

Report to the
South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA)

Ascertaining the integrity of the *Kha Ri Gude* literacy campaign Learner
Assessment Portfolios

Year Seven: 2014/2015

David Adler, John Aitchison and Edward French

23 November 2015

Contents

Overview.	1
The status of this document	1
The findings	1
The recommendations.	2
Introduction - a quick guide to Kha Ri Gude and SAQA's verification and moderation of the campaign's assessment processes in 2014/2015	3
Background to the 2015 verification activities	6
Approach to the 2014/2015 verification and moderation	6
The course of the site visits	7
The process of the moderation and verification	11
Verifier judgements of authenticity	12
Verifier moderation of quality of marking	13
The relationship of the ISVR to the LAP	14
Relationship of Verifiers' and VEs' marks for the same item on the LAP	14
Discussion of the results	15
Summary of the findings	16
Recommendations.	17
Appendices	19
The Braille LAPs.	21
General site visit cover summary	27
Verification: individual site visit record irt LAP	29

Overview

This report is concerned with the seventh SAQA moderation and verification of the results of the *Kha Ri Gude* national literacy campaign and relates to the cohort of learners of 2014/2015.

The status of this document

This report is to be submitted to the SAQA Board in order to guide their decision on the recording of the results of the *Kha Ri Gude* adult literacy campaign on the NLRD. The campaign ran from late 2014 into 2015. The report should also provide the groundwork for SAQA's report to the Department of Basic Education.

The findings

The findings in brief are:

- Some 91% of the LAPs examined were considered to be the authentic work of the learners enrolled in *Kha Ri Gude*.
- The marks arrived at by *Kha Ri Gude* 's voluntary educators (VEs) on the sample of tasks in the LAPs exhibited a strong positive relationship with the marks arrived at by SAQA's verifiers on the same sample of the tasks in the LAPs.
- Just over 90% of the sample of LAPs was considered to be marked and moderated very well or adequately by *Kha Ri Gude* VEs, Supervisors and Coordinators. The verifiers' and VEs' marks for the selected items in the LAPs are almost identical throughout.
- The verifiers' marks on the independent test (ISVR) and on the identical items in the LAPs exhibited a strong positive relationship.
- The results on the sample of LAPs exhibited a strong positive relationship with the results on SAQA's independent tests.
- The verifiers made a subjective judgement that nearly all of the matched pairs reflected a worthwhile educational experience - 53% adequate / good; 43% excellent.

The recommendations

On the basis of these findings, the senior verifiers recommend that the SAQA Board allows the results of successful *Kha Ri Gude* learners in 2014-2015 to be recorded on the NLRD.

A separate report is presented on the moderation of Braille LAPs reflecting achievement within *Kha Ri Gude*'s commitment to people with disabilities. Although there were minor puzzles in the data, the recording of the achievement of successful blind learners is also recommended.

Various reflections are offered on the process and the findings that SAQA may wish to communicate to the Department of Basic Education or the Ministry of Basic Education.

Introduction - a quick guide to Kha Ri Gude and SAQA's verification and moderation of the campaign's assessment processes in 2014/2015

This glossary is recommended reading for those who are not familiar with the complex of institutions and processes involved in the report.

General

The *Kha Ri Gude* adult literacy campaign runs every year for 6 months. Learners use substantial course workbooks in their own language. They are taught by Voluntary Educators (VEs) with minimal training who are supplied with comprehensive facilitators' guides. VEs are backed by local Supervisors and regional Coordinators. As they work through the course the learners complete a printed portfolio (LAP) of prescribed exercises summarising the learning programme. The portfolio is marked by the VE, moderated internally by the Supervisor and signed off by the Coordinator. SAQA moderates a sample of the LAPs before agreeing to register successful completion of ABET level 1 unit standards for reading, writing and numeracy on the National Learner Records Database (NLRD). In 2015 SAQA's verification and moderation consisted of a close examination and analysis of the LAPs in relation to the results of summary tests conducted in independent site visits to over 300 learning sites around the country.

The following alphabetic glossary should provide insight and ready reference for the terms used in the report.

Department of Basic Education (DBE)

Although adult education and training now falls under the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), the *Kha Ri Gude* adult literacy campaign remained in the Department of Basic Education when the previous Department of Education split into the DBE and the DHET. *Kha Ri Gude* 's management reports to the Director General and the Minister of Basic Education.

