

---

---

**CONDUCT OUTCOMES-BASED  
ASSESSMENT  
US 115753  
NQF LEVEL: 5  
CREDITS: 15  
NOTIONAL HOURS: 150**

**MODERATOR GUIDE**

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Contact Address</b>	
<b>Telephone (H)</b>	
<b>Telephone (W)</b>	
<b>Facsimile</b>	
<b>Cellular</b>	
<b>E-mail</b>	

# Table of Contents

---

## Table of Contents

Provider Details.....	3
Moderation Plan .....	4
Pre-Moderation .....	5
1. Moderation Preparation .....	5
1.1 Learner Sample .....	5
1.2 ETD Staff Sample .....	5
1.3 Documents in Moderation Sample .....	5
2. Validation of Assessors & Candidates.....	6
2.1 Assessor Validation .....	6
2.2 Candidate Validation.....	7
3. Comparative Moderation Results .....	8
3.1 Assessors Validation.....	8
3.2 Candidates Validation .....	9
4. Cross Sample Moderation Report.....	10
Concurrent / Post Moderation .....	12
1. Moderation Preparation .....	12
1.1 Learner Sample .....	12
1.2 ETD Staff Sample .....	12
1.3 Documents in Moderation Sample .....	12
1.4 Learner Status .....	12
2. Portfolio Construct.....	13
3. Comparative Moderation Results .....	14
4. Cross Sample Moderation Report.....	17
Using the Moderation Guide .....	19
1. Introduction .....	19
2. Using the Moderation Guide .....	19
2.1 Point of Moderation Purpose .....	19
2.2 Moderation Documents.....	20
2.2.1 Pre-Moderation.....	22
2.2.2 Concurrent / Post Moderation.....	22

# Provider Details

---

<b>Provider Name</b>		<b>Type of Moderation</b>	
<b>Provider Address</b>		<b>Date of Moderation Report</b>	
<b>Provider Contact Person</b>		<b>Moderator Responsible</b>	
<b>Provider Contact Details</b>		<b>Moderator Contact Details</b>	
<b>Qualification / Learning programme</b>			

# Moderation Plan

---

1	Type of Moderation	
2	Purpose of Moderation	
3	Date of Moderation	
4	Location of Moderation	
5	Method of Moderation	
6	Role Players	
7	Scope of Moderation	
8	Moderation Sample	
9	Moderation Tools	
10	Preparation Required	

Additional Briefing Notes

---

**Moderator Signature**

**Date of Moderation Plan**

# Pre-Moderation

---

## 1. Moderation Preparation

### 1.1 Learner Sample

Surname	Name	Learner ID Numbers	Unit Standards Completed

### 1.2 ETD Staff Sample

Surname	Name	Assessor ID Numbers	Unit Standards Assessed

### 1.3 Documents in Moderation Sample

No	Documents requested	Received		Comments
		Yes	No	
1	Alignment Strategy & Facilitation Schedule			
2	Master Assessment Guide and Assessment Toolkit			
3	Learner recruitment, selection & entry documents as per selection			
4	Assessor registration and SME details			
5	Workplace agreement / minutes			

## 2. Validation of Assessors & Candidates

### 2.1 Assessor Validation

Programme / Qualification	
Assessment period / Client / Project	

Rating ranges from 1 – 4 for each main criterion

No Evidence – 0, Insufficient Evidence – 1, Sufficient Evidence – 2, Above Standard Evidence – 3, Excellent Evidence – 4

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Requirements		External Moderator Comments
		Met	Not met	
<b>A. Assessor Name</b>				Assessor Validation to Programme
1	ID / CV / scholastic documents on file			
2	SETA Registration Report			
3	Assessment Scope validated			
4	Assessor SLA and code of conduct			
5	Assessor /learner allocation validated			
<b>B. Assessor Name</b>				Assessor Validation to Programme
1	ID / CV / scholastic documents on file			
2	SETA Registration Report			
3	Assessment Scope validated			
4	Assessor SLA and code of conduct			
5	Assessor /learner allocation validated			
<b>C. Assessor Name</b>				Assessor validation to programme
1	ID / CV / scholastic documents on file			
2	SETA Registration Report			
3	Assessment Scope validated			
4	Assessor SLA and code of conduct			
5	Assessor /learner allocation validated			
<b>Overall Findings</b>				Average of 3 ratings, and moderator decision in terms of candidate suitability and entry process
11	Assessors' registration and scope in line with programme requirements			
12	Assessor contracts and administration in line with SETA requirements			
13	Assessor learner allocations reasonable and manageable			

