors in the learners’s work, there is a problem and you should may give the marking a **low** rating (I or P). Remember – you are rating the marker (low) not the learner (which would also be low).

If the educator gives marks that reflects “learner mistakes” but you see correct learner answers, this is a problem and you should give the assessment a low rating (I or P). Remember you are rating the marker (low) not the learner (in this example high).

Sometimes it is not so easy to judge. If the educator has given a high mark because the student’s response is “meaningful” or well written, but you think the response is inappropriate to the task (because it does not really answer the actual question), you have to ask yourself whether this is a genuinely unsuitable answer, or that you simply disagree with the learner’s view. If in doubt, you should ask a verifier for advice in rating the assessment.

Judgement Two: Are the marks given to the learner fair and accurate?

The second judgement (which naturally follows from the first one) is whether the moderator think the marks given the learner should be left the **same**, or raised **up** or lowered **down**.

If the moderator believes that the actual mark given to the learner is too low or too high this must be shown using the following rating scale:

If you believe the mark given is accurate and fair – an **S** (the mark stays the **same**).

If the mark should be put up – a **U** (the mark should be put **up** higher)

If the mark should be brought down – a **D** (the mark should be brought **down** lower).

Judgement Three: How do learner marks in the LAP compare with the marks given by you to a site-based assessment?

This judgement is based on your comparison of the LAP completed by the learner with a site-based assessment (which you will mark).

The forms the moderators use

There are five forms the moderators will use:

Guidelines for verifying the marking of the LAPs

Data sheet 1

Data sheet 2

Data sheet 3

Data sheet 4

Guidelines for verifying the marking of the LAPs

This is a two page general checklist (printed on green paper) used in the initial training round. This checklist is used only for the first three LAPs looked at. It is not handed in but, when these first three LAPs are looked at, a *Data sheet 1* should also be started, which will be handed in.

The questions in the checklist are designed to remind moderators of the things they have to look for when they are going through each LAP during the verification. Most Kha Ri Gude Coordinators will already be familiar with the questions in this checklist as they have used them in group moderation with their supervisors.

Data sheet 1

The *Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class set* is the form (printed on white paper) used for moderating a full set of LAPs from one class.

Data sheet 2

The *Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 2 – sample from class set* is the form (on blue paper) for moderating a sample of LAPs from one class. When these forms are issued, the Senior Verifiers will indicate how many LAPs from each class set pack are to be moderated. When using this form the moderator needs to record how many LAPs there were in the whole class set.

Data sheet 3

The *Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 3 – detailed analysis of one sample per class set* is the form (on pink paper) that is a simplified version of the *Guidelines for verifying the marking of the LAPs*. It is used to provide a detailed analysis of one LAP from a class set. It is handed in.

Data sheet 4

The *Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4* (on yellow paper) is used to enter data from *Site Visit Record* sheets and your marks for the learner's site visit assessment, some corresponding marks from the learner's LAP and your judgement on the authenticity of the LAP as compared to the site visit assessment.

Guidelines for moderating the marking of the LAPs

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)		
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)		
Were only some ticks added up?		
Were the ticks from both pages of a double page activity added up?		
Validity		
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)		
Does the educator's assessment accurately match the criteria set out in the LAP.		
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?		

Kha ri gude: Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class set

Moderator name: _____ Identity number: _____ Unique number: _____

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	09 Tswana	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

Educator name: _____ Identity number: _____

	Whole portfolio			Q 7			Q 9			Q 16			Comments	
	E	A	I	S	U	D	E	A	I	P	S	U		D
1														
2														
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														

Verifier name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____ 20112

Kha ri gude: Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 2– sample from class set

Moderator name: _____ Identity number: _____ Unique number: _____

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	----------	-----------

Educator name: _____ Identity number: _____

	Whole portfolio			Q 7			Q 9			Q 16			Comments	
	#	A	P	S	U	D	E	A	I	P	S	U		D
1														
2														
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														

Number of LAPs in pack: _____

Verifier name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____ 2012

Kha Ri Gude: Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 3 – detailed analysis of one sample per class set

Moderator name: _____ Identity number: Unique number:

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	09 Tswana	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

Educator name: _____ Identity number:

Number of LAPs in pack:

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 mark all the work done?		
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?		
For each activity did the educator add up all the "ticks" correctly?		
Validity		
Has the educator used the Mark Criteria correctly?		
Do you think the mark should be changed upwards or downwards or stay the same? [U D S]		
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 or fluctuations of standard within portfolio not explainable by development through the programme?		
Do some of the answers seem not to be those of the learner?		
Is the handwriting genuinely the learner's handwriting throughout the LAP?		
Does it seem that learner or a group of learners copied the answers off the board?		