Individual Site Visit Record (ISVR)

This is a 4-page test form completed by each learner at the sample of *learning sites* involved in the site visits. The form replicates the content of a sample of items from the *Learner Achievement Portfolio* (LAP). Although a few changes are made, the format and content of the tasks are identical to those in the LAPs. The ISVRs were made available in 11 languages. A copy of the English version can be found in Appendix 1.

Kha Ri Gude

Kha Ri Gude (We can learn) is the name of the national adult literacy campaign that started in 2008. The campaign was initiated under the then Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, who requested that SAQA play a role in the quality assurance of the campaign.

Learner Achievement Portfolio (LAP)

This is a printed booklet provided by *Kha Ri Gude* in its pack of learning materials for each learner. Each LAP has a range of tasks intended to summarise, test and record the learning achieved through 6 months of tuition. The actual learning is guided by a much more

substantial workbook and teacher's guide. The LAPs are marked by the Voluntary Educator (the site teacher), moderated internally by the local Supervisor and verified internally by the regional Coordinator. They are then returned to a national logistics centre where they are stored for some years for moderation, verification and auditing purposes. There have generally been around 600,000 LAPs stored for each year of the campaign. SAQA's senior verifiers call for a sample of the year's LAPs to be delivered to the verification centre for verification and moderation.

Matched pair

This refers to the set consisting of a LAP and its corresponding ISVR. Matching was not possible when the learners present for the visit did not submit LAPs, or in a handful of cases, where the site visited did not submit LAPs (or returned them too late for verification). In some cases as well there were anomalies in the identity data which made it impossible to match the given pairs.

South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and *Kha Ri Gude*

When satisfied with the results of *Kha Ri Gude*, SAQA records these on its national database of qualifications and learning credits – the National Learner Records Database (NLRD). SAQA would not itself normally conduct the verification and moderation of a learning process, but does this in the case of *Kha Ri Gude* at the request of the Ministry of Basic Education. *Kha Ri Gude* and the ABET Level 1 credits involved in *Kha Ri Gude* do not fall clearly within the ambit of the three Quality Councils which are directly tasked with certification and quality assurance.

Senior Verifiers

A small team of individuals appointed by SAQA and tasked with the design, management and oversight of the whole verification process.

Site Visits (and sampling)

Tuition in *Kha Ri Gude* happens in the community: in houses, garages, shacks, perhaps even under a tree - and sometimes in school classrooms. Hence the general term "site". These sites are scattered across South Africa, sometimes in remote areas. The sites visited are a sample of 311 out of 40,821 in 2014-15. The sample of sites was designed to reflect all provinces adequately. A lack of figures and other considerations in the planning limited the extent that the sample would be absolutely proportional to the provincial distribution of sites. There was a commitment to reflect an adequate relationship between urban and rural sites. Practical and cost considerations had the visits organised around hubs from which a range of sites could be visited in a day's journey. (See also "Visitor" below.)

Site Visit Records (SVRs)

Each site visit yields a set of individual site visit records (ISVRs). Each visit's set is packed in a cover with information relating to the visit entered by the Visitor.

Volunteer educator (VE)

A voluntary Educator who recruits and teaches a group of 18 learners and receives a stipend.

Verification and Moderation

In SAQA's process for *Kha Ri Gude*, verification and moderation involve the critical comparison by marking and inspection of each LAP with a matching ISVR (see above). The

process takes the verifier an average of 10 minutes per individual record set. Using a summary data sheet, the verifier checks the identity data in the two documents, marks the ISVR, records the marks given by the voluntary educator for these tasks in the LAP corresponding to the tasks in the ISVR, remarks the tasks in the LAP, compares the handwriting and other stylistic features of the two documents, does a quick survey of the internal marking in the whole LAP, records a scaled judgement of the adequacy of marking, and records on a separate sheet information of interest from the site visit cover sheet.

The data from this process is then captured on a spreadsheet for the analysis reflected in the present report. The data capture sheets can be found in Appendix 2.

Visitor

A suitably qualified person with no direct affiliation to *Kha Ri Gude*, appointed by SAQA through one of three independent regional agencies, and trained to carry out the visits following strict guidelines.

