

CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF COMPETENCY FOR THE PURPOSE OF REGISTRATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Version | Version 2 |
| Revision | 1 |
| Author | Sindiswa Kwenaitse |
| Contributors | |
| Supporting Policies | Registration Policy Revised Accreditation Policy |
| Owner | Research and Policy Development Department |
| Date Approved by Management/Executive Committee or Council | 7 February 2022 |
| Effective Date | Date of Approval |

Revision History

| Version Revised | Approval Date |
|-----------------|---------------|
| Version 1 | 28 July 2021 |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1. | Definitions..... | 4 |
| 2. | Introduction..... | 5 |
| 3. | Purpose | 5 |
| 4. | Applicable Legislation and/or Policies | 6 |
| 5. | Acknowledgement of Sources | 6 |
| 6. | Principles of assessment | 6 |
| 7. | Assessment Criteria..... | 8 |
| 9. | Assessment Methods and Instruments | 9 |
| 10. | Quality of Evidence | 11 |
| 11. | Record of assessment..... | 11 |
| 12. | Malpractice | 11 |
| 13. | Moderation..... | 15 |
| 14. | Assessor and Moderator Criteria | 17 |
| 15. | Approval of Assessment Provider | 18 |
| | Annexure A..... | 19 |
| | Annexure B..... | 21 |
| | Annexure C..... | 23 |
| | Annexure D..... | 25 |
| | Annexure E | 27 |
| | Annexure F | 47 |
| | Annexure G | 48 |
| | Annexure H..... | 49 |
| | Annexure I | 51 |

LIST OF ANNEXURES

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Annexure A | Types of Questions that could be Used in Assessments |
| Annexure B | Application Form for Assessor Appointment |
| Annexure C | Code of Conduct for Assessors and Moderators |
| Annexure D | Assessment Provider Evaluation Form |
| Annexure E | SAQA Unit Standards Required by Assessors and Moderators |
| Annexure F | Penalties for Applicant Malpractice Matrix |
| Annexure G | Penalties for Assessment Provider Malpractice Matrix |
| Annexure H | Guidelines on Plagiarism |
| Annexure I | Declaration on Plagiarism |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| | |
|----------------|---|
| CCFO | Critical Cross-Field Outcomes |
| CHE | Council on Higher Education |
| CPD | Continuing Professional Development |
| ETQA | Education and Training Quality Assurance Body |
| HEQSF | Higher Education Qualifications Sub-framework |
| IHL | Institution of Higher Learning |
| NQF | National Qualifications Framework |
| OQSF | Occupational Qualifications Sub-Framework |
| PEDUA | Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, Act No.4 of 2000 |
| PI | Professional Interview |
| QCTO | Quality Council for Trades and Occupations |
| RP | Registered Person |
| RPL | Recognition of Prior Learning |
| SACPCMP | South African Council for the Project and Construction Management Professions |
| SAPS | South African Police Service |
| SAQA | South African Qualification Authority |
| SETA | Sector Education and Training Authority |
| TPC | Test for Professional Competency |

1. Definitions

“Assessment” is the process of gathering and weighing evidence in order to determine whether or not applicants can demonstrate competence in a specific registration category and designation.

“Assessment criteria” statements used by an assessor to judge whether the evidence provided by an applicant is sufficient to demonstrate competent performance.

“Assessor” the person designated and recognised by the Council who is responsible for judging and recording applicant evidence.

“Assessment Provider” is an entity, assessor, or internal Council department which is accredited, recognised or appointed to conduct an assessment for the purpose of registration.

“Competence” is defined as the application of knowledge, skills and values in a specific context to a defined standard of performance. This may also be view as applied competence which is a combination of practical, foundational and reflexive competence.

“Credibility” is the measure of confidence in the results of any assessment. It is a combination of all the principles of assessment, namely, fairness, validity, reliability, and practicability. When all these principles are properly adhered to, an assessment can be considered credible.

“Criminal Offense” is an act which common or statue law prohibits. Examples of criminal offenses, that could relate to assessments, is bribery and corruption.

“Currency” refers to the applicability of skills, knowledge and understanding in the present circumstances.

“Evidence” The proof produced by an applicant that shows that he/she complies with the requirements of the criteria of the designations they wish to be registered in.

“Exit level outcomes” are the planned combination of learning outcomes - both specific and critical - that are required for competence at the particular level of qualification. Specific outcomes are those that are specific to the qualification’s purpose.

“Fairness” refers to there being no hinderance or advantage to an applicant through an assessment.

“Foundational Competence” The demonstrated understanding of what the applicant is doing and why. This underpins the practical competence and therefore the actions taken.

“Maladministration” lack of care, judgment, or honesty in the management of assessment and process attached thereto.

“Malpractice” includes maladministration and non-compliance and means any action (or inaction) that could compromise the integrity of the assessments for the purpose of registration and the registered designations.

“Moderation” in assessment means internal and external verification that an assessment system is credible and that assessors and applicants behave in an ethical way; and that assessments are credible.

“Outcomes” are statements regarding elements of competence.

“Practicability” requires an assurance that assessments take into account the available resources and time.

“Practical Competence” is the demonstrated ability to perform a set of tasks in an authentic context. A range of actions or possibilities is considered, and decisions are made about which actions to follow.

“Product Evaluation” is evaluating something that the applicant has produced after the task has been completed.

“Questioning” are oral or written assessments which are answered orally or in writing and is done to establish the applicants underpinning knowledge and understanding.

“Reflexive Competence” The demonstrated ability to integrate performance with understanding, so as to show that the applicant is able to adapt to changed circumstances appropriately and responsibly, and to explain the reason behind an action.

“Reliability” is the measure of the degree of consistency with which applicant assessment evidence is judged. This ensures consistency in that the same judgements are made in the same or in similar contexts each time a particular assessment is administered.

“Recognition” a formal acknowledgment of the validity and academic level of an educational qualification, of part qualification, or of prior learning for the purpose of providing an applicant with outcomes including, but not limited to, the right to apply for registration in a specified category.

“Standardisation” Processes to check, adjust and ensure that assessment processes and criteria (including both the administration of the assessment itself, and its marking) are applied consistently by assessors, assessment providers and moderators.

“Validity” is the measurement of the accuracy of the assessment. In other words, the procedures, methods, instruments and materials have to match what is being assessed.

2. Introduction

The Project and Construction Management Act (Act No. 48 of 2000) requires that applicants who desire to register in one of the categories must satisfy Council that they have:

- 2.1. demonstrated their competence as measured against standards determined by the Council for the relevant category of registration; and
- 2.2. passed any additional examinations that may be determined by the Council.

Paragraph 2.1. and 2.2. are determined through assessment procedures determined by the Council.

This criteria and process document describes the core principles of assessment as part of the registration process in line with the registration and accreditation policies of the Council. It sets out the criteria for the appointment and recognition of assessors. It is also a guide to assessors and moderators.

3. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to ensure that the designing and implementing of assessments of competency for the purpose of registration are set to minimum standards and provide guidance for the assessments to be credible and aligned to applicable legislation and national policies.

4. Applicable Legislation and/or Policies

- National Policy and Criteria for Designing and Implementing Assessment for NQF Qualifications and Part-Qualifications and Professional Designations in South Africa.
- Section 13 (g)(h) and 19 (2)(a) of the Project and Construction Management Act, Act No. 48 of 2000.
- Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, Act 3 of 2000

5. Acknowledgement of Sources

The following information sources were used in the compilation of this criteria and process document:

- Scottish Qualifications Authority
- South African Qualifications Authority
- Council for Higher Education
- Safety and Security Sector Education and Training Authority
- Construction Education and Training Authority
- Quality Council for Trades and Occupations
- University of Cambridge
- University of Oxford
- University of Pretoria

6. Principles of assessment

All assessments of competency for the purpose of registration should encompass all the principles of assessment, namely, validity, reliability practicability and fairness. The following sections describe how these principles should be applied to ensure that assessments meet the required standards:

6.1. Validity

In order for validity in an assessment to be achieved, the following must be adhered to:

- 6.1.1. The assessment must be appropriate for its purpose.
- 6.1.2. The assessment must be designed to allow applicants to show that they have the required knowledge, understanding and skills to meet the criteria for the designation.
- 6.1.3. The assessment must allow the assessors to make reliable assessment decisions.
- 6.1.4. The assessment must allow interpretations and inferences which can be drawn from assessment outcomes to be meaningful and justifiable.
- 6.1.5. Outcomes which are being assessed must be clearly stated.
- 6.1.6. The appropriate type of evidence is used.
- 6.1.7. An appropriate method of assessment is used.
- 6.1.8. An appropriate instrument of assessment is selected.
- 6.1.9. All aspects of the assessment process are documented and available for scrutiny.

6.2. Reliability

Firstly, assessment results should not be perceived to have been influenced by the following variables:

- 6.2.1. Assessor bias in terms of the applicant's gender, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, religion, like/dislike and appearance.
- 6.2.2. Assessor assumptions about the applicant, based on previous (good or bad) performance.
- 6.2.3. Different assessors interpreting designation criteria and competency standards inconsistently.
- 6.2.4. Different assessors applying different assessment standards.
- 6.2.5. Assessor stress and fatigue.
- 6.2.6. Insufficient evidence gathered.

Avoidance of variance in results is ensured in the following ways:

- 6.2.7. Standardisation of assessments.
- 6.2.8. Each time an assessment is administered, the same or similar conditions prevail.
- 6.2.9. Procedures, methods, instruments, and practices are the same or similar for the same or similar contexts.
- 6.2.10. Consistency in assessment judgements should be checked.
- 6.2.11. All assessment decisions must be recorded.
- 6.2.12. Assessors should be trained and competent in administering assessments.
- 6.2.13. Assessors should give clear, consistent, and unambiguous instructions.
- 6.2.14. Assessment criteria and guidelines for unit standards and qualifications should be adhered to, where applicable.
- 6.2.15. Assessors should be experts in their profession.
- 6.2.16. Internal and external moderation procedures for assessment should be in place.
- 6.2.17. Clear and systematic recording procedures should be in place.

6.3. Practicability

Assessment that requires elaborate arrangements for facilities as well as being costly, will make the assessment system fail.

6.4. Fairness

The following represents unfairness in assessment:

- 6.4.1. Bias in respect of ethnicity, gender, age, disability, social class and race, in so far as that the assessment approaches, methods, instruments and materials do not take these differences into account.
- 6.4.2. Lack of clarity in terms of what is being assessed.