Reliability

When working through the LAP has the educator made the same sort of judgement for the same kind of work?		
--	--	--

General comment

The moderation process using the first four data forms

The moderation of each batch of LAPs from a single class set involves completing the following tasks:

1. Fill in your name, identity number and unique (coordinator) number on the data capture form (Data sheet 1 – the white form for class sets).
2. Mark with a cross the province from which the LAPs come.
3. Mark with a cross the language of the LAPs (and if there are more than one language, enter the number of them in each language in the block provided).
4. Write in the name and identity number of the voluntary educator who marked the LAPs (from LAP page ii).
5. Rapidly review the marking of the portfolio as a whole, checking that:
 - Activities have been completed have been marked
 - There are no obvious problems.
6. Rate the quality of the marking of the whole portfolio by placing a ✓ in one of the first four columns: the marking was Excellent (E column) or Acceptable (A column) or Inaccurate (I column) or Problematic (P column).
7. Then rate the fairness of the mark by placing a ✓ in the appropriate column: the mark stays the same (S column) or should go up (U column) or should do down lower (D column).
8. Then closely review the educator's marking of activities 7, 9, and 16 and give your ratings of the marking and the learner's mark in the appropriate columns of the data capture form. Here you will be especially concerned with the validity of the mark.
9. *Only if necessary*, write a short comment concerning problems the LAP in question.
10. If the problems seem particularly serious note down the ID number of the Learner concerned in the comment space as well.
11. *Only if necessary*, draw the attention of the verifier of your group to problems and queries in a particular LAP.
12. Go on to the next portfolio.

If the senior verifiers or verifiers at any stage ask you to moderate a smaller number (from 9 down to 1) of LAPs drawn from each class pack, you need to change to the **blue** form (*Data sheet 2*).

If the senior verifiers or verifiers at any stage ask you to analyse a LAP in more detail from a pack, you need to change to the **pink** form (*Data sheet 3*).

Note the following:

If the whole LAP has not been done by the learner leave the data sheet row blank. Such LAPs should **not** be recorded as not having been marked – they have not been done by the learner. If one or more of the Activity Questions has not been done, leave that part of the data sheet row blank.

Moderation using the *Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4*

The purpose of this verification activity is to **compare** the way the Learner Assessment Portfolios (LAPs) were completed with the results of a brief set of assessment exercises the learners did during a site visit to the class by SAQA personnel in late 2010.

The process

Each moderator will have a pack of *LAP* s from the class visited and a set of *Site Visit Record* sheets completed by learners in that particular class (though not necessarily from all the learners in the class).

- A. Take the yellow *Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4* and fill in your Name, ID, Unique Kha Ri Gude number, the Province, Language, Educator name and the Educator ID for the set of LAPs you have in hand. If there is more than one language in the set, use a separate sheet for each language.
- B. It will be useful at this point to put the pile of *Site Visit Record* sheets and the *LAP*s in the order of the Unique Learner number (01 to 18) because you have to match the *Site Visit Record* for each learner with that learner's *LAP*. Now take the first *Site Visit Record* sheet and the matching *LAP* and complete the steps C, D and E below.
- C. Look at the *Site Visit Record* sheet and complete the steps 1 to 9 below in the section on the *Site Visit Correlation Data Sheet* in the sections 'Learner identity number' and 'Site visit record'.
Note: All the handwriting in green is by the SAQA visitor. Do not mark green text in the answers – it is not by the learner.
 1. Fill in the Learner's Unique Number (on front cover of LAP and LAP marksheet).
 2. Enter the learner's answer for number of years of schooling completed (0 to 9) in column *Sch*.
 3. Enter the learner's answer to the question "Could you read before the start of the KRG programme?" (No = 0; A little = 1; Yes = 2) in column *Rpl*.
 4. Mark the learner's performance on the copy of a LAP "Filling in a form" activity out of 8 (using the 8 mark blocks – each block ticked is a mark for a adequate answer by the learner) in column *Fif*
 5. Mark the learner's reading comprehension by filling in the four missing words in the text out of 4 (a mark for each plausible word) in column *Wor*.
 6. Mark the learner's completion of the question about what they did at certain times of the day out of 6 (a mark for each meaningful statement) in column *Tod*.
 7. Mark the learner's filling in the missing numbers out of 9 (a mark for each correct number after 6) in column *Num*.
 8. Mark the learner's completion of the addition sums out of 4 in column *Add*.
 9. Write in the score written down for reading aloud (Not at all = 0; With difficulty = 1; Adequately = 2; Fluently = 3) in column *Lee*.

- D. Next take the matching LAP belonging to that learner and complete the steps 1 to 7 below in the section “LAP”:
1. Copy the Total Combined Mark from the mark sheet page in the centre of the LAP into double column *Total*.
 2. Fill in the learner's mark for Activity 2 “Filling in a form” on page 3 of the LAP (out of 8) in column *A2*.
 3. Fill in the learner's mark for Activity 4 “Reading speed” on page 7 of the portfolio (out of 6) in column *A4*.
 4. Count the ticks for Activity 5 part B “Telling the time” on page 9 of the LAP and fill in this mark (out of 6) in column *A5B*.
 5. Fill in the learner's mark for Activity 7 “Comprehension” on page 13 of the LAP (out of 6) in column *A7*.
 6. Fill in the learner's mark for Activity 13 “Numbers and counting” on page 21 of the LAP (out of 5) in column *A13*.
 7. Count the ticks for the first 4 blocks in Activity 14 “Addition and subtraction” on page 22 of the LAP and fill in this mark (out of 4) in column *A14*.
- F. Now, on the basis of your looking at the learner’s *Site Visit Record* and *LAP* do a comparison in the section “Compare”
1. Fill in **your own** assessment of the match of handwriting in the *Site Visit Record* and the *LAP* (No match = 0, Problematic match = 1; Adequate match = 2; Good match = 3) and fill it in in column *Han*.
 2. Fill in **your own** assessment of the authenticity of the *LAP* compared with the *Site Visit Record* (Clearly different writers = 0; Problematic, difficult to judge = 1; Mixed - most is clearly by the same learner = 2; Fully authentic = 3) and fill it in in column *Ove*.

Outline of the verification process

Training session

In plenary the participants should sit in the area designated for the particular language group. Participants will initially work in groups of three at a table.

Generally moderators will be seated in language clusters of about ten to twenty moderators assisted by a verifier. Larger groups may also have a head verifier.

Outline of purposes of verification (See page 1.) and signing of commitment form (See page 2).

Overview of initial procedures and timing and roles of various staff.

Explanation of the *General Checklist for verifying the marking of the LAPs* and the three data capture forms and rating scales (See pages 4-11.)

Issuing of three class sets of LAPs to each group of three moderators.

The group of three moderators together look at three LAPs (one from each class set) using the *Guidelines for marking of the LAPs*.

The group then fills in the data for these three LAPs on their *Kha ri gude Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class sets* and notes any additional comments.

The group of three appoints a spokesperson to report on general impressions and issues and select exemplary or problematic portfolios. (Additional notes are kept for later plenary discussion).

Plenary reports back and discussion. Questions and answers.

First normal session

After the plenary each person continues moderating the class set until it is completed and they hand it in, together with the data sheet at the appropriate language table.

For and all the later sessions the moderators should sit in the appropriate language group, some of which will be in break away rooms.

Further normal sessions

Further instructions will be given and sets or randomly selected individual portfolios moderated using Data sheets 2 and 3.

Session using the Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4

At the scheduled time or when announced special pack will be distributed to each moderator. In the pack will be a file with a set of Site Visit Records for a particular class of learners and the pack of the corresponding LAPs for the class.

Instructions will be given on how to fill in the data sheets.

Once the set from a class is completed, another pack can be collected. No moderator will deal with more than two packs.