Background to the 2015 verification activities

Since 2009 SAQA has moderated the results of the *Kha Ri Gude* campaign. The commitment was undertaken at the request of the then Minister of Education and Training. It was entered into after SAQA had satisfied itself that successful outcomes in *Kha Ri Gude* would satisfy the requirements of the relevant Unit Standards in literacy and numeracy for Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) Level 1.

Until 2015 the process focused on reviewing the quality of the marking of the LAPs. A substantial sample of LAPs was moderated each year by over 200 *Kha Ri Gude* coordinators under the supervision of SAQA's senior verifiers. With certain provisos, the recording of the results on the NLRD was recommended in each of these years.

In 2012 SAQA added a programme of site visits and independent tests to the process. Without these tests it was not possible to verify the authenticity of the LAPs, or to assess the degree to which the LAPs reflected the actual levels of achievement of the learners involved. The moderation of marking only allowed a limited statement of confidence to the effect that:

the LAPs have been marked with a satisfactory degree of accuracy. Results on the tasks completed in the portfolio deserve recording at ABET Level 1 on the NLRD. We cannot say whether these are the results of the learners themselves, or of someone else (e.g. the educator, a family member).

There was some compensation for this limitation in observations made on the probability and consistency of the learners' work in the LAPs.

The site visit process offered a more rigorous and persuasive process of verification. Visitors, reporting to SAQA and with no affiliation to *Kha Ri Gude*, visited selected sites with relatively little warning. At each site they conducted a test consisting of a sample of items identical (or nearly identical) to the tasks in the LAPs which the learners had already completed or were close to completing. The visitors also made a number of observations on site. Each test (the Individual Site Visit Record - ISVR) was then closely compared to the matched LAP. This analysis was done later under the supervision of the senior verifiers at the annual moderation event.

Approach to the 2014/2015 verification and moderation

In 2015 the verification and moderation process was undertaken solely on the basis of the site visits. There were several reasons for this decision. The large moderation event was considered to be cumbersome and costly - requiring *inter alia* the accommodation of over 200 people for three nights. It was also felt that the moderation process had served its purpose well, but that it had also become stable and predictable and no longer provided much additional value to the previous year's moderation exercise. Given the added financial constraints in *Kha Ri Gude* in the past year, the adoption of a sole focus on the site visit process was welcomed.

In order to compensate for the smaller sample of the total LAPs that would be engaged with in 2015, the site visit process was enhanced in various ways:

- The test (ISVR) was made longer and more comprehensive; as far as possible the test items were formatted identically to the same item in the LAP.
- The comparability of ISVR and LAP results was enhanced as far as possible by using raw marks rather than rubric judgements; the adjusted rubric judgement based marks in the LAPs had previously made it difficult to apply correlation tests.
- Strict requirements were put in place to ensure as full as possible effective attendance at the site visits: this included encouragement and some threat of sanctions by *Kha Ri Gude* management, plus an extensive process of engagement by the visitors to ensure that they were expected on the set date.
- Enhancements in the processes of reporting, verification and moderation (see opening *Quick Guide* above).
- There were to be at least 300 site visits (in the event, 311, as opposed to the 100 that had been allowed for in the previous budget for 2013/2014 cohort).

The course of the site visits

The site visits were conducted from early March 2015 to the end of April 2015 by two agencies and one individual with suitable qualifications and resources and no formal connection with *Kha Ri Gude*. (They were appointed with a special concern to avoid conflicts of interest.) The Tembaletu Trust conducted the visits in KwaZulu-Natal (involving the largest number of participants in one province). An individual organiser was employed to coordinate the visits in the Eastern Cape. Hubutani Communication Enterprises organised the visits in all of the remaining seven provinces. The visits were overseen by a Senior Verifier, with logistical support from SAQA.

Three illuminating reports on the course of the site visits are available separately. In general they are affirmative about the experience. In most cases the effort to ensure successful visits proved rewarding. Supervisors, Voluntary Educators and Learners tended to be supportive and positively responsive to the visits. The reports reflect a continuing valuing of *Kha Ri Gude* by visitors and the visited.

However, difficulties are reflected in the reports. The most common problems related to some reported disarray in the management of *Kha Ri Gude*. Although the programme was originally run, as designed, in the second half of the year, the 2014 programme was delayed to September and seemed to get underway at variable times. The difficulty seems to be attributable especially to problems in the timeous procurement, production and distribution of resources. Numbers of visitors report complaints from learning sites about having received materials late or not at all. While local officials were often most helpful, there seems to be an increase of instances of unhelpful or even hostile responses to the visits by local officials.

For the organisation of the site visits, the greatest difficulty was in getting information about when the programmes were closing. The site visits should ideally happen in the last weeks of the programme. Hubutani had to conduct intelligence gathering to find out when they could

visit. Tembaletu found that in most cases the programme in KwaZulu-Natal had been closed in February. This sometimes seriously limited the availability of learners. Sites had to be (re)selected on the best chance of finding learners there.

By far the most limiting and frustrating experience was that in the Eastern Cape. The regional manager of the site visit programme was fresh to the work, and found himself faced with disaffection and resistance. This seemed to stem from central restructuring of the coordination of Eastern Cape *Kha Ri Gude* management. The province had previously been a flagship in *Kha Ri Gude*, but now returned the most disappointing sample of site visit records.

Nonetheless, the returns on the site visits nationally were satisfactory, and far better than previous returns. This was to the credit of the intensive management of the site visits. The agencies were under strict instructions to secure returns that were as full as possible. On the whole, exhaustive efforts were made to establish contact and relationships with *Kha Ri Gude* officials and VEs to limit possible wastage on often expensive field trips. Impressive efforts were made to reach clusters of sites in difficult terrain and also within the maximum budget limit of 150 m travelling per day, with no overnight stays.

The pattern of comments in the site visit reports is very similar to previous years. There is much warm appreciation for the opportunity to learn, repeated requests for the programme to be lengthened to cope with its ambitious content, and a picture of learning in constraining facilities – with occasional complaints about the supply of materials, and late payment or non-payment by the VEs.

In previous site visit programmes, the visitors were invited to write comments on aspects of the visit. These were illuminating, but time-consuming for all concerned as well as being difficult to quantify. In the present site visits, the cover sheet asked for a scaled rating of these aspects. In general 78% of the ratings were positive: good (47%) or excellent (31%). Poor ratings amounted to 22% (4% very poor; 18% inadequate)

The 9 rating categories came out as follows:

Rating category	Rating			
	Very poor	Inadequate	Good	Excellent
Arrangements for visit	1	11	51	37
Attitude of local <i>Kha Ri Gude</i> leadership	20	12	24	44
Attitude of learners	1	18	56	25
Quality of event	1	26	52	21
VE view of <i>Kha Ri Gude</i>	2	17	52	29
Learners' views of <i>Kha Ri Gude</i>	1	14	53	32
Learners' response to external	3	24	45	28
VE's understanding of LAP assessment	1	17	50	32
State of readiness of LAPs for return	2	23	44	31
Totals	32	162	427	279
As %	4%	18%	47%	31%

Only 6% of the site covers include an incident report. In most cases this relays VE concern about non-payment or late payment and about failures or lateness of delivery of learning materials. A mere 1% relate to some form of obstruction or lack of helpfulness in the arrangements of the visits.

Sampling criteria

The following considerations went into the construction of the sample:

- The sample was based on information from *Kha Ri Gude* management regarding the provision for the year – noting for example that demographic and management considerations had led to some cut-back in the Free State and the Eastern Cape.
- As far as possible the sites visited were to reflect the regions of all the current *Kha Ri Gude* regional coordinators.
- A balance between rural and urban contexts was also sought for.
- The sample was constructed around hubs so that visitors trips to sites would fall within the limited budget. (A cluster of sites was to fall in the scope of a day's visit from the hub.)
- There was a request from *Kha Ri Gude* that a majority of site visits be made to sites not previously visited.
- The language distribution of the provision should be reflected as far as possible. *Kha Ri Gude* is based on sites and has many sites where the languages of provision are variable, sometimes mixed, and never entirely predictable by the area. In the present sample an effort was made to include more of the minority languages that had tended to be marginalised - notably xiTsonga and TshiVenda.

In the event, the agencies running the site visits had to make tactical decisions on visits, opting, for example, for an alternative site when it became apparent that the visit to the originally selected site would be futile.

Distribution of the realised sample

Some 311 sites were visited. Matched pairs (individual site visit record with LAP) from 287 sites were processed by the verifiers. The remaining 24 site visits were not processed, as no LAPs were available for these (8 never submitted LAPs, 16 were late submissions after the completion of the verification).

The realised sample in terms of matched pairs totaled 1 227.

This was distributed by **province** as follows, compared with the distribution of enrolments:

Province	Number	% of sample	% of enrolments 2014/2015
Eastern Cape	66	5.4	14.5
Free State	67	5.5	5.6
Gauteng	156	12.8	18.3
KwaZulu-Natal	107	8.8	21.5
Mpumalanga	224	18.3	11.0
Northern Cape	124	10.2	2.7
Limpopo	302	24.7	16.2
North West	59	4.8	6.4
Western Cape	116	9.5	3.8
Totals	1 221	100	100

Another 6 (0.4%) of the processed pairs did not identify the province.

Distribution of processed pairs by **language** is as follows:

Language	Number	% of sample	% of enrolments 2014/2015	Province
isiZulu	231	22.1	29.6	KwaZulu-Natal (106), Mpumalanga (64), Gauteng (61)
seTswana	174	16.7	11.6	Northern Cape (124), Gauteng (69), North West (59)
isiXhosa	152	14.5	18.9	Western Cape (85), Eastern Cape (66), Gauteng (1)
siNdebele	105	10.0	1.9	Mpumalanga (105)
xiTsonga	122	11.7	3.8	Limpopo (118), Mpumalanga (3)
seSotho	80	7.7	7.5	Free State (67), Gauteng (9), Limpopo (3), KwaZulu-Natal (1)
sePedi	80	7.7	15.0	Limpopo (112), Mpumalanga (52), Gauteng (9)
TshiVenda	69	6.6	3.1	Limpopo (68), Gauteng (1)
Afrikaans	31	2.9	2.7	Western Cape (31)
English	1	0.1	2.1	Gauteng (1)
siSwati	0	0.0	3.8	
Totals	1 045	100	100	

Distribution of languages in terms of **dominant language at sites** visited:

Language	Number	% of sample
isiZulu	89	35.5
isiXhosa	42	16.7
xiTsonga	32	12.7
sePedi	28	11.2
seTswana	23	9.2
seSotho	22	8.8
TshiVenda	12	4.8
Afrikaans:	2	0.8
English	1	0.4
siSwati	0	0.0
Totals	251	100.1

To a slight extent the sample was affected by contingent factors. For example, in the Eastern Cape there appeared to be some breakdown in *Kha Ri Gude* 's regional management morale, and at the same time the regional manager of the site visits in the province was new to the job. The result is that there are fewer than expected in that province – but a more than adequate sample for isiXhosa because of the strong showing of that language in the Western Cape.

Partly because of highly effective site visit management in KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo and Mpumalanga, isiZulu and xiTsonga are represented above the broad national distribution of these languages.

The process of the moderation and verification

The process involved:

- Conducting independent tests (ISVRs) at a sample of 311 *Kha Ri Gude* sites nationwide
- Comparing these tests with the learner achievement portfolios (LAPs) used by *Kha Ri Gude* for summative assessment
- Making observations regarding:
 - ▶ the authenticity of the LAPs
 - ▶ the degree of fit between the competencies displayed in the LAPs and those displayed in the independent tests
 - ▶ the quality of marking and internal moderation by *Kha Ri Gude* educators
- The moderation and verification of all the LAPs from the sight-disabled learners.

Verifier judgements of authenticity

The statistical fit between the three sets of results compared in the verification exercise (see below) provides an important measure of the reliability of the LAPs, and is also relevant to the question of authenticity. However, the verifiers gave specific attention to authenticity.

After processing the two key documents as explained above, the verifiers made a number of judgements of authenticity, often comparing notes when uncertain. Four categories were provided:

- handwriting
- consistency given growth
- contents
- character.

Other than handwriting, the categories related to the probability that the LAP was completed by a *bona fide* adult literacy learner. These proved difficult to manage, they were often left blank and were not ultimately very useful. The judgements in them tend to be positive.

The comparison of handwriting in the ISVR and the LAP was therefore the focus of the judgement of authenticity. It was often impossible to be completely certain about the handwriting. The letter formation of a person new to writing can be extremely variable. Thus, although there were cases where the handwriting clearly differed or was clearly identical, the majority of judgements fell into the domain of the probably authentic.