The following represents fairness in assessment:

- 6.4.3. The above-mentioned influences are taken into account and addressed.
- 6.4.4. The assessment process is clear, transparent and available to all applicants.
- 6.4.5. Appeal mechanisms are accessible to all applicants.
- 6.4.6. Equitable costs, where:
 - 6.4.6.1. the calculation of fees takes into consideration the actual costs involved as well as the affordability of the fees in the target markets in each instance; and
 - 6.4.6.2. there is fair and transparent affordability means testing.
- 6.4.7. Sensitivity to language, where:

- 6.4.7.1. an accessible language is used, which is mediated for those applicants for whom it is not their mother tongue; and
- 6.4.7.2. care is taken to use appropriate language that is free of ambiguity.
- 6.4.8. Supportive administrative procedures, which include:
 - 6.4.8.1. clear and accessible information;
 - 6.4.8.2. standardised conditions under which assessment is conducted; and
 - 6.4.8.3. standardised appeals processes which are the same for all similar instances within the Council.
- 6.4.9. In terms of Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), mediation between knowledge and skill gained in informal and non-formal ways, and the formal knowledge and skill required.

7. Assessment Criteria

Assessment criteria are statements that describe the standard to which applicants must perform the actions, roles, knowledge, understanding, skills, values and attitudes stated in the outcomes and competency standards frameworks. They are a clear and transparent expression of requirements against which successful (or unsuccessful) performance is assessed. This ensures that there is a built-in mechanism to avoid assessor deviation, inconsistency and error. The assessment criteria remain constant regardless of who is assessing and who is being assessed.

The following should be included in assessment criteria:

- 7.1. The knowledge, understanding, action(s), roles, skills, values and attitudes that an applicant has to display in order to provide evidence that outcomes and competence have been achieved.
- 7.2. The level of complexity and quality of the above (paragraph 7.1.).
- 7.3. The context of and conditions under which demonstrations should occur.

8. Criteria for the Assessment Relating to Formal, Non-formal and Informal Learning, and the Implementation of RPL

Assessment is an integral part of RPL as it ensures that informal and non-formal learning are recognised. The following are key elements that must be included in assessment processes for RPL:

- 8.1. RPL for access which provides alternative access routes into a registered designation.
- 8.2. RPL for credit which involves obtaining credit towards a registered designation for learning or experience obtained informally or non-formally.
- 8.3. Applicant support before, during and after the RPL process.
- 8.4. Preparation for an RPL process or sub-process.
- 8.5. Mediation of knowledge obtained informally or non-formally, and that required formally.
- 8.6. Assessment of competence.

9. Assessment Methods and Instruments

The two assessment methods currently used by Council for the assessment of applicant competency for the purpose of registration is **Product Evaluation** and **Questioning**. These methods of assessments are embedded in the following assessment instruments, utilised by the Council:

9.1. Examinations or tests

9.1.1. Purpose

- 9.1.1.1. Used to sample a domain of knowledge and skills.
- 9.1.1.2. It is administered under supervised conditions and is therefore kept confidential beforehand.
- 9.1.1.3. Used to assess the range of an applicant's ability to recall information, demonstrate understanding, interpret, apply their knowledge, solve problems, analyse and evaluate.

9.1.2. Features

- 9.1.2.1. The language used in the question paper should not be a barrier.
- 9.1.2.2. The weighting given to a particular part of the question paper reflects its relative importance.
- 9.1.2.3. The level of difficulty of the individual questions is appropriate.
- 9.1.2.4. The mark available for each question must match the demands of the task and the examination or test specification.
- 9.1.2.5. The level of difficulty of the overall paper must be appropriate to the level of the designation.
- 9.1.2.6. The marking instructions must allow for a range of valid answers for open-ended questions.

9.2. Interviews

9.2.1. Purpose

- 9.2.1.1. An interview is a dialogue between the assessor and the applicant.
- 9.2.1.2. Oral questions assess the knowledge and understanding of the applicant.
- 9.2.1.3. An interview provides an opportunity to also assess an applicant's communication skills.

9.2.2. Features

- 9.2.2.1. A range of questions must be developed to meet the requirements of the competency standards.
- 9.2.2.2. If used as an alternative to a written exam, a detailed set of marking instructions must be prepared so that there is a clear understanding, on the part of all assessors, of the credits (points) available to a range of possible responses.
- 9.2.2.3. The outcomes to be covered and the competency standards to be achieved must be clearly described. The assessor must reference evidence against the outcome and/or competency standard.
- 9.2.2.4. The assessment should be audio and/or video recorded.

9.3. Logbooks

9.3.1. Purpose

9.3.1.1. Used to assess candidate's progress and achievements.

9.3.2. Features

9.3.2.1. Should have clear instructions for use and how essential information is to be recorded.

9.3.2.2. Should be formally structured.

9.4. Portfolios

9.4.1. Purpose

9.4.1.1. A portfolio is a means of presenting evidence of applicant achievement.

9.4.1.2. It is a representative collection of different pieces of evidence of an applicant's skills, knowledge and understanding which indicates that they have met the requirements of a designation.

9.4.2. Features

9.4.2.1. Portfolios must be designed to allow the applicant and assessor to identify each piece of evidence against the relevant outcomes and competency standards.

9.4.2.2. Portfolios must contain some form of referencing, such as a contents checklist and index of evidence, to ensure that the necessary evidence has been produced and that there is a logical sequence.

9.4.2.3. Portfolios must be well organised and clearly labelled, which relates each piece of evidence to the outcomes and performance criteria.

9.4.2.4. A checklist must be developed, defining the outcomes to be covered and the standards to be achieved.

9.5. Project reports

9.5.1. Purpose

9.5.1.1. Producing evidence gathered over an extended period of time.

9.5.1.2. Developing and reviewing activities applicants have done in the course of their professional practice.

9.5.2. Features

9.5.2.1. Provides a record to note successes and problems.

9.5.2.2. Provides a basis for questioning.

9.5.2.3. Evidence required must not ask for more than is stipulated in the competency standards.

9.5.2.4. Evidence required must not pose any barriers to applicants.

The type of questions which should be covered in assessment instruments is described in tabular format in Annexure A. A balanced combination of the types of questions described in Annexure A must be utilised in examinations, in particular.

10. Quality of Evidence

The assessor must judge whether the applicant has provided enough evidence of sufficient quality to confirm that he or she has reached the required standard or level of competence. The quality of evidence is ensured by checking:

- 10.1. The validity of evidence – evidence should be appropriate to what is being assessed.
- 10.2. The authenticity of evidence – the assessor must verify that the evidence is the applicant's own work.
- 10.3. The sufficiency of evidence – there is enough evidence to meet all the criteria needed to certify the applicant as competent.
- 10.4. The currency of evidence – the evidence is related to current competence.

11. Record of assessment

- 11.1. Assessment decisions must be recorded.
- 11.2. The final result of an assessment must be recorded after the following conditions are met:
 - 11.2.1. Sufficient, relevant, and authentic evidence showing that applicants have met the standards.
 - 11.2.2. The assessment has undergone internal moderation.
- 11.3. Records of applicant assessment must be kept, as these are the basis on which registered designations are awarded. The criteria for assessment records and their retention are as follows:
 - 11.3.1. A list of applicants registered with the Council for each registered designation.
 - 11.3.2. Details of the applicant assessment, including the name of the assessor, location, date and outcome.
 - 11.3.3. Internal moderation report related to the assessment.
 - 11.3.4. Database of assessment results.
 - 11.3.5. Records must be stored securely and in a retrievable format.
 - 11.3.6. Records must be available to external moderators.
- 11.4. Assessment evidence must be retained. The following criteria will apply:
 - 11.4.1. Physical evidence of applicant assessment must be retained for a specific length of time.
 - 11.4.2. Assessment evidence must be stored securely and in a retrievable format.
 - 11.4.3. Assessment evidence must be available to external moderators.

12. Malpractice

12.1. Prevention of malpractice

All reasonable steps must be taken to prevent any malpractice. This includes the development, implementation and monitoring of policies and procedures to minimise any opportunity for malpractice, including in:

- 12.1.1. Design of assessments
- 12.1.2. Security of assessment materials
- 12.1.3. Assessment delivery and completion of assessments
- 12.1.4. Quality assurance of assessment
- 12.1.5. Authentication of applicant evidence
- 12.1.6. Management of applicant assessment data

The following criteria also apply:

- 12.1.7. There should be a robust internal quality assurance system, with appropriate internal verification, to enable the management team and/or the registration committee to identify and take early action to address any concerns about assessment practices.
- 12.1.8. Any concerns of possible applicant or assessment provider malpractice must be dealt with fairly. Procedures must be developed, implemented and monitored to do this, including a documented system and procedure for recording, and where appropriate reporting, all concerns of possible assessment provider or applicant malpractice. This information must be available to quality assurance persons on request.
- 12.1.9. Reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that applicants understand their responsibilities in relation to malpractice.

12.2. Applicant Malpractice

Applicant malpractice means any type of malpractice by an applicant which threatens the integrity of an examination or assessment. The following are examples of applicant malpractice:

- 12.2.1. Breaching the security of assessment materials in a way which threatens the integrity of any exam or assessment.
- 12.2.2. Breaching the defined conditions of an assessment.
- 12.2.3. Collusion — working collaboratively with other applicants beyond what is permitted.
- 12.2.4. Copying from another applicant.
- 12.2.5. Misconduct — inappropriate behaviour in an assessment room that is disruptive and/or disrespectful to others. This includes talking, shouting and/or aggressive behaviour or inappropriate language in the examination or interview room.
- 12.2.6. Offensive content — content in assessment materials that includes vulgarity and swearing that is outside the context of the assessment, or any material that is discriminatory in nature (including discrimination in relation to the protected characteristics identified in the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, 2000 (PEPUDA or the Equality Act, Act No. 4 of 2000).
- 12.2.7. Impersonation — assuming the identity of another applicant, or an applicant having someone assume their identity during an assessment.

- 12.2.8. Plagiarism — failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the applicants own (See Annexure H for more in-depth Guidelines).

12.3. Assessment Provider (service provider, assessor or internal department) Malpractice

Assessment Provider malpractice includes any type of malpractice by a service provider or internal department, or someone acting on its behalf (for example, an assessor). Assessment Provider malpractice does not need to be intentional malpractice and may take place unintentionally (in other words maladministration). Malpractice can include both maladministration in the assessment and deliberate non-compliance with policy requirements. Whether they are intentional or not, it is necessary to investigate any suspected instances of malpractice to protect the integrity of the registered designation.