Moderator Comments		
Moderation Decision		
Assessors meet the programme and SETA requirements in terms of registration and Subject Matter Expertise	Yes	No
Assessors have been duly contracted / briefed on programme / assessment requirements	Yes	No
Assessor – candidate ratio is suitable and in line with SETA requirements	Yes	No

## 2.2 Candidate Validation

Candidate Name	
Candidate ID	
Qualification / Unit Standards	

Rating ranges from 1 – 4 for each main criterion

No Evidence – 0, Insufficient Evidence – 1, Sufficient Evidence – 2, Above Standard Evidence – 3, Excellent Evidence – 4

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Met Requirements	Not met Requirements	External Moderator Comments
<b>A. Candidate Administration</b>				Candidate screening and administration
1	ID / CV / scholastic documents			
2	Registration Form & database entry			
3	Contract			
4	Learner administration file			
<b>B. Candidate RSE</b>				Recruitment, Selection & Entry
5	Recruitment & Selection Validation			
6	Entry Orientation / Induction			
7	Assessment Preparation			
8	Candidate meets entry requirements / special needs identified			
<b>C. Learner Support</b>				Candidate support from provider and workplace
9	Candidate received training material & facilitation schedule			
10	Candidate coach / mentor / workplace identified			
<b>D. Overall Findings</b>				Average of 3 ratings, and moderator decision in terms of candidate suitability

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Met Requirements	Not met Requirements	External Moderator Comments
				and entry process
11	Candidate Administration in order			
12	Candidate RSE fair, valid, appropriate			
13	Learner support evident			

Moderator Comments		
Moderation Decision		
Candidate meets the programme entry requirements and due process has been followed in recruitment, selection and entry	Yes	No
Candidate administration has been completed relevant resources provided	Yes	No
Candidate has been oriented on programme and assessment requirements	Yes	No

### 3. Comparative Moderation Results

#### 3.1 Assessors Validation

Candidate Name / Surname	Candidate ID Number	1. ID, CV, Scholastics	2. SETA Scope & Registration	3. SLA / Code of Conduct	4. Assessor / candidate ratio	Rating per Assessor
Rating per area of moderation						



## 3.2 Candidates Validation

Candidate Name / Surname	Candidate ID Number	A. Candidate Administration	B. Candidate RSE	C. Learner Support	D. Overall Findings	Rating per candidate
<b>Rating per area of moderation</b>						

Overall Moderation Area	Overall Rating	General Comments and Remediation Required
<b>A. Assessor Validation</b>		
<b>B. Candidate Validation</b>		
<b>C. Overall Findings</b>		

KEY: MR – Met Requirements, RR – Remediation Required, NMR – Not met Requirements

Moderation Decision	MR / RR/ NMR
The selected candidates meet the requirements of the programme recruitment, selection and entry requirements	
The assessors meet the requirements of the programme registration, scope and subject matter expertise	
Overall programme requirements have been met for candidates and assessors moderated	
<b>Moderator Details</b>	
<b>Moderator Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Moderator Signature</b>	

## 4. Cross Sample Moderation Report

Rating ranges from 1 – 4 for each main criterion

No Evidence – 0, Insufficient Evidence – 1, Sufficient Evidence – 2, Above Standard Evidence – 3, Excellent Evidence – 4

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Met Requirements	Not met Requirements	External Moderator Comments
<b>A. Candidates</b>				Candidate Validation
1	Candidates meet entry requirements of programme, special needs identified			
2	Recruitment, selection and entry process followed			
3	Learner Administration and support in place			
<b>B. Assessors</b>				Assessor Validation
4	Assessors meet registration and subject matter expertise requirements			
5	Assessor contracts, agreements and administration in place			
6	Assessor briefing / schedules completed			
7	Assessor – candidate ration is reasonable and appropriate – note total assessors and candidates			
<b>C. Instrument Validation</b>				Instruments Reviewed
8	Assessment strategy and related assessment toolkit suitable for target group in this project			
9	Plan for special needs identified			
10	Workplace supports valid assessment and evidence gathering			
<b>D. Overall Findings</b>				Average of 3 ratings, and moderator decision in terms of programme start up
11	Candidates suitable for programme			
12	Assessors suitable for programme			
13	Instruments suitable for programme			
14	Overall logistics, planning and preparation for programme in place			

**Moderator Comments**

--	--	--

**Moderation Review**

Candidate and assessor sample is valid and representative of the total target group under review in terms of demographics and programme suitability	Yes	No
Moderation methods allowed for a fair, valid reliable and credible review of candidate, assessor, workplace and instrument suitability – a combination of desk-top and interactive methods used	Yes	No
A remedial plan has been established that will allow current learners to exit, and future practices to improve.	Yes	No

# Concurrent / Post Moderation

---

## 1. Moderation Preparation

### 1.1 Learner Sample

Surname	Name	Learner ID Numbers	Unit Standards Completed

### 1.2 ETD Staff Sample

Surname	Name	Assessor ID Numbers	Unit Standards Assessed

### 1.3 Documents in Moderation Sample

No	Documents requested	Received		Comments
		Yes	No	
1	Alignment Strategy & Facilitation Schedule			
2	Master Assessment Guide and Assessment Toolkit			
3	Learner PoE sample as per selection			
4	Assessment Toolkits as per selection			
5	Learner uploads for programme in moderation			

### 1.4 Learner Status

No	Description	Total	No	Description	Total
1	Learners registered		4	Number of drop-outs	
2	Learners remaining		5	Percentage drop out	
3	Number of learners Competent to date		6	Number of learners in remediation	
7. Number of drop-outs per reason - please complete below					
	Reason				Total

## 2. Portfolio Construct

<b>Candidate Name</b>	
<b>Candidate ID</b>	
<b>Qualification / Unit Standards</b>	
<b>Assessor Name</b>	
<b>Assessor ID</b>	

Rating ranges from 1 – 4 for each main criterion

No Evidence – 0, Insufficient Evidence – 1, Sufficient Evidence – 2, Above Standard Evidence – 3, Excellent Evidence – 4

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Requirements		External Moderator Comments
		Met	Not met	
<b>A. Assessment Details</b>				Candidate details
1	Portfolio Index / checklist			
2	Progress sheet completed and as per strategy / roll out schedule			
3	Learner Preparation Learner Information Declaration of Authenticity			
<b>B. Assessment Process</b>				Plan, prepare, conduct, judge, feedback, review documents
4	Assessment Recording & Administration - complete			
5	Coaching Sheets & Re-assessment evidence			
6	Validity of assessment recording - quality of comments			
7	Learner feedback per instrument completed in line with decision			
8	Evidence Summary completed			
9	Judgements completed			
10	Overall learner feedback completed			
<b>C. Evidence</b>				Evidence documents, review in terms of VACS
11	Valid - sample answers checked against model answers, re-assessments where necessary recorded			
12	Authenticity & Currency – signed and dated			
13	Sufficient – enough evidence provided in line with strategy and model answers			
<b>D. Assessment Judgement</b>				Feedback, re-assessment, coaching and recorded judgement
14	Feedback and re-assessment / coaching			

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Requirements		External Moderator Comments
		Met	Not met	
15	Judgement			
<b>E. Overall Findings</b>				Average of 5 ratings, and moderator decision in terms of assessment conducted.
16	Assessment practice – process, recording, policy compliance			
17	Evidence – VACS			
18	Administration – recording, PoE structure			
19	Overall reliability, consistency and credibility of assessment judgement and feedback			

Moderator Comments		
Moderation Decision		
The learner meets the requirements of the unit standards and evidence requirements, and is therefore competent.	Yes	No
Assessment meets the requirements of process, principles and recording	Yes	No
Overall portfolio and assessment decision can be upheld	Yes	No

### 3. Comparative Moderation Results

Candidate Name / Surname	Assessor Name / Surname	A. Assessment Details	B. Assessment Process	C. Evidence	D. Assessment Judgement	E. Overall Findings	Rating per candidate
<b>Rating per area of moderation</b>							

Overall Moderation Area	Overall Rating	General Comments and Remediation Required
A. Assessment Details		
B. Assessment Process		
C. Evidence		
D. Assessment Judgement		
E. Overall Findings		



KEY: MR – Met Requirements, RR – Remediation Required, NMR – Not met Requirements

<b>Moderation Decision</b>	<b>MR / RR/ NMR</b>
The learner meets the requirements of the unit standards and evidence requirements, and is therefore competent.	
Assessment meets the requirements of process, principles and recording across all portfolios and assessors	
Overall portfolio and assessment decisions for group of learners moderated can be upheld	
<b>Moderator Details</b>	
<b>Moderator Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Moderator Signature</b>	
<b>Assessors Feedback Provided</b>	
<b>Assessor Name &amp; Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Assessor Name &amp; Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Assessor Name &amp; Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>



## 4. Cross Sample Moderation Report

Rating ranges from 1 – 4 for each main criterion

No Evidence – 0, Insufficient Evidence – 1, Sufficient Evidence – 2, Above Standard Evidence – 3, Excellent Evidence – 4

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Met Requirements	Not met Requirements	External Moderator Comments
<b>A. Assessment Details</b>				Candidate details
1	General Portfolio administration: portfolio checklists, structure, neatness and consistent filing			
2	Progress sheets / assessor reports, candidate details, adherence to provider policy and strategy / roll out schedule			
3	Learner Preparation Learner Information Declaration of Authenticity			
<b>B. Assessment Process</b>				Plan, prepare, conduct, judge, feedback, review documents
4	General Assessment Recording & Administration – across portfolios and per assessor			
5	Coaching Sheets & Re-assessment evidence - across portfolios and per assessor / candidate			
6	Validity of assessment recording - quality of comments - across portfolios and per assessor			
7	Learner feedback per instrument completed in line with decision - across portfolios and per assessor			
8	Evidence Summary completed - across portfolios and per assessor			
9	Judgements completed - across portfolios and per assessor			
10	Overall learner feedback completed - across portfolios and per assessor			
<b>C. Evidence</b>				Evidence documents, review in terms of VACS
11	Valid - sample answers checked against model answers, re-assessments where necessary recorded - across portfolios and per assessor			
12	Authenticity & Currency – signed and dated - across portfolios and per assessor			
13	Sufficient – enough evidence provided in line with strategy and model answers - across portfolios and per assessor			
<b>D. Assessment Judgement</b>				Feedback, re-assessment, coaching and

Doc	Evidence Evaluation	Met Requirements	Not met Requirements	External Moderator Comments
				recorded judgement
14	Feedback and re-assessment / coaching - across portfolios and per assessor			
15	Judgement - across portfolios and per assessor			
<b>E. Overall Findings</b>				Average of 5 ratings, and moderator decision in terms of assessment conducted.
16	Assessment practice – process, recording, policy compliance - across portfolios and per assessor			
17	Evidence – VACS - across portfolios and per assessor			
18	Administration – recording, PoE structure - across portfolios and per assessor			
19	Overall reliability, consistency and credibility of assessment judgement and feedback - across portfolios and per assessor			

Moderator Comments		
Moderation Review		
Portfolio sample is valid and representative of the assessment under review in terms of learner demographics, assessors, regions / sites	Yes	No
Moderation methods allowed for a fair, valid reliable and credible review of assessment practice – a combination of desk-top and interactive methods used	Yes	No
A remedial plan has been established that will allow current learners to exit, and future practices to improve.	Yes	No

# Using the Moderation Guide

---

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this Moderation Guide is to provide the Moderator with basic tools to conduct moderation before, during and after assessment has taken place.

The Moderation Guide incorporates a system of comparative moderation as a basis for obtaining more objectivity in the moderation findings, and allows for block moderations instead of a “per portfolio” approach only.

## 2. Using the Moderation Guide

Depending on the moderation point, the Moderator will delete the sections not in use, and only maintain the areas applicable to the point of moderation.