Verifier ratings for **authenticity of handwriting** were:

Category	Percentage
No match	3.3%
Possible match, but weak	4%
Probable match	73.6%
Clearly identical	17.3%
No answer	1.8%
Total	100%

The incidence of inauthenticity is low. Given the collaborative, nurturing quality in adult basic education, even the 3.3% of clearly different handwriting is not necessarily evidence of deliberate fraud.

Verifier moderation of quality of marking

The verifiers made two judgements: First of the voluntary educator's (VE's) marking of the LAP, secondly of the control reflected in the signing off of the LAP by Supervisor and Coordinator.

The judgement of **quality of marking by the Voluntary Educator**:

Category	Percentage
Very weak	2%
Weak	6%
Good	77%
Very good	13%
No answer	2%
Total	100%

The judgement of the **quality of the moderation control by supervisor and coordinator**:

Category	Percentage
Very weak	3%
Weak	8%
Good	74%
Very good	13%
No answer	2%
Total	100%

Judgement on the **authenticity and quality of marking of the set as a whole**

The verifier was asked to reflect on the set of matched pairs from each site, and to make a scaled judgement of the overall authenticity, reliability and educational value that they felt was reflected in the set. Their general responses were as follows:

Category	Percentage
Poor	4%
Good	53%
Excellent	43%
Total	100%

The relationship of the ISVR to the LAP

Comparison between ISVR and LAP		% Within same range	% ISVR one range higher	% ISVR one range lower	% ISVR two ranges higher	% ISVR two ranges lower	Wider apart
Total ISVR % and LAP %		32.3	18.5	19.2	13.2	5.4	11.4
Total ISVR % and total % matched items on LAP		33.4	22.2	20.9	10.8	5.0	7.7
ISVR question and LAP question							
Q1	2	82.6	3.8	1.9	3.6	3.5	4.6
Q2	3	82.7	3.8	1.7	3.6	3.5	4.7
Q3	8	53.0	12.1	10.9	9.7	4.1	10.2
Q4	12	84.6	7.2	2.0	2.9	0.8	2.5
Q5	13b	70.8	8.2	5.8	5.6	1.4	8.2
Q6	16a	54.5	5.1	3.6	10.6	21.9	4.3
Q7	16b	47.3	6.7	8.3	8.2	18	11.5
Q8	20	41.6	10.2	7.1	6.9	7.4	26.8
Q9	4	33.3	12.0	20.2	2.6	15.9	16.0

Relationship of Verifiers' and VEs' marks for the same item on the LAP

Question		Same	One range higher	One range lower	Wider apart
	LAP				
1	2	96.5	0.2	1.1	2.2
2	3	98.6		0.2	1.4
3	8	96.7	0.3	0.7	2.3
4	12	98.2	0.2	0.2	1.4
5	13b	97.2	0.2	0.6	2.0
6	16a	93.9	0.5	0.7	4.9
7	16b	96.5	0.3	0.9	2.3
8	20	96.0	0.3	1.0	2.7
9	4	95.2	0.4	0.5	3.4
10		95.2	0.4	0.5	3.9

Discussion of the results

The assumption in the running and scoring of the external test (ISVR) against the portfolio (LAP) was that the external test would be a more reliable and valid indication of the learners' competencies than the more user-friendly portfolio. Because of the inevitably less friendly test situation overseen by an unknown visitor on the one hand, and the fact that the portfolio is completed in a more nurturing context, it was expected that the external test would tend to yield lower scores than the portfolio. However, it was also expected that, if both instruments provided valid, reliable indicators of the learners' competencies, there would be a reasonably consistent positive relationship between the sets of data.

Even in the course of the verification, it was clear that a much stronger positive relationship than observed in previous years was emerging between the results on the portfolio (LAP) and the results on the independent test (ISVR). Once the spreadsheets had been produced, inspection of the various columns of comparable data suggested that this positive relationship was present across the data.

The closer analysis reflected in the tables above was carried out by grouping the data (after inspection) into ranges, mostly of 10%. It was immediately apparent that the results of the comparable columns of data clustered very clearly around the lines where the marks of both instruments fell into the same range, or into the immediately contiguous range. This points to a probably close correlation between the results on the two instruments, and between external and internal marking. In other words, it is highly likely that the portfolio is marked reliably and that its marks reflect the level of competence of the learner in the specified unit standards for literacy and numeracy at ABET level 1.