The following are examples of assessment provider malpractice:

- 12.3.1. Council members, executives and/or managers or others exerting undue pressure on staff to pass applicants who have not met the requirements for a designation.
- 12.3.2. Deliberate falsification of records in order to claim registration certificates.
- 12.3.3. Excessive direction from assessors to applicants on how to meet competency standards.
- 12.3.4. Failure to comply with policy requirements in the preparation, quality assurance and conclusion of an assessment.
- 12.3.5. Misuse of assessments contrary to requirements, including inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions.
- 12.3.6. Failure to recognise and apply appropriate measures to manage potential conflict of interest in assessment or quality assurance.
- 12.3.7. Failure to apply appropriate processes to ensure fairness in the provision of assessment arrangements.
- 12.3.8. Failure to comply with Council requirements in relation to appeals processes.
- 12.3.9. Insecure storage, transmission or use of assessment instruments, materials and marking instructions, resulting in a breach of assessment security.
- 12.3.10. Failure to comply with requirements for safe retention of applicant evidence, and safe and accurate maintenance of assessment and internal moderation records.
- 12.3.11. Failure to comply with SACPCMP procedures for managing and transferring accurate applicant data.
- 12.3.12. Failure by a service provider or an assessor to promptly notify, investigate and report concerns of potential malpractice to the Council.
- 12.3.13. Withholding information about circumstances that may compromise the integrity of any assessment or the credibility of the Council.

12.4. Responding to Concerns of Applicant or Assessment Provider Malpractice

The department and/or service provider conducting the assessment must develop a policy and procedure on how to investigate concerns of possible applicant malpractice and to manage this appropriately. The following conditions should prevail for and during the implementation of said policy:

- 12.4.1. All applicants and staff must be aware of the policy for malpractice, and their responsibilities and rights during and following an investigation into alleged malpractice, including their rights of appeal.
- 12.4.2. No applicant results relevant to an investigation are formally recorded during the course of the investigation.
- 12.4.3. Applying an appropriate action/decision when a case of suspected applicant or Assessment Provider malpractice has been upheld.
- 12.4.4. Reviewing internal quality assurance procedures following malpractice investigations, to minimise the risk of further malpractice, and implementing any required corrective actions.
- 12.4.5. Retaining appropriate records for a relevant period.
- 12.4.6. Criteria for flagging malpractice:
 - 12.4.6.1. A statement of the facts and a detailed account of the circumstances relating to the malpractice concerns.
 - 12.4.6.2. Written statements from relevant parties or staff members as appropriate.
 - 12.4.6.3. Details of any mitigating factors.
 - 12.4.6.4. Any work of the applicant(s) and any associated material that is relevant to the investigation.
- 12.4.7. Applicants or Assessment Providers under investigation for suspected malpractice should be provided with the following:
 - 12.4.7.1. Information about the allegation made against them and the supporting evidence.
 - 12.4.7.2. Information about the possible consequences if malpractice is established.
 - 12.4.7.3. The opportunity to seek advice (if necessary) and the right to be accompanied and supported in any interviews or meetings.
 - 12.4.7.4. The opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required).
 - 12.4.7.5. The opportunity to submit a written statement.
 - 12.4.7.6. A written response, from the Council, providing the applicant with the outcome of the investigation.
 - 12.4.7.7. Information on the applicable appeals procedure, if a decision is made against them.
- 12.4.8. Investigations should be:
 - 12.4.8.1. Focused
 - 12.4.8.2. Impartial and unbiased
 - 12.4.8.3. Proportionate to the nature of the issue under investigation

- 12.4.8.4. Robust and thorough
 - 12.4.8.5. Evidence-based
 - 12.4.8.6. Conducted with discretion
 - 12.4.8.7. Fair to all involved; and
 - 12.4.8.8. Carried out in compliance with the law and relevant regulations
- 12.4.9. Following an investigation, a full written report should be provided to the Legal Operations Committee, in the case of Applicant Malpractice and the Education Operations Committee, in the case of assessment provider malpractice, with all appropriate supporting documentation. The investigation report should provide the following information and use clear, simple language:
- 12.4.9.1. The reason for and background to the investigation.
 - 12.4.9.2. A summary of the approach to the investigation.
 - 12.4.9.3. A description of the evidence considered (identifying interviews and documents, key points arising from each, and highlighting any inconsistencies).
 - 12.4.9.4. The lead investigator's findings, based on the evidence, identifying the nature and implications of any malpractice identified.
 - 12.4.9.5. Any mitigating factors that seem relevant to the lead investigator.
- 12.4.10. Based on the report submitted to it, the Legal Operations Committee will decide on whether to institute a Disciplinary Tribunal.
- 12.4.11. The penalties for proven applicant malpractice will be decided by the Legal Operations Committee on a case-by-case basis, guided by the Penalties for Applicant Malpractice Matrix in Annexure F and Assessment Provider Penalties in Annexure G (which does not limit the Council's discretion in determining the appropriate penalty to apply to an individual case).
- 12.4.12. If a decision is made against an applicant, they may apply to appeal the decision.
- 12.4.13. Any malpractice which is considered, by law, to be a criminal offense must be reported and handed over to the South African Police Service (SAPS).

13. Moderation

- 13.1. The main functions of the moderation system are to:
- 13.1.1. Verify that assessments are credible.
 - 13.1.2. Identify the need to redesign assessments, if required.
 - 13.1.3. Evaluate the performance of assessors.
 - 13.1.4. Provide procedures for the expulsion of unsatisfactory assessors.
 - 13.1.5. Provide feedback to the Council on assessment standards.
 - 13.1.6. Enhance consistency and reduce bias, which includes:
 - 13.1.6.1. Documentation of internal moderation procedures and outcomes.
 - 13.1.6.2. Documentation of processes for the appointment of external moderators with expertise and experience.
 - 13.1.6.3. Documentation of external moderation procedures and outcomes.
 - 13.1.6.4. Documentation of processes by which internal or external irregularities or sources of error are or will be corrected.

13.2. Standardisation of assessments

- 13.2.1. After an assessment standardisation exercises must be undertaken to identify any discrepancies between assessors and allow adjustments to be made to remedy these.

13.3. Internal Moderation

Internal moderation ensures that assessments conducted by a single assessment provider, are consistent, accurate and well-designed. Internal moderation must occur at the three stages of the assessment process, namely, the design, implementation and review stages. Internal moderators should:

- 13.3.1. Establish systems to standardize assessment, including the plans for internal moderation.
- 13.3.2. Monitor consistency of assessment records.
- 13.3.3. Through sampling, check the design of assessment materials for appropriateness before the assessment is implemented.
- 13.3.4. Monitor assessment processes, check applicants' evidence, check the results and decisions of assessor for consistency.
- 13.3.5. Co-ordinate assessor meetings and workshops
- 13.3.6. Liaise with external moderators.
- 13.3.7. Provide appropriate and necessary support, advice and guidance to assessors.

13.4. External Moderation

External moderation ensures that two or more assessment providers are assessing consistently to the same standard, and in a well-designed manner. An External Moderator acts on behalf of the Education Operations Committee as part of the quality assurance and/or accreditation process. External moderation involves the following:

- 13.4.1. Checking that the systems required to support the implementation of assessments at assessment sites are appropriate and working effectively.
- 13.4.2. Providing advice and guidance to assessment providers.
- 13.4.3. Maintaining an overview of implementation across providers.
- 13.4.4. Checking that all the staff involved in assessment are appropriately qualified and experienced.
- 13.4.5. Checking the credibility of assessment methods and instruments.
- 13.4.6. Checking internal moderation systems.
- 13.4.7. Through sampling, monitoring and observing assessment processes and applicants' evidence to ensure consistency across assessment providers.
- 13.4.8. Checking assessors' decisions.

14. Assessor and Moderator Criteria

The following criteria are required in order for an individual to be recognised and/or appointed, by the Council, as an assessor or moderator.

14.1. Requirements for the appointment of an assessor

- 14.1.1. All assessors must have obtained the SAQA registered unit standards, “Conduct outcomes-based assessments” and “Design and develop outcomes-based assessments” (refer to Annexure E).
- 14.1.2. Assessors are required to show competence in relation to the standards and qualifications, competency framework and designation against which they assess applicants, at (or preferably above) the level of the standards and qualifications in question.
- 14.1.3. All assessors must be registered with the Council as a professional.
- 14.1.4. All assessors must have a minimum of seven (7) years relevant, unbroken, industry experience.
- 14.1.5. Assessors must apply for appointment using the application form shown in Annexure B.
- 14.1.6. Assessors will be required to adhere to the Code of Conduct for Assessors in Annexure C, Section A.

14.2. Requirements for the appointment of a moderator:

- 14.2.1. Moderators who are appointed by assessment providers and the Council should be experienced assessors who other assessors have confidence in.
- 14.2.2. All moderators must have obtained the SAQA registered unit standard “Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments” (refer to Annexure E).
- 14.2.3. They should also have undergone training in moderation.
- 14.2.4. They should have good knowledge of the area of competency being assessed.
- 14.2.5. They should have good standing.
- 14.2.6. They should have unquestionable skill in the standards, competency framework and assessment practices.
- 14.2.7. Moderators must have a minimum of 5 years experience as an assessor, according to the criteria described in section 14.1. above.
- 14.2.8. Moderators must have a high level of personal, interpersonal and communication skills.
- 14.2.9. Moderators must apply for appointment using the application form shown in Annexure B.
- 14.2.10. Moderators will be required to adhere to the Code of Conduct for Moderators in Annexure C, Section B.