### 2.1 Point of Moderation Purpose

The Moderation Guide allows for a targeted scope of moderation:

No	Moderation Point	Purpose and Scope of Moderation
1	Pre-Moderation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessor Validation</li><li>• Candidate Validation</li><li>• Instrument Validation</li></ul>
2	Concurrent / Post Moderation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learner Status</li><li>• Assessment Practice</li><li>• Assessor Performance</li><li>• Portfolio Validation</li></ul>

## ASSESSMENT TOOLS MODERATION CHECKLIST

### Moderation of Assessment Instruments

<b>Unit Standard/Qualification Title:</b>	
<b>Linked to Qualification Title:</b>	
<b>NQF Level:</b>	
<b>Date of Internal Moderation:</b>	
<b>Internal Moderator Name:</b>	
<b>Internal Moderator Signature:</b>	

Question	Yes	No	Comments
1. Are/Is the Unit Standard(s) registered with the SETA?			
2. To what extent has the Unit Standard been covered?			
3. Was anything asked outside the scope of the Unit Standard? (Validity)			
4. In the case of a full qualification, does the assessment instrument integrate the fundamental unit standards with the core and elective unit standards?			
5. In the case of a full qualification, does the assessment instrument cover all the exit level outcomes?			
6. Is the Assessment Strategy available for Assessors?			
7. Does the Assessment Strategy cover all the specific outcomes?			
8. Is there an Assessment Guide for Assessors?			
9. Is the Assessment Plan available for all Assessors?			
10. Were the spread of marks and the weighting of the questions / assessments in accordance with the unit standard(s) / qualification(s)?			
11. Were the assessment questions, e.g. case studies, role plays effectively used?			
Were the following clear, grammatically correct and unambiguous so that the learners will know exactly what is expected of them:			
a. Language?			
b. Questions?			
c. Terminology?			
d. Numbering?			

Question	Yes	No	Comments
e. Spelling?			
f. Punctuation?			
g. Sentence construction?			
h. Symbols?			
12. Does the assessment include practical assessment / workplace based application as requested in the Unit Standard(s) / Qualification(s)?			
13. Is the allocation of marks / weighting to each assessment question as a whole and sub-division correct?			
14. Is the memorandum of model answers sufficient and clear?			
15. Are the marks / weighting in the memorandum judiciously allocated?			
16. Is the memorandum accurate and fair?			
17. Are sketches, photographs, diagrams, etc of sufficient quality to be reproduced clearly?			
18. Have all articles and pictures taken from papers, magazines, etc. been sufficiently acknowledged?			
19. Where excerpts from articles or texts have been taken, has a copy of the complete article been handed in?			
20. Are resources and references used for the setting of the assessment instrument been available and checked?			
21. Does this assessment instrument address the critical cross-field outcomes?			
22. Does the assessment instrument include a learner's guide and assessor's guide?			
23. Does the assessment instrument cover the observation criteria sufficiently?			
24. Was an assessor guide for practical observation included?			
25. Must any adjustments be made to the assessment instrument?			
26. Is the assessment instrument appropriate for the Unit Standard(s) / Qualification (s)?			
27. Is the assessment instrument fair?			
28. Does the assessment instrument allow for judgements of competence in line with SAQA's definition of competence			

Question	Yes	No	Comments
(embraces foundational, practical and reflexive dimensions of competence).			
29. Does the assessment instrument clearly indicate the evidence the learner needs to submit?			
30. Does the assessment instrument provide for an opportunity for additional questions and comments from the learner?			
31. Does the assessment instrument have a feedback section?			
32. Does the assessment instrument have a declaration of acceptance from the learner?			
33. Have the principles of assessment being adhered to, i.e. Validity, Authenticity, Currency, Sufficiency, and Reliability?			
34. Can the assessment instrument be authenticated with signatures from the relevant parties?			
35. Are all assessment instruments dated; indicate the duration for completion, etc?			

## 2.2 Moderation Documents

### 2.2.1 Pre-Moderation

The pre-moderation should be conducted during and directly after learner registration. When conducting the pre-moderation, delete the concurrent / post moderation section and only complete the pre-moderation reports.

### 2.2.2 Concurrent / Post Moderation

The concurrent moderation should be conducted at the end of every Learning Unit and results reported as part of the SETA moderation report. When conducting the concurrent moderation, delete the pre-moderation section and only complete the pre-moderation reports.