The analysis shows the strong relationship to be sustained, with some fluctuations that are easily explainable by reference to the character of the particular question concerned.

The analysis shows an especially strong, even overwhelming positive relationship between the verifiers' and the voluntary educators' marking of the selected items in the portfolios and in the independent tests. In other words, the moderation of the marking shows it to be generally very satisfactory. This observation is supported by the subjective judgements by the verifiers of the quality of marking as seen above.

A number of questions show a less powerful, but still strong, relationship. This can be seen in the percentage of marks within the same range or with one range's difference, and is supported by the interesting observation that the marks fall almost equally above and below the same range: Questions 3 (63.2%), 7 (62.3%), 8 (58.9), 9 (65.5%). Each of these questions had features which explain this relatively weaker relationship:

Question 3 is a comprehension exercise where the text is reduced considerably in the SVRI test. Some questions were slightly edited to make them different in detail – to ensure that understanding and not just remembered responses were being tested. This may account for the greater variability.

Question 7 requires marks for the identification of a shape, and another for its drawing. The verifiers were more consistent than the VEs in demanding this requirement.

Question 8 is a substantial set of calculations, with some numbers changed for authenticity. (Addition, subtraction, multiplication and division are tested.) It is to be expected that the performance on the LAP would differ from the performance on the SVRI test. What is surprising is the large number of candidates who did better in this question on the external test than in the friendly LAP.

(Note that question 10 in the ISVR presented the scores for reading aloud. It was not possible for the verifier to verify this mark, but only to check its relationship with the equivalent item in the LAP.

The relationship between the final marks on the whole LAP and the total of marks on the ISVR is less strong than on individual questions. This can be readily explained: While the questions on the ISVR were chosen to represent the range of questions in the LAP, they had to be pared down in most cases for practicability; the total marks of the ISVR, reflected as a percentage for comparability, do not parallel the allocation of marks on the LAP. Notably, when totalled, the marks on the ISVR test over-represent numeracy as opposed to literacy. Nonetheless, the fact that 70% of the marks on both instruments fall within the same range or one range difference remains strong evidence that the portfolio this year generally provides an acceptable reflection of learner achievements in *Kha Ri Gude*.

The relationship of totals on the external test and selected identical items in the portfolio are even more acceptable, with 76.5% of the scores falling within the same range or within one range's difference.

Summary of the findings

The findings in brief are:

- Some 91% of the LAPs examined were considered to be the authentic work of the learners enrolled in *Kha Ri Gude*.
- The marks arrived at by *Kha Ri Gude*'s voluntary educators (VEs) on the sample of tasks in the LAPs exhibited a strong positive relationship with the marks arrived at by SAQA's verifiers on the same sample of the tasks in the LAPs.
- Just over 90% of the sample of LAPs was considered to be marked and moderated very well or adequately by *Kha Ri Gude* VEs, Supervisors and Coordinators. The verifiers' and VEs' marks for the selected items in the LAPs are almost identical throughout.
- The verifiers' marks on the independent test (ISVR) and on the identical items in the LAPs exhibited a strong positive relationship.
- The results on the sample of LAPs exhibited a strong positive relationship with the results on SAQA's independent tests.
- The verifiers made a subjective judgement that nearly all of the matched pairs reflected a worthwhile educational experience - 53% adequate / good; 43% excellent.

Recommendations

On the basis of these findings, the senior verifiers recommend that the SAQA Board allows the results of successful Kha Ri Gude learners in 2014-2015 to be recorded on the NLRD.

A separate report is presented on the moderation of Braille LAPs reflecting achievement within *Kha Ri Gude*'s commitment to people with disabilities. Although there were minor puzzles in the data, the recording of the achievement of successful blind learners is also recommended.

Various reflections are offered on the process and the findings that SAQA may wish to communicate to the Department of Basic Education or the Ministry of Basic Education.

Appendices

Appendix: The Braille LAPs

The results of the marking rating for Braille

Summary of quality of Braille marking ratings					
Code	Description of rating	Whole portfolio	Activities		
			7	9	16
E =	Excellent well judged accurate assessment	52.0%	54.5%	50.1%	45.6%
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 serious enough to question the credibility of the overall result of the marking.	28.6%	24.5%	26.2%	29.6%
I =	Inaccurate and/or inconsistent judgement.	4.7%	8.8%	10.5%	7.9%
P =	Problematic. Extremely questionable judgement by marker that indicates either very poor marking or the ignoring of problems or of possible indications of dishonest practice.	14.5%	10.7%	13.2%	16.9%

The evidence from the moderators is consistent and clear. The majority (81%) of the marking was good – either acceptable or excellent. The inadequate or problematic marking averaged out at 19.2%.