15. Approval of Assessment Provider

- 15.1. Any assessment provider that will enable assessing of applicants for the purpose of registration, must be evaluated and approved or accredited as an assessment provider with the Council.
- 15.2. Providers must:
 - 15.2.1. Be a legally registered entity
 - 15.2.2. Be tax compliant
 - 15.2.3. Be financially sound
 - 15.2.4. Have an Employment Equity plan in place
 - 15.2.5. Own or have access to resources and facilities required for provision
- 15.3. Providers will have to show that they have the capacity to:
 - 15.3.1. Implement an internal moderation system that will facilitate and ensure that assessment activities will be carried out effectively and efficiently in order to gain accreditation.
 - 15.3.2. Develop assessment tools according to the required standards.
 - 15.3.3. Securely store assessment tools and implement assessment.
 - 15.3.4. Securely store applicant assessment records.
- 15.4. Providers will be evaluated according to the accreditation criteria above, using the Evaluation form in Annexure D

Annexure A

TYPES OF QUESTIONS THAT COULD BE USED IN ASSESSMENTS

| TYPE OF QUESTION | DESCRIPTION | RECOMMENDED USE | FEATURES |
|--|--|--|--|
| Alternative response (True/False) | Applicant is presented with a statement followed by two alternatives (e.g. true/false, yes/no), only one of which is correct | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the recall of information To assess the ability to discriminate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use positive rather than negative statements. Make sure there is a roughly equal distribution of true and false statements. Avoid lengthy and ambiguous statements. Set the pass mark high to counter the guess factor. |
| Assertion/reason | This type of question consists of an assertion and a supporting explanation. The applicant is asked to select the answer from a list of possibilities, usually five, deciding whether the assertion and the explanation are individually true, and if true, whether the explanation is a valid reason for the assertion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For assessing higher order skills of analysis and evaluation To assess ability to weigh up options and to discriminate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reason should be a free-standing sentence so that it can be considered separately from the assertion. Avoid supplying minor or insignificant reasons — these could result in an ambiguous question. |
| Case Studies | A description of an event concerning a real-life or simulated situation, usually in the form of a paragraph or text, a video, or a picture. This is followed by a series of instructions to elicit responses from applicants. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For exercising problem-solving and decision-making skills To demonstrate skills of information-gathering, analysis and time management Reports on possible courses of action | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The brief for the case study must be clearly defined. A checklist must be developed defining the outcomes to be covered and the standards to be achieved so that the requirements of the situation defined in the case study are met. The assessor must to reference evidence against the outcome and/or standard. |
| Completion questions | The applicant is presented with a question with a pre-determined answer consisting of a few words, or may be given a statement where key words are omitted. The applicant is required to supply the words that complete a given statement or to label various parts of a diagram. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the recall of factual information To test understanding and application of knowledge, e.g. in mathematical concepts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the key words in the statement should be left blank. Diagrams should be clearly identified and the parts requiring to be named should be clearly shown. There should be only one possible word or phrase for each blank space. |
| Extended response | Few restrictions on the content and form of the response. Continuous prose is normally expected, but there may be limits imposed on the length and/or the time allocated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For open-ended debates or other responses For arguments For reports | |
| Multiple Choice | Questions consist of an incomplete statement or a question, followed by plausible alternative responses from which the applicant has to select the correct one. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not for assessing higher order analytical skills For recall of information To check level of understanding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stem should contain as much information as possible. Negative statements should be avoided in the stem. All the responses should be of approximately the same length. The responses should be grammatically correct, unambiguous and consistent with the stem. None of the responses should be synonymous. |

| TYPE OF QUESTION | DESCRIPTION | RECOMMENDED USE | FEATURES |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All distractors should be feasible but there should only be one key. • The position of the key in the options should be randomised. • Items should be tested before use to check validity, reliability and the difficulty level. |
| Short-answer | This type of question involves the applicant being presented with a question with a predetermined answer. These questions may use words, numbers, diagrams or graphs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the recall of factual information, • To test the understanding and application of knowledge, e.g. mathematical concepts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They must be devised to ensure that they reflect the requirements of the outcomes. • They should be phrased in such a way that the applicant's task is clearly indicated. • A detailed set of marking instructions must be prepared so that there is a clear understanding, on the part of all assessors, of the expected answers. |
| Structured questions | Consists of a stem (which describes a situation), followed by a series of related questions. The stem can be text, a diagram, a picture, a video, etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recall of information • Application of knowledge and understanding • Analyses • Debates • Arguments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions should be based on, and relevant to, the stem • Questions should be phrased in such a way that the applicant's task is clearly indicated • Questions based on recall are inappropriate |

APPLICATION FORM FOR ASSESSOR AND MODERATOR APPOINTMENT
A. ASSESSOR INFORMATION

| | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| Title (Dr/Mr/Mrs/Ms/Prof) | | |
| Name/s | | |
| Surname | | |
| ID or Passport no. | | |
| Designation | | |
| Gender (for equity purposes) | | |
| Race (for equity purposes) | | |
| Disability (for equity purposes) | | |
| Postal Address | | |
| Contact details | Tel. | |
| | Mobile | |
| | E-mail | |

B. EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION DETAILS

| | | | |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|
| Employment status <i>(cross out relevant response)</i> | Unemployed | Employed | Self-employed |
| Position in Company <i>(if relevant)</i> | | | |
| Name of Employer <i>(if relevant)</i> | | | |
| Contact details of Employer <i>(if relevant)</i> | Address | | |
| | Tel no. | | |
| | Email address | | |

C. EXPERIENCE

| Relevant Industry Experience | |
|---|--|
| How many years of experience do you have? | |

| Experience as an Assessor (<i>only those applying to be a moderator fill in</i>) | |
|--|--|
| How many years of experience do you have? | |

D. QUALIFICATION VERIFICATION DETAILS

| No. | Name of Educational Institution | Name of Qualification attained | Date conferred |
|-----|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |

| Achievement of unit standards | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Do you have the unit standard "Conduct outcomes-based assessment" at NQF Level 5? | YES | NO |
| Do you have the unit standard "Design and develop outcomes-based assessment" at NQF Level 5? | YES | NO |
| As a moderator do you have the unit standard "Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments" at NQF 6? | YES | NO |

I solemnly declare that, to the best of my knowledge, all the information contained in my application is true and correct.

Applicant's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

For Office Use

Confirmation of supporting documents (tick✓ if submitted)

| | |
|---|--|
| Certified Copies of ID document | |
| Curriculum Vitae | |
| Supporting Documents (letters of reference which confirm the claims made in the CV, contact details of referees, service certificates, etc) | |
| Certified copies of all qualifications (including unit standards) | |
| Letter of Appointment as assessor (only required for moderator applicants) | |
| Registration Certificate | |
| Signed Code of Conduct | |

Annexure C

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR ASSESSORS AND MODERATORS

A. Code of Conduct for Assessors

I, the undersigned, am applying to become an assessor. I agree that, if my application is successful, I hereby commit myself to abide by the SACPCMP Code of Conduct in relation to all my work conducted as a SACPCMP assessor. The Code of Conduct to which I agree is as follows:

1. I shall conduct my work as a SACPCMP assessor with integrity, seeking at all times to create a positive environment for assessment and to take note of and respect the historical diversity of applicants' cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds;
2. Any conflict of interest, existing between any applicant, and myself shall be declared in advance, and, if requested, I shall recuse myself from the process in such instances;
3. All information received during my work as an assessor about individuals or organisations will be treated with the strictest confidentiality unless it is relevant to the fairness, reliability and validity of the assessment process;
4. All relevant information about any irregularities in the assessment process of which I become aware will be included in my reports to the moderator; these will include:
 - a. unplanned environmental, personal or other problems which may have interfered with the performance of the applicant
 - b. suspected or proven irregularities committed by the applicant
 - c. suspected or proven irregularities committed by any other parties to the assessment
 - d. any suspected or proven bribery, threats or sexual or other harassment of or by applicants
 - e. any grounds for doubting the authenticity of the evidence presented during the assessment process;
5. If I have reason to believe the moderator is not addressing irregularities brought by myself to his or her notice, I shall draw these irregularities to the attention directly to the SACPCMP Education Operations Committee.

Names in full: _____ **ID No.** _____

Signed: _____ **Date:** _____

B. Code of Conduct for Moderators

I, the undersigned, am applying to become a moderator. I agree that, if my application is successful, I hereby commit myself to abide by the SACPCMP Code of Conduct in relation to all my work conducted as a SACPCMP moderator. The Code of Conduct to which I agree is as follows:

1. I shall conduct my work as a SACPCMP moderator with integrity, seeking at all times to create a positive environment for assessment and moderation and to take note of and respect the historical diversity of applicants' and assessors' cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds;
2. Any conflict of interest, existing between any applicant or assessor, and myself shall be declared in advance, and, if requested, I shall recuse myself from the process in such instances;
3. All information received during my work as an moderator about individuals or organisations will be treated with the strictest confidentiality unless it is relevant to the fairness, reliability and validity of the assessment process;
4. Any unevenness in the standards of different assessors will be noted, and every effort will be made through feedback and constructive support to achieve a common standard amongst all assessors under my moderation; in this way I shall try to promote quality assessments and avoid standards drift;
5. If I identify a particular assessor as unreliable and am unable to correct his or her weaknesses through a supportive and transparent process I shall inform the SACPCMP about this problem and ask the Council to take appropriate steps;
6. All relevant information about any irregularities in the assessment process of which I become aware will be included in my reports to the SACPCMP; these will include:
 - a. unplanned environmental, personal or other problems which may have interfered with the performance of the applicant
 - b. suspected or proven irregularities committed by the applicant
 - c. suspected or proven irregularities committed by any other parties to the assessment
 - d. any suspected or proven bribery, threats or sexual or other harassment of or by applicants or assessors
 - e. any grounds for doubting the authenticity of the evidence presented during the assessment process;
7. Any constructive comments about the assessment guides, instruments or procedures which I can make by reflecting on their use on the ground shall be collated and sent to the SACPCMP Registration committee; this feedback will be used to improve old guides and instruments and develop new ones in a continuing process of renewal and improvement of quality.

Names in full: _____ **ID No.** _____

Signed: _____ **Date:** _____

ASSESSMENT PROVIDER EVALUATION FORM

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Assessment Provider | |
| Type of Assessment | |
| Assessment provided on behalf of which department | |
| Date of Evaluation | |

A. OFFICIAL CONTACT PERSON

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Full Names | |
| Surname | |
| Tel no. | |
| Cell no. | |
| Email | |

B. ASSESSMENT PROVIDER REQUIREMENTS VERIFICATION

| | Evidence | <i>(tick if fulfilled)</i> |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Registered as legal entity | Company registration certificate | |
| Company Tax compliant | Tax clearance certificate | |
| Accredited by ETQA | Registration Certificate | |
| Provider is financially sound | Financial Statements | |
| Company has Employment Equity in Place | BEE certificate | |

C. ASSESSMENT MANAGEMENT BREAKDOWN

| 1 = Poor | 2 = Fair | 3 = Good | 4 = Very Good | 5 = Excellent | SCORE |
|--|----------|--|---------------|---------------|-------|
| CRITERIA | | EVIDENCE | | | |
| Ownership of or access to the resources and facilities require for assessment provision | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of facilities and resources required for assessment provision Evidence provided of ownership or agreements of use with other parties | | | |
| Applicant's results are submitted promptly to the Council | | Applicant's record database (records stored to include: ID number, race, gender, disability status, assessment undertaken, assessment score) | | | |
| Assessment meets the requirements as specified in the policy standards | | Assessment procedures outlined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designing the assessment Conducting of the assessment Collection of evidence Making judgement Provision of feedback on the assessment Assessment evaluation process | | | |
| Assessment methods and instruments/tools clearly defined | | Existing systems that cater to the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulate instruments used for assessment Procedure for recording assessment in place | | | |
| Assessors work to common and explicit instructions for allocating results or judgments | | Example of assessment scoring tools (e.g. checklist, marking memos etc.) | | | |
| Internal and/or external moderation procedures are in place | | Outline of moderation procedures | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | |
| % | | | | | |

FOR OFFICIAL USE

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Evaluation Conducted by: | | |
| Decision | | Please tick relevant option |
| 1 | Assessment Provider approved (85% and above) | |
| 2 | Assessment Provider approved subject to certain conditions (below 85%). Specify conditions below | |
| 3 | Assessment provider not approved (below 60%). Provide reasons for non-approval below | |
| AUTHORISED SIGNATURE | | |
| DATE | | |

Annexure E

SAQA UNIT STANDARDS REQUIRED BY ASSESSORS AND MODERATORS

REGISTERED UNIT STANDARD: Conduct outcomes-based assessment

| SAQA US ID | UNIT STANDARD TITLE |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 115753 | Conduct outcomes-based assessment |
| ORIGINATOR | |
| SGB Assessor Standards | |

PURPOSE OF THE UNIT STANDARD

This generic assessor unit standard is for those who assess people for their achievement of learning outcomes in terms of specified criteria using pre-designed assessment instruments. The outcomes and criteria may be defined in a range of documents including but not limited to unit standards, exit level outcomes, assessment standards, curriculum statements and qualifications.

Those who achieve this unit standard will be able to conduct assessments within their fields of expertise. This unit standard will contribute towards the achievement of a variety of qualifications, particularly within the fields of Education Training and Development Practices and Human Resource Development.

People credited with this unit standard are able to carry out assessments in a fair, valid, reliable and practicable manner that is free of all bias and discrimination, paying particular attention to the three groups targeted for redress: race, gender and disability.

In particular, people credited with this unit standard will be able to:

- Demonstrate understanding of outcomes-based assessment;
- Prepare for assessments;
- Conduct assessments;
- Provide feedback on assessments; and
- Review assessments.

LEARNING ASSUMED TO BE IN PLACE AND RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

The credit calculation is based on the assumption that those starting to learn towards this unit standard have no previous assessment experience. It is assumed, though, that the candidate-assessors have evaluative expertise within the area of learning in which they intend to assess (see Definition of Terms for a definition of "evaluative expertise").

UNIT STANDARD RANGE

1. This generic assessment unit standard applies to assessment in all fields of learning. However, it is expected that assessments will be contextualised to meet the requirements of different contexts.
2. Assessment of candidate-assessors will only be valid for award of this unit standard if the following requirements are met:
 - Assessments carried out by the candidate-assessor are in relation to significant, meaningful and coherent outcome statements that include criteria for assessment purposes, and allow for judgements of competence in line with SAQA's definition of competence i.e. embrace foundational, practical and reflexive dimensions of competence. Outcomes that are highly task-

orientated and do not demand much, if any, in the way of reflexive competence, will not be sufficient for measuring competence as an assessor in terms of this unit standard. It is important that candidate-assessors select outcomes that enable them to meet the requirement laid out here.

- The candidate-assessor demonstrates repeatability by carrying out at least two assessments:
 - One of which may be a simulated assessment (in order to cover a range of typical assessment situations), and
 - At least one of which must involve a real candidate in a real assessment situation, preferably under the guidance of a mentor.

The assessments may involve two or more candidates in relation to the same outcome.

- Candidate-assessors produce evidence that they can conduct assessments in RPL situations and for candidates who may have fairly recently acquired the necessary knowledge and skills through courses or learning programmes. However, candidate assessors do not need to carry out both kinds of assessments in practice for the award of this unit standard. Should candidate-assessors carry out an RPL-related assessment for the purposes of this unit standard, then it is sufficient for them to show how they might have conducted the assessment differently had it been an assessment linked to recent learning, and vice versa.

3. For the purposes of assessment against this unit standard, candidate-assessors should have access to Assessment Guides and will not be expected to design assessments. (See Definition of Terms for a definition of Assessment Guides). Candidate assessors will be expected to interpret the standards at hand in order to ensure their assessment judgements are in accordance with the requirements of the standard. In cases where Assessment Guides are not available, providers should seek ways to make such guides available for the purposes of this assessment. Where candidate-assessor also intend to design assessments, then providers are encouraged to integrate the learning and assessment of the unit standards:

- Conduct outcomes-based assessments
- Design and develop outcomes-based assessments

4. Candidate-assessors should have access to organisational assessment policies, procedures and systems (including moderation). It is assumed the organisational policies and procedures are of a quality sufficient for accreditation purposes. Where such policies and procedures are not yet available, the provider may make general policies and procedures available for the purposes of this assessment.

Further range statements are provided in the body of the unit standard where they apply to particular specific outcomes or assessment criteria.

Specific Outcomes and Assessment Criteria:

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate understanding of outcomes-based assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Comparisons between outcomes-based and another form of assessment of learning highlight key differences in terms of the underlying philosophies and approaches to assessment, including an outline of advantages and disadvantages.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

RPL is explained in terms of its purpose, processes and related benefits and challenges. Explanations highlight the potential impact of RPL on individuals, learning organisations and the workplace.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

A variety of assessment methods are described and compared in terms of how they could be used when conducting assessments in different situations.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

The description of methods should cover situations for gathering evidence of:

- Problem solving ability,
- Knowledge and understanding,
- Practical and technical skills,
- Attitudinal skills and values.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Key principles of assessment are described and illustrated in practical situations. The descriptions highlight the importance of applying the principles in terms of the possible effect on the assessment process and results.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

The approach to giving feedback on assessment results is described in terms of the possible impact on candidates and further learning and assessment.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 2

Prepare for assessments.

OUTCOME RANGE

Preparation for assessments relates to organising and preparing resources, people, schedules, venues, assessment instruments and documentation for a particular assessment and/or related assessments for an individual or a number of assessment candidates/learners. Preparation is to be carried out in situations where the candidate assessor has access to:

- Relevant organisational assessment and moderation policies and procedures, and
- Assessment guides and instruments for the assessment at hand, including the relevant outcomes and criteria.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Preparation of assessment resources, logistics, documentation and environment meets the requirements of the assessment at hand and ensures fairness and safety of assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Parties involved in the assessment are notified in good time. Checks are carried out to ensure parties involved in the assessment are ready and available to meet required schedules.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Parties include assessment candidates and moderators, and may include assessment facilitators and/or assistants, teachers, trainers, invigilators and safety personnel.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

All pre-assessment moderation requirements are carried out in accordance with relevant assessment policies, moderation plans and ETQA requirements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Assessment details are explained to candidates clearly and constructively. Opportunities for clarification are provided and responses promote understanding of the requirements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Assessment details cover the specific purpose, process, expectations, roles, responsibilities and appeals procedures related to the assessment at hand, as well as the general context of assessment in terms of the principles and mechanisms of the NQF, as applicable to the situation and assessment context.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Inputs are sought from candidates regarding special needs and possible sources of evidence that could contribute to valid assessment, including RPL opportunities. Modifications made to the assessment approach on the basis of the inputs do not affect the validity of the assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 6

Candidate readiness for assessment is confirmed. In cases where candidates are not yet ready, actions taken are in line with assessment policies.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 3

Conduct assessments.

OUTCOME RANGE

The ability to make assessment judgements using diverse sources of evidence must be demonstrated. Assessments to include cases where candidates have special needs and where evidence arises through RPL situations. Should it not be feasible to gather evidence for assessments of special need candidates or in RPL situations, evidence may be produced through scenarios.

- Candidate-assessors must show they can make judgements in situations where:
- Candidates meet all criteria for a particular outcome,
- Candidates clearly do not meet the criteria for a particular outcome,
- Candidates meet some, but not all criteria, and
- More evidence is required in order to make a judgement of competence.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Assessment practices promote effective, manageable, fair and safe assessment. Assessment practices are in line with quality assurance requirements, recognised codes of practice and learning-site or work-site standard operating procedures where applicable.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Professional, industry or legislated codes of practice.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The assessment is carried out according to the assessment design and in line with the assessment plan. Adjustments are justified by the situation, and unforeseen events and special needs of candidates are addressed without compromising the validity or fairness of the assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Questioning techniques are appropriate and have the potential to successfully elicit appropriate responses. Communication with candidates is non-leading, and is appropriate to the assessment at hand and the language ability of the candidate.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

"Leading" refers to the practice of inadvertently or deliberately influencing the evidence candidates produce through the style of questioning, instructions or responses to candidates.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Sufficient evidence is gathered, including evidence generated over time, to enable valid, consistent, reliable and fair assessment judgements to be made.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Assessment judgements are consistent with judgements made on similar evidence and are justified by the authenticity, validity, sufficiency and currency of the evidence.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 6

Records of the assessment are in line with the requirements of the organisation's quality assurance system. Records meet requirements for making assessment judgements, giving meaningful feedback, supporting internal and external moderation, and addressing possible appeals.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 4

Provide feedback on assessments.

OUTCOME RANGE

- Parties include candidates, educators, trainers, managers and moderators as applicable to the situation.
- Evidence must be provided of the ability to give written and oral feedback.
- The ability to give feedback must be demonstrated in situations where:
 - Candidates meet all criteria in relation to an outcome,
 - Candidates clearly do not meet the criteria in relation to an outcome,
 - Candidates meet some, but not all criteria, and
 - More evidence is required before a judgement is possible.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Feedback is given to relevant parties in accordance with confidentiality requirements, in an appropriate sequence and within agreed timeframes.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Feedback is clear and confined to strengths and weaknesses in performance and/or requirements for further evidence in relation to the outcome/s at hand.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

The type and manner of feedback is constructive, culturally sensitive and related to the relevant party's needs. Sufficient information is provided to enable the purpose of the assessment to be met, and to enable parties to make further decisions.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Further decisions include awarding of credit, redirecting candidates to further learning or guiding candidates to further application or re-assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Feedback on the assessment process is obtained from the candidate and opportunities are provided for clarification and explanations concerning the entire assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Disputes and/or appeals that arise are dealt with according to the assessment policy.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 6

Agreements reached and key elements of the feedback are recorded in line with the requirements of the organisation's quality assurance system.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 5

Review assessments.

