

PRACTICAL ASSESSMENT

GENERAL INFORMATION

LEARNER DETAILS		
Learner Full Names		
Learner No.:		
Organisation:		
Unit/Dept:		
Contact Details:	Telephone /Cell Numbers:	Email Address:
WORKSHOP DETAILS		
Workshop Venue:		
Facilitator Name:		
Date Started:		
Date Completed:		
PRACTICAL WORPLACE DETAILS		
Workplace Name:		
Workplace Address:		
Coach/Mentor Full Names:		
Coach/Mentor Contact Details:		
Coach/Mentor Position:		

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.

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.

Instructions

Candidate moderator is required to Moderate at least two sets of real assessment materials for the same standards and at least six assessor decisions.

NB. The candidate MODERATOR can use Moderator guide (moderator guide for candidate moderator) when carrying or simulating the task if there is nothing in place from the organisation.

ASSESSMENT ON CRITICAL CROSS FIELD OUTCOMES

Unit standard Title	CONDUCT ASSESSMENT	OUTCOMES-BASED	Unit Std Number
			115759 NQF level 6
Learner's Name		ID	NLRD No
Assessor's Name		Co	

CRITICAL CROSS FIELD OUTCOMES (CCFO)	(S0s)	YES	NO
1. 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.	2,3,4		
2. Work effectively in a team using critical and creative thinking: working with assessors and other relevant parties during moderation, as well as post-moderation.	3,4,5		
3. Organize and manage oneself and ones activities: planning, preparing, conducting and recording the moderation.	2,3,4,6		
4. Collect, analyse, organize and critically evaluate information: gather, evaluate and judge evidence and the assessment process.	2,3,4,5,		
5. Communicate effectively: communicate with assessors and other relevant parties during moderation, and provide feedback.	3,4,5		
6. 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.	4,5		
7. Be culturally and aesthetically sensitive across a range of social contexts: plan, conduct and give feedback on moderation in a culturally sensitive manner.	4,5,6		

Practical/workplace Assessment

Learner Name		Learner Identity No.	
MODULE	SAQA 115759 -Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments	Town	

SO 1: Demonstrate understanding of moderation within the context of an outcomes-based assessment system.

SO 1.1: 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.
SO 1.2: 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.
SO 1.3: 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.
SO 1.4: 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.

	QUESTIONS	Attempt 1		Attempt 2		Attempt 3		Comments
		Date:		Date:		Date:		
		C	NYC	C	NYC	C	NYC	
	Demonstrate an understanding of the following:							
1	Moderation							
2	moderation methods							
3	Key principles of assessment							
4	Examples to show how moderation activities could verify the fairness and appropriateness of assessment methods and activities.							

Integrated theory

Question:

--

SO.2: Plan and prepare for moderation.

SO 2.1: Planning and preparation activities are aligned with moderation system requirements.
 SO 2.2 The scope of the moderation is confirmed with relevant parties.
 SO 2.3 Planning of the extent of moderation and methods of moderation ensure manageability of the process. Planning makes provision for sufficient moderation evidence to enable a reliable judgement to be passed on the assessments under review.
 SO 2.4: 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.
 SO 2.5: 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.
 SO 2.6: The documentation is prepared in line with the moderation system requirements and in such a way as to ensure moderation decisions are clearly documented..
 SO 2.7: 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.

	QUESTIONS	Attempt 1 Date:		Attempt 2 Date:		Attempt 3 Date:		Comments
		C	NYC	C	NYC	C	NYC	
	Demonstrate understanding of how to Plan and prepare for moderation activities							
1	• resources,							
2	• people,							
3	• schedules,							
4	• venues,							
5	• assessment instruments							
6	• And documentation							

SO 3: Conduct moderation.

SO 3.1: The moderation is conducted in accordance with the moderation plan. Unforeseen events are handled without compromising the validity of the moderation.

SO 3.2 The assessment instruments and process are checked and judged in terms of the extent to which the principles of good assessment are upheld.

SO 3.3: Moderation confirms that special needs of candidates have been provided for but without compromising the requirements specified in the relevant outcome statements.

SO 3.4: 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.

SO 3.5: Appeals against assessment decisions are handled in accordance with organisational appeal procedures.

SO 3.6: The moderation decision is consistent with the quality assurance body's requirements for fairness, validity and reliability of assessments to be achieved.

	QUESTIONS	Attempt 1		Attempt 2		Attempt 3		Comments
		Date:		Date:		Date:		
		C	NYC	C	NYC	C	NYC	
	Demonstrate understanding of how							
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To conduct moderation to address the design of the assessment, activities before, during and after assessment, and assessment documentation. 							
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To conduct 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. 							
3	Demonstrate understanding of how (Candidate-moderator to moderate in situations where:							
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The moderation process confirms the assessment results, and where 							
b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The moderation process finds it cannot uphold the assessment results. 							

SO 4: Advise and support assessors.

SO 4.1: The nature and quality of advice facilitates a common understanding of the relevant outcomes and criteria, and issues related to their assessment by assessors.

SO 4.2 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..

SO 4.3: Support contributes towards the further development of assessors as needed.

SO 4.4: All communications are conducted in accordance with relevant confidentiality requirements.

	QUESTIONS	Attempt 1		Attempt 2		Attempt 3		Comments
		Date:		Date:		Date:		
		C	NYC	C	NYC	C	NYC	
	Demonstrate understanding of how to advice assessors on quality management systems							
1	• planning,							
2	• staffing,							
3	• resourcing,							
4	• training							

SO 5: Report, record and administer moderation.

SO 5.1: 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

SO 5. Records are maintained in accordance with organisational quality assurance and ETQA requirements.

SO 5.3: Confidentiality of information relating to candidates and assessors is preserved in accordance with organisational quality assurance and ETQA requirements..

	QUESTIONS	Attempt 1		Attempt 2		Attempt 3		Comments
		Date:		Date:		Date:		
		C	NYC	C	NYC	C	NYC	
	Demonstrate understanding of Moderation findings are reported to							
1	Role-players eg ETQA or Moderating Body personnel							
2	internal or external moderators							
3	and assessors							

	Integrated theory	
Question:		

SO 6: Review moderation systems and processes.

SO 6.1: 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.
SO 6.2 . Recommendations contribute towards the improvement of moderation systems and processes in line with ETQA requirements and overall manageability.
SO 6.3: The review enhances the credibility and integrity of the recognition system.

	QUESTIONS	Attempt 1 Date:		Attempt 2 Date:		Attempt 3 Date:		Comments
		C	NYC	C	NYC	C	NYC	
Demonstrate understanding of how to								
1	Review Strengths and weaknesses of moderation systems and processes							
2	contribute towards the improvement of moderation system by making Recommendations							

	Integrated theory		
Question:			

Overall performance of the learner	Meet SOP	Do not meet SOP
Overall outcomes of the integrated assessment (theory & practical)	C	NYC
Assessor signature		CANDIDATE ASSESSOR signature
Date:		Date: