

Site visit cover questionnaires 2016

In the original site visits four years ago the visitors were invited to answer some open-ended questions about the visit. This was a voluntary addition to the technical data regarding the visit. Visitors proved eager to write fully about their observations. Based on these, there is now a questionnaire requiring scaled scores on nine issues.

The site visitor's answering of the questionnaire was guided but not strictly controlled. The results are thus impressionistic.

SITE VISITORS' SCORING OF THE SITE VISIT

Issue:	Highly satisfactory %	Satisfactory %	Problematic %	Very Poor %
1. Arrangements by local KRG	23	37	30*	10*
2. Attitude of local leadership	23	48	26*	3*
3. Attitude of learners	23	52	25	-
4. Quality of the event	22	46	25	7
5. VE's feelings about KRG as such	26	55	19	-
6. Learners' feelings about KRG as such	25	58	17*	-
7. Learners' response to being assessed	24	49	27	-
8. VE understanding of LAP assessment	25	49	21	5
9. Readiness of LAPs	23	49	23	5

* The Eastern Cape, followed by KZN, were marked contributors to these negative assessments.

If the highly satisfactory and satisfactory scores are added they are all well above 70%, except for issues 1 and 4. The greater levels of dissatisfaction in these two may be attributed to the lateness of the site visits, but also seem to reflect a certain dysfunction discussed elsewhere in this report.

As seen elsewhere, there is a strongly positive valuing of KRG per se. However, an incidence of negative reports that hovers around 25% may be a matter of concern. In one case this is normal – the learners are understandably apprehensive about external assessment (Issue 7). In others the negativity may be contingent on factors relating to management and timing, while in one case

(Issue 8) it may relate to the severely limited training and supervision criticised by the Senior Moderators after the moderation event.

The average satisfaction level across the nine issues was 63%.

Verifiers' observations and ratings

In addition to capturing the site visitors' scores on the above issues, the verifiers provided additional ratings.

Tally of matched pairs

The first rating was a tally of matched pairs in the site visit sets the verifiers were handling. According to these there were:

- i. 747 cases where there were no LAPs to match the individual tests (ISVRs), and
- ii. 1,273 cases where there were no ISVRs to match the available LAPs.

There are three possible reasons for i.: a) The learners who were tested in site visits did not complete LAPs; b) The LAPs could not be located by the logistics agency responsible for their collection; c) The LAPs had not been submitted yet. (In spite of the lateness of the site visits, LAPs were still being sent in by late-starting sites well after the closing moderation event. Some are still being awaited at the time of writing.)

The second observation (ii) may be explained by the low turnout of learners at many of the site visits. Learners who had submitted LAPs were not available for various reasons.

Verifiers' rating of the quality of matched sets

Verifiers rated their impression of the presentation and educational quality of the matched sets. 50% were rated as outstanding, 37% as satisfactory and 13% as poor or very bad (2%).