OUTCOME RANGE

The review should address at least the following aspects:

- The quality of the assessment instruments, including the outcomes against which assessment takes place and Assessment Guides used,
- The assessment process, and
- Candidate readiness for assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

The review identifies strengths and weaknesses in the instruments and process, and records these for incorporation in assessment redesign.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Feedback from relevant parties is analysed and used to influence future assessments positively.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Weaknesses in the assessment design and process that could have compromised the fairness of assessment are identified and dealt with according to the organisation's assessment policy.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Weaknesses in the assessment arising from poorly defined outcomes and criteria are identified, and effective steps are taken to inform relevant bodies.

UNIT STANDARD ACCREDITATION AND MODERATION OPTIONS

- A candidate-assessor wishing to be assessed, against this unit standard may apply to an assessment agency, assessor or provider institution accredited by the relevant ETQA.
- Anyone assessing a candidate-assessor against this unit standard must meet the assessor requirements of the relevant ETQA. In particular, such assessors of candidate-assessors must demonstrate that they assess in terms of the scope and context defined in all the range statements.
- Any institution offering learning towards this unit standard must be accredited as a provider with the relevant ETQA.
- External moderation of assessment will be conducted by the relevant ETQA at its discretion.

UNIT STANDARD ESSENTIAL EMBEDDED KNOWLEDGE

- The following knowledge is embedded within the unit standard, and will be assessed directly or indirectly through assessment of the specific outcomes in terms of the assessment criteria:
- Outcomes-based education, training and development
- Principles of assessment - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'Key principles of assessment are described and illustrated in practical situations. The descriptions highlight the importance of applying the principles in terms of the possible effect on the assessment process and results.', and indirectly assessed via a requirement to apply the principles throughout the standard.

- Principles and practices of RPL - directly assessed through assessment criteria 'RPL is explained in terms of its purpose, processes and related benefits and challenges. Explanations highlight the potential impact of RPL on individuals, learning organisations and the workplace.', 'Inputs are sought from candidates regarding special needs and possible sources of evidence that could contribute to valid assessment, including RPL opportunities. Modifications made to the assessment approach on the basis of the inputs do not affect the validity of the assessment.' and specific outcome 'Conduct assessments.', as well as through application in the rest of the standard.
- Methods of assessment - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'A variety of assessment methods are described and compared in terms of how they could be used when conducting assessments in different situations.', and indirectly assessed through application of the methods
- Potential barriers to assessment - assessed when dealing with special needs.
- The principles and mechanisms of the NQF - this knowledge underpins the standard
- Assessment policies and ETQA requirements
- Moderation requirements

Critical Cross-field Outcomes (CCFO):

UNIT STANDARD CCFO IDENTIFYING

Identify and solve problems using critical and creative thinking: preparing for contingencies, candidates with special needs, problems that arise during assessment, suggesting changes to assessment.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO WORKING

Work effectively in a team using critical and creative thinking: working with candidates and other relevant parties during assessment, as well as post-assessment.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO ORGANISING

Organize and manage oneself and one's activities: preparing, conducting and recording the assessment.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COLLECTING

Collect, analyse, organize and critically evaluate information: gather, evaluate and judge evidence and the assessment process.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COMMUNICATING

Communicate effectively: prepare candidates for assessment, communicate during assessment, and provide feedback.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO DEMONSTRATING

Demonstrate the world as a set of related systems: understanding the impact of assessment on individuals and organisations.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO CONTRIBUTING

Be culturally and aesthetically sensitive across a range of social contexts: give feedback on assessments in a culturally sensitive manner.

**REGISTERED UNIT STANDARD:
Design and develop outcomes-based assessments**

| SAQA US ID | UNIT STANDARD TITLE |
|------------------------|---|
| 115755 | Design and develop outcomes-based assessments |
| ORIGINATOR | |
| SGB Assessor Standards | |

PURPOSE OF THE UNIT STANDARD

This unit standard is for people who design and develop assessments to facilitate consistent, credible, reliable, fair, and unbiased assessments of learning outcomes. The outcomes may be defined in a range of documents including but not limited to unit standards, exit level outcomes, assessment standards, curriculum statements and qualifications. This unit standard will contribute towards the achievement of a variety of qualifications particularly within the field of Education Training and Development Practices and Human Resource Development.

In particular, people credited with this unit standard are able to:

- Demonstrate understanding of design principles of outcomes-based assessment,
- Design outcomes-based assessments,
- Develop assessment activities,
- Develop assessment guides, and
- Evaluate assessment designs and guides.

LEARNING ASSUMED TO BE IN PLACE AND RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

The credit calculation is based on the assumption that those entering programmes to learn towards this unit standard:

- Have already achieved unit standard NLRD 115753: Conduct outcomes-based assessment, or equivalent,
- Are competent in the relevant field in which they are designing assessments, or have access to subject matter experts, and
- Are able to analyse and interpret the relevant outcomes (or standards).

UNIT STANDARD RANGE

1. This is a generic assessment unit standard, and candidates can design and develop assessments within any field of learning in line with their subject matter expertise. For the purposes of assessment of this assessment design unit standard, candidates should have access to the relevant outcomes for which assessments will be designed. However, the assessment of candidate-designers will only be valid for award of this unit standard if the following requirements are met:
 - The credit value for the assessment/s designed is worth 8 credits (or the equivalent of 8 credits). This means the candidate can design an assessment for a single outcome worth 8 credits or more, or for a number of smaller outcomes collectively worth 8 credits.
 - The outcome/s selected for design of assessments require assessment in relation to significant, meaningful and coherent outcome statements that include assessment criteria and allow for judgements of competence in line with SAQA's definition of competence i.e. embraces foundational, practical and reflexive dimensions of competence. As a general guide, the outcomes selected should carry at least 4 credits each or the equivalent. Single-task assessments will not be valid for awarding this unit standard. Outcomes that are highly task-orientated and do not demand much, if any, in the way of reflexive competence, will not be sufficient for measuring competence as an assessment designer in terms of this unit standard.

Thus candidate-designers should select outcomes that enable them to meet the requirement laid out here.

- At least three assessment activities are designed in detail, illustrating the use of three different assessment methods.
- Candidates produce evidence that they can design assessments in RPL situations and for candidates who may have fairly recently acquired the necessary knowledge and skills through courses or learning programmes.

2. For the purposes of assessment against this unit standard, candidates should have access to organisational assessment policies, procedures and systems (including moderation). It is assumed the organisational policies and procedures are of a quality sufficient for accreditation purposes. Where such policies and procedures are not yet available, the provider may make general policies and procedures available for the purposes of this assessment.

Further range statements are provided in the body of the unit standard where they apply to particular specific outcomes or assessment criteria.

Specific Outcomes and Assessment Criteria:

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate understanding of design principles of outcomes-based assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Comparisons between outcomes-based design and another form of assessment design highlight key differences in terms of the underlying philosophies and approaches to assessment, including an outline of advantages and disadvantages.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Similarities and differences include assessment methodology, advantages to learners, employers and institutions, impact on learners and assessors, and means of reporting results.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Key differences are identified in the approach to designing assessments for RPL-candidates and for programme-based assessments.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Different assessment methods are described and justified in relation to particular contexts, and their advantage over other possible options.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

The description of methods should cover situations for gathering evidence of abilities in problem solving, comprehension, analysis and synthesis, evaluation, practical and technical skills, attitudinal skills and values.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Key principles of assessment are described and illustrated in terms of their impact on assessment design, and ultimately assessment practice and results.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

See "Definition of Terms" for a definition of principles of good assessment principles.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Scenarios are provided to illustrate the manner in which questioning approaches impact on the validity of assessments.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Open versus closed questions, leading questions, probing questions

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 2

Design outcomes-based assessments.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

The design addresses the need for cost-effectiveness and takes into account the overall assessment plan, results of previous assessments, special needs of candidates, assessment contexts, and where applicable, the accessibility and safety of the environment and contingencies.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Assessment activities, instruments and resources selected are appropriate to the outcomes to be assessed and the assessment candidates, and have the potential to enable the collection of valid and sufficient evidence. The design accommodates the possibility of RPL.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Potential unfair barriers to achievement by candidates are identified and the design addresses such barriers without compromising the validity of the assessment or possibilities for continued learning.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Unfair barriers could relate to issues such as language or disabilities.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

The design ensures holistic, integrated and comprehensive assessment using a range of potential sources and types of evidence.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Opportunities for gathering naturally-occurring evidence are identified and planned whenever possible, so as to improve assessment efficiency and match assessment conditions to real performance conditions where applicable.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Naturally-occurring evidence refers to evidence gathered during the normal course of learning or work.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 3

Develop assessment activities.

OUTCOME RANGE

Candidates are to provide evidence for the development of activities that assess:

- Psychomotor skills: through methods such as observation of naturally occurring evidence, simulations, skills tests, assessment of products.
- Cognitive skills: through methods such as fixed and open response, written and oral items.
- Affective skills (value and attitudinal orientation): such as through observation of behaviour.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

The activities facilitate the production of valid, sufficient, authentic and current evidence, matching the requirements of the given outcome statement/s.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Activities promote integrated assessment as far as possible and enable combinations of outcomes to be assessed simultaneously where possible.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

The activities are appropriate, fair and manageable, and are consistent with the defined purpose of the assessment, including the possibility of RPL.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

See "Definition of Terms" for a definition of appropriate, fair and manageable.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Communication intended for candidates is appropriate to the candidates and assessment context, and provides clear direction without influencing candidates towards particular responses.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

The activities are described in sufficient detail to facilitate effective and efficient assessments, but with sufficient opportunities for assessors to adapt and contextualise the activities as required within the assessment context. Where appropriate, guidance is provided for contextualising the activities.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 6

Activities meet cost and time requirements and any other constraints within the assessment context.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 7

Time allocated for the activities is realistic, can be justified in terms of the requirements of the outcomes and is sufficient for the nature of the performances being assessed.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 4

Develop assessment guides.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Guides contain all the details needed by assessors to conduct assessments in line with defined assessment principles.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Details concerning at least: the approach to assessment, outcomes to be assessed; types and quality of evidence to be collected (including cognitive, affective and psychomotor); assessment methods to be used; resources required; conditions of assessment; timing of assessment; time-limits where applicable, sequence and schedules of activities; accountabilities; deadlines; relevant standard operating procedures where applicable; administrative procedures; moderation arrangements; instructions to assessors, candidates, and support personnel.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The guide provides clear details of the assessment activities in line with the assessment design, so as to facilitate fair, reliable and consistent assessments by assessors. The activities are presented in a form that allows for efficient communication of requirements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

The structure of the guide promotes efficient and effective assessment. It further facilitates the recording of data before, during and after the assessment for purposes of record keeping, assessment judgements and moderation of assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

The guide includes all support material and/or references to support material, including observations sheets, checklists, possible or required sources of evidence and guidance on expected quality of evidence including exemplars, memoranda or rubrics as applicable.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

The guide makes provision for review of the assessment design, and is presented in a format consistent with organisational quality assurance requirements.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 5

Evaluate assessment designs and guides.