When three individual activities were examined slightly less excellent marking was detected (average 50.1%) compared with the whole LAP marking (52%). With the inaccurate or problematic marking the three individual activities average was 27.5% as against the overall assessment of 19.2%.

One caveat to this analysis was the large number of “0” ratings in the dataset (e.g. 336 out of 1207 in the whole LAP rating). It has been assumed that these are where the markers did not give any rating at all. If however these are actually negative (Problematic marking) ratings then the percentage of Problematic marking is huge (37%)!

Comparison between Braille rating in 2014 with the marking ratings of the general moderation of previous years

Generally the ratio between OK marking (Excellent or Acceptable) and unsatisfactory marking (Inaccurate/Inconsistent or Problematic) seems remarkably stable between the five years (2008 to 2014) for the general moderation. The Braille marking for 2015 is reasonably congruent though there is nearly double the percentage of Not OK marking (19% versus an average of 10.5%).

Comparison general marking ratings (2008 - 2013) with the Braille group (2014)								
Code	Description of rating	General						Braille
		08	09	10	11	12	13	15
E + A	Excellent or Acceptable assessment	87%	86%	90%	90%	93%	90%	81%
I =	Inaccurate and/or inconsistent judgement or Problematic judgement.	13%	14%	10%	9%	7%	10%	19%

Interestingly the Braille moderators gave a much higher percentage for Excellent marking (52%) than the average for the period 2008 to 2013 for the general moderation (26%). Thus it may be that the Braille moderators more extreme judgements.

The quality and standard of the learning exhibited in the Braille portfolios

The primary purpose of the verification process was not one of adjusting the marks awarded to the learners. What was being looked at was the quality of the marking. Whether, on the basis of that judgement of the quality of marking, some adjustment of marks was deemed necessary via a standardisation or remarking process, would be a consequent decision for *Kha Ri Gude* to consider.

However, obviously, the moderators would gain an impression of the quality and standard of the learning shown in the portfolios, and they were asked to do a simple rating of the accuracy and fairness of the mark given for that demonstration of competence.

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).

One caveat to the analysis which follows is that there were a large number of “0” level rating in the dataset (e.g. 677 out of 1207 in the whole LAP level). It has been assumed that these are blanks (where the markers did not give any rating at all) but the data capturers have incorrectly entered a “0”. If however these are actually meant to be “Lower the marks” ratings then the percentage of Lower the marks is huge (51%)!

The results of this rating were as follows:

Summary of fairness and accuracy of the Braille mark ratings					
Code	Description of rating	Whole portfolio	Activities		
			7	9	16
S	Mark given is accurate and fair	72.6%	79.1%	85.9%	90.5%
U	Mark is too low (the mark should be put up higher)	4.8%	5.2%	4.3%	9.9%
D	Mark is too high (the mark should be brought down lower)	7.1%	15.6%	9.8%	14.3%

Again, the ratings are fairly consistent. The moderators believed that for most (about 72%) of the portfolios the marks given were an accurate reflection of the quality of the learning demonstrated and could remain unchanged. Their opinions were somewhat divided on the remaining 12% or so of portfolios where they disagreed with the marks – some should be brought down, some raised. Of these disputed marks there is a tendency to want the marks lowered (7.1% versus 4.8% raised).

Comparison between Braille rating of fairness and quality of the mark ratings in 2014 with the marking ratings of the general moderation of previous years

Generally the rating of the level of the learner's performance was done in a fairly congruent way with that of previous years in the general moderation for the years 2008 to 2013. The Braille ratings for 2015 are reasonably close to these.

Comparison general fairness and accuracy of mark ratings (2008 - 2013) with the Braille group (2014)								
Code	Description of rating	General						Braille
		08	09	10	11	12	13	15
S	Mark given is accurate and fair	87%	87%	91%	91%	93%	92%	81%
U	Mark is too low (the mark should be put up higher)	6%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	5%
D	Mark is too high (the mark should be brought down lower)	7%	8%	7%	6%	5%	5%	7%