OUTCOME RANGE

Candidates to provide evidence of the ability to identify and make recommendations on strengths and weaknesses of assessment guides.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Methods are appropriate and sufficient to evaluate the quality of the assessment design and guides in relation to good assessment principles and the intention of the assessment reflected in the standards.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The evaluation results are described and justified in terms of the principles of good assessment and based on evidence from a variety of sources, including empirical data, moderation findings and stakeholder feedback.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Recommendations contribute towards the improvement of assessment design and guides to facilitate assessments in line with the requirements of the given outcome statements and the purposes of the assessment.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

The evaluation is carried out in line with quality assurance requirements, including moderation requirements, and contributes towards enhancing the credibility and integrity of the recognition system.

UNIT STANDARD ACCREDITATION AND MODERATION OPTIONS

- A candidate-designer wishing to be assessed, against this unit standard may apply to an assessment agency, assessor or provider institution accredited by the relevant ETQA.
- Anyone assessing a candidate-designer against this unit standard must meet the assessor requirements of the relevant ETQA. In particular, such assessors must demonstrate that they assess in terms of the scope and context defined in all the range statements.
- Any institution offering learning towards this unit standard must be accredited as a provider with the relevant ETQA.

- External moderation of assessment will be conducted by the relevant ETQA at its discretion.

UNIT STANDARD ESSENTIAL EMBEDDED KNOWLEDGE

The following knowledge is embedded within the unit standard, and will be assessed directly or indirectly through assessment of the specific outcomes in terms of the assessment criteria:

- Outcomes-based education, training and development - underpins understanding of outcomes-based assessment
- Principles of assessment - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'Key principles of assessment are described and illustrated in terms of their impact on assessment design, and ultimately assessment practice and results.', and indirectly assessed via a requirement to apply the principles throughout the standard.
- Principles and practices of RPL - directly assessed through assessment criteria 'Key differences are identified in the approach to designing assessments for RPL-candidates and for programme-based assessments.', 'Assessment activities, instruments and resources selected are appropriate to the outcomes to be assessed and the assessment candidates, and have the potential to enable the collection of valid and sufficient evidence. The design accommodates the possibility of RPL.' and 'The activities are appropriate, fair and manageable, and are consistent with the defined purpose of the assessment, including the possibility of RPL.', as well as through application in the rest of the standard.
- Methods of assessment - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'Different assessment methods are described and justified in relation to particular contexts, and their advantage over other possible options.', and indirectly assessed through application of the methods when designing activities, Specific outcome 'Develop assessment activities'.
- Potential barriers to assessment - assessed when dealing with special needs.
- The principles and mechanisms of the NQF - this knowledge underpins the standard
- Assessment policies and ETQA requirements
- Moderation requirements

Critical Cross-field Outcomes (CCFO):

UNIT STANDARD CCFO IDENTIFYING

Identify and solve problems using critical and creative thinking: planning for contingencies, candidates with special needs, problems that could arise during assessment, suggesting changes to assessment following evaluation of the design.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO ORGANISING

Organize and manage oneself and ones activities: planning the assessment, assessment activities and assessment guide.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COLLECTING

Collect, analyse, organize and critically evaluate information: determine evidence requirements and sources, evaluate the quality of assessment guides.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COMMUNICATING

Communicate effectively: communicate all assessment requirements and processes in writing.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO DEMONSTRATING

Demonstrate the world as a set of related systems: understanding the impact of assessment on individuals and organisations.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO CONTRIBUTING

Be culturally and aesthetically sensitive across a range of social contexts: plan and design assessments in a culturally sensitive manner.

**REGISTERED UNIT STANDARD:
Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments**

| SAQA US ID | UNIT STANDARD TITLE |
|------------------------|--|
| 115759 | Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments |
| ORIGINATOR | |
| SGB Assessor Standards | |

PURPOSE OF THE UNIT STANDARD

This unit standard is for people who conduct internal or external moderation of outcomes-based assessments. The assessments could be in terms of outcomes defined in a number of documents, including but not limited to unit standards, exit level outcomes, assessment standards, curriculum statements and qualifications. This unit standard will contribute towards the achievement of a variety of qualifications particularly within the field of Education Training and Development Practices and Human Resource Development.

Those who have achieved this unit standard will be able to moderate assessments in terms of the relevant outcome statements and quality assurance requirements. The candidate-moderator will be able to use the prescribed Quality Assurance procedures in a fair, valid, reliable and practicable manner that is free of all bias and discrimination, paying particular attention to the three groups targeted for redress: race, gender and disability.

In particular, people credited with this unit standard are able to:

- Demonstrate understanding of moderation within the context of an outcomes-based assessment system,
- Plan and prepare for moderation,
- Conduct moderation,
- Advise and support assessors,
- Report, record and administer moderation, and
- Review moderation systems and processes.

LEARNING ASSUMED TO BE IN PLACE AND RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

The credit calculation is based on the assumption that learners have previous assessment experience when starting to learn towards this unit standard, and in particular, recognition for the unit standard: NLRD 115753: "Conduct outcomes-based assessments". It is recommended that candidates should achieve NLRD 115755: "Design and develop outcomes-based assessments" before attempting this unit standard:

It is further assumed that the person has evaluative expertise within the field in which they are moderating assessments.

UNIT STANDARD RANGE

1. This is a generic unit standard, and applies to internal and/or external moderation within all fields of learning. It is accepted that moderation happens in different ways and at different levels in different sectors, including different models for what constitutes internal versus external moderation. This standard is intended to cover any situation in which moderation occurs, whether this be internally, i.e. within the ambit of the provider-assessor, or externally through cooperating providers, or externally through professional bodies and quality assurance bodies.
2. Assessment of candidate-moderators will only be valid for award of this unit standard if the following requirements are met:
 - Moderation is carried out for assessments that include candidates with special needs, and RPL situations. Where real assessments are not available to cover these situations, the candidate is

able to demonstrate how special needs and RPL situations would be addressed within their moderation plan and process.

- Moderation covers assessment instruments, assessment design and methodology, assessment records; assessment decisions, reporting and feedback mechanisms.
 - Moderation is carried out for assessments involving a variety of assessment techniques, such as work samples, simulations, role-plays, written items, oral, portfolios and projects.
 - Moderation activities include pre-assessment interactions with assessors, interactions during assessments and post-assessment interactions.
 - Moderation involves at least two sets of real assessment materials for the same standards and at least six assessor decisions.
 - The assessments that are moderated are in relation to a significant, meaningful and coherent outcome statement that includes assessment criteria and allows for judgements of competence in line with SAQA's definition of competence i.e. embraces foundational, practical and reflexive dimensions of competence. This means that moderation of simple, single-task assessments will not be valid for awarding this unit standard.
3. For the purposes of assessment against this unit standard, candidate-moderators should have access to organisational assessment and moderation policies, procedures and systems. It is assumed the organisational policies and procedures are of a quality sufficient for accreditation purposes. Where candidate-moderators are assessed in organisations that do not have a moderation system in place, assessors of moderators should provide a mock system for the purposes of the assessment.
4. This unit standard applies to all Moderators, regardless of whether a person carries out moderation internally, as part of an organisation's quality assurance system, or externally, as part of an ETQA or other process to verify assessment results supplied by the provider or assessment agency.

Further range statements are provided in the body of the unit standard where they apply to particular specific outcomes or assessment criteria.

Specific Outcomes and Assessment Criteria:

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate understanding of moderation within the context of an outcomes-based assessment system.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Moderation is explained in terms of its contribution to quality assured assessment and recognition systems within the context of principles and regulations concerning the NQF.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

A variety of moderation methods are described and compared in terms of strengths, weaknesses and applications. The descriptions show how moderation is intended to uphold the need for manageable, credible and reliable assessments.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Key principles of assessment are described in terms of their importance and effect on the assessment and the application of the assessment results. Examples are provided to show how moderation may be effective in ensuring the principles of assessment are upheld.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

See "Definition of Terms" for a definition of assessment principles.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Examples are provided to show how moderation activities could verify the fairness and appropriateness of assessment methods and activities used by assessors in different assessment situations.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Assessment situations for gathering evidence of abilities in problem solving, knowledge, understanding, practical and technical skills, personal and attitudinal skills and values.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 2

Plan and prepare for moderation.

OUTCOME RANGE

The planning and preparation is to take place within the context of an existing moderation system, whether internal or external, as well as an existing assessment plan.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Planning and preparation activities are aligned with moderation system requirements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The scope of the moderation is confirmed with relevant parties.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Parties include the assessors and moderating bodies where these exist.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Planning of the extent of moderation and methods of moderation ensures manageability of the process. Planning makes provision for sufficient moderation evidence to enable a reliable judgement to be passed on the assessments under review.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

The contexts of the assessments under review are clarified with the assessors or assessment agency, and special needs are taken into consideration in the moderation planning.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Moderation methods and processes are sufficient to deal with all common forms of evidence for the assessments to be moderated, including evidence gathered for recognition of prior learning.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 6

The documentation is prepared in line with the moderation system requirements and in such a way as to ensure moderation decisions are clearly documented.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 7

Required physical and human resources are ensured to be ready and available for use. Logistical arrangements are confirmed with relevant role-players prior to the moderation.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 3

Conduct moderation.

OUTCOME RANGE

- Moderation to address the design of the assessment, activities before, during and after assessment, and assessment documentation.
- Moderation to include assessments of candidates with special needs and for RPL cases. Where assessments do not include special needs or RPL cases, evidence for this may be produced through scenarios.
- Evidence must be gathered for on-site and off-site moderation.
- Evidence must be show candidate-moderators are able to moderate in situations where:
 - The moderation process confirms the assessment results, and where
 - The moderation process finds it cannot uphold the assessment results.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

The moderation is conducted in accordance with the moderation plan. Unforeseen events are handled without compromising the validity of the moderation.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The assessment instruments and process are checked and judged in terms of the extent to which the principles of good assessment are upheld.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

See "Definitions of Terms" for definitions of assessment principles.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Moderation confirms that special needs of candidates have been provided for but without compromising the requirements specified in the relevant outcome statements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

The proportion of assessments selected for checking meets the quality assurance body's requirements for consistency and reliability. The use of time and resources is justified by the assessment history or record of the assessors and/or assessment agency under consideration.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Appeals against assessment decisions are handled in accordance with organisational appeal procedures.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 6

The moderation decision is consistent with the quality assurance body's requirements for fairness, validity and reliability of assessments to be achieved.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

The "moderation decision" includes agreement or disagreement with the results of the assessments. requirements include the interpretation of assessment criteria and correct application of assessment procedures.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 4

Advise and support assessors.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

The nature and quality of advice facilitates a common understanding of the relevant outcomes and criteria, and issues related to their assessment by assessors.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The nature and quality of advice promotes assessment in accordance with good assessment principles and enhances the development and maintenance of quality management systems in line with ETQA requirements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Advice on quality management systems includes planning, staffing, resourcing, training and recording systems.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Support contributes towards the further development of assessors as needed.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

All communications are conducted in accordance with relevant confidentiality requirements.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 5

Report, record and administer moderation.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Moderation findings are reported to designated role-players within agreed time-frames and according to the quality assurance body's requirements for format and content.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Role-players could include ETQA or Moderating Body personnel, internal or external moderators and assessors.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Records are maintained in accordance with organisational quality assurance and ETQA requirements.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Confidentiality of information relating to candidates and assessors is preserved in accordance with organisational quality assurance and ETQA requirements.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 6

Review moderation systems and processes.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Strengths and weaknesses of moderation systems and processes are identified in terms of their manageability and effectiveness in facilitating judgements on the quality and validity of assessment decisions.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Recommendations contribute towards the improvement of moderation systems and processes in line with ETQA requirements and overall manageability.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

The review enhances the credibility and integrity of the recognition system.

UNIT STANDARD ACCREDITATION AND MODERATION OPTIONS

- A candidate-moderator wishing to be assessed, against this unit standard may apply to an assessment agency, assessor or provider institution accredited by the relevant ETQA.
- Anyone assessing a candidate-moderator against this unit standard must meet the assessor requirements of the relevant ETQA. In particular, such assessors of candidate-moderators must demonstrate that they assess in terms of the scope and context defined in all the range statements.
- Any institution offering learning towards this unit standard must be accredited as a provider with the relevant ETQA.
- External moderation of assessment will be conducted by the relevant ETQA at its discretion.

UNIT STANDARD ESSENTIAL EMBEDDED KNOWLEDGE

The following knowledge is embedded within the unit standard, and will be assessed directly or indirectly through assessment of the specific outcomes in terms of the assessment criteria:

- Outcomes-based education, training and development
- The role and function of moderation - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'Moderation is explained in terms of its contribution to quality assured assessment and recognition systems within the context of principles and regulations concerning the NQF.' and indirectly assessed throughout the unit standard.
- Moderation methods - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'A variety of moderation methods are described and compared in terms of strengths, weaknesses and applications. The descriptions show how moderation is intended to uphold the need for manageable, credible and reliable assessments.' and 'Moderation methods and processes are sufficient to deal with all common forms of evidence for the assessments to be moderated, including evidence gathered for recognition of prior learning.', and indirectly assessed through application throughout the standard.
- Principles of assessment - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'Key principles of assessment are described in terms of their importance and effect on the assessment and the application of the assessment results. Examples are provided to show how moderation may be effective in ensuring the principles of assessment are upheld.', and indirectly assessed via a requirement to judge whether the principles are applied by assessors.
- Principles and practices of RPL - assessed in terms of the requirement for candidate moderators to moderate RPL-related assessments.
- Methods of assessment - directly assessed through assessment criterion 'Examples are provided to show how moderation activities could verify the fairness and appropriateness of assessment methods and activities used by assessors in different assessment situations', and indirectly when checking the appropriateness and fairness of assessment methods used by assessors
- Potential barriers to assessment - assessed when dealing with special needs.
- The principles and mechanisms of the NQF - this knowledge underpins the standard
- Assessment policies and ETQA requirements
- Knowledge of quality assurance policy and procedures
- Understanding of organisational or institutional contexts
- Understanding the curriculum (where applicable).

Critical Cross-field Outcomes (CCFO):

UNIT STANDARD CCFO IDENTIFYING

Identify and solve problems using critical and creative thinking: planning for contingencies, candidates with special needs, problems that arise during moderation, suggesting changes to moderation following review.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO WORKING

Work effectively in a team using critical and creative thinking: working with assessors and other relevant parties during moderation, as well as post-moderation.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO ORGANISING

Organize and manage oneself and ones activities: planning, preparing, conducting and recording the moderation.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COLLECTING

Collect, analyse, organize and critically evaluate information: gather, evaluate and judge evidence and the assessment process.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COMMUNICATING

Communicate effectively: communicate with assessors and other relevant parties during moderation, and provide feedback.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO DEMONSTRATING

Demonstrate the world as a set of related systems: understanding the impact of moderation assessment on individuals, organisations and the credibility of recognition through NQF systems.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO CONTRIBUTING

Be culturally and aesthetically sensitive across a range of social contexts: plan, conduct and give feedback on moderation in a culturally sensitive manner.

Annexure F

PENALTIES FOR APPLICANT MALPRACTICE MATRIX

| CATEGORY | Warning | Warning with revision of assessment score | Cancel application or award | Bar applicant from ever applying with the Council |
|---|---------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Assessment conditions | | | | |
| Breach of assessment conditions | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Collusion | | | | |
| Significant amount copied in one or more of the contributing pieces | | | ✓ | |
| Candidate shared his/her own work with another candidate | ✓ | | | |
| Candidates worked collaboratively in one or more of the contributing pieces | | ✓ | | |
| Misconduct | | | | |
| Causes disturbance/disruption | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Abusive and/or aggressive behaviour | | | ✓ | |
| Offensive content | | | | |
| Discriminatory content — any amount | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Significant amount — non-discriminatory | | ✓ | | |
| Minor amount — non-discriminatory | ✓ | | | |
| Personation | | | | |
| Identities proven | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Plagiarism | | | | |
| Significant amount of plagiarism in one or more of the contributing pieces | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Prohibited items (including mobile phone) | | | | |
| Prohibited item at applicant's allocated seat (areas) in exam room | | | ✓ | |

Annexure G

PENALTIES FOR ASSESSMENT PROVIDER MALPRACTICE MATRIX

| CATEGORY | Warning Letter | Additional Quality Assurance | Withdrawal of Accreditation/ appointment | Re-assessment of Applicant |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Deliberate falsification of records | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Excessive direction from assessors to applicants | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Failure to comply with policy requirements | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Withholding information about circumstances that may compromise the integrity of any assessment or the credibility of the Council | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Failure to recognise and apply appropriate measures to manage potential conflict of interest | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Failure to apply appropriate processes to ensure fairness | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Insecure storage, transmission or use of assessment instruments etc. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Failure to comply with requirements for safe retention of applicant evidence | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Failure to comply with SACPCMP procedures for managing and transferring accurate applicant data | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Failure to promptly notify, investigate and report concerns of potential malpractice | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |



GUIDELINES ON PLAGIARISM

An applicant may be found guilty of plagiarism irrespective of the intent to deceive. Plagiarism is a disciplinary offence which bears a penalty as described in Section 12 and Annexure F of the *Criteria and Process for the Assessment of Competency for the Purpose of Registration*.

1. Scope of Plagiarism

1.1. Copying

This is when the applicant uses other peoples' words, text, diagrams, images, formulas or ideas etc. as if they are the applicant's own.

This is done by:

1.1.1. Not acknowledging the source/s.

1.1.2. Paraphrasing, through changing word order and sentence structure. The idea remains someone else's and not the applicant's.

1.1.3. Copying and pasting from several internet sources to make up a collection of ideas that are not originally the applicant's.

1.1.4. Submitting someone else's report as if it is the applicant's.

1.2. Collusion

This is unauthorised collaboration or excessive assistance that leads to a report not being the applicant's own work.

This occurs when:

1.2.1. Making use of professional agencies to produce the applicant's report or to write the report on the applicant's behalf.

1.2.2. Buying and/or receiving a completed report from someone.

1.2.3. Receiving excessive assistance which leads to the report being made up of someone else's ideas and/or words etc..

1.3. Inaccurate citation

This occurs when sources of information are not correctly cited and/or a list of sources provided.

2. Plagiarism Detection

The Council uses plagiarism software and/or techniques to check an applicant's submitted report against a database of previously submitted reports, internet content and other publications etc. This software and/or technique detects instances where the applicant's writing is similar to, or matches against, one of these sources, it will be flagged for investigation, through which the report will be reviewed.

This process produces what is known as a similarity score which highlights any matching areas in the report as an investigative tool.

3. Criteria for copied text

Similarity scores are used to flag the prevalence of copied text in a document. Council's criteria for copied text is:

- 3.1. Anything less than 10% is acceptable
- 3.2. Anything that is 10% and above must be investigated for plagiarism

4. Declaration

The Council requires that all reports submitted to it for the purposes of registration must be accompanied by a Declaration on Plagiarism reflected in Annexure I. This is to certify that the applicant submitting the report is aware of the plagiarism guidelines, penalties for plagiarism and to confirm that they are not submitting a plagiarised report.

Annexure I

Declaration on Plagiarism

I, here undersigned, understand what plagiarism is as outlined in the South African Council for the Project and Construction Management Professions' (SACPCMP's) Guidelines on Plagiarism and understand that plagiarism is considered applicant malpractice as described in Section 12 of the *Criteria and Process for the Assessment of Competency for the Purpose of Registration*. I also understand that if I were to be found guilty of plagiarism, I may face a penalty as outlined in the Penalties for Applicant Malpractice Matrix.

I hereby declare that:

1. This report is my original work.
2. I have not used work previously produced by any other person or applicant to submit as my own.
3. I have not, or will not allow, any person copy my work with the intention of submitting it as their own.

Full Name/s: _____

Surname: _____

Identity No.: _____

Membership No.: _____

Date submitted: _____

Signature: _____