



South African Qualifications Authority

Guide for moderators and verifiers

Ascertaining the integrity of the marking of
Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign learner
assessment portfolios of 2015-2016

June 2016



South African Qualifications Authority
Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign South Africa

© South African Qualifications Authority and Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign
South Africa, 2016

South African Qualifications Authority
Postnet Suite 248
Private bag X06
Waterkloof
0145

Kha Ri Gude literacy campaign South Africa
Department of Basic Education
Private Bag X895
Pretoria
0001

Contents

The purpose and benefits of this verification	1
The three groups involved in this verification	1
What do the participants commit themselves to?	2
What do the senior verifiers do?	3
What do the verifiers have to do?	3
What do the moderators have to do?	4
The judgments the moderators have to make	4
The forms the moderators use	6
<i>General Checklist for verifying the marking of the LAPs</i>	7
<i>Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class set</i>	9
<i>Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 2 – sample from class set</i>	10
<i>Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 3 – detailed analysis of one sample per class set</i>	11
<i>Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4</i>	13
The moderation process using the first four data forms	14
The three activities chosen for special attention	15
The moderation process using the Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4	16
Outline of the verification process	18

The purpose and benefits of this verification

This verification exercise aims to ascertain the integrity of the marking of the Kha Ri Gude Learner Assessment Portfolios (LAPs).

This purpose will be achieved by:

- checking the authenticity of the marking of the LAPs, that is, that they have been marked and that the marking is generally reliable and valid.
- making a judgement on the quality of the marking so that a finding can be made on fairness and credibility of the assessments of learner achievement.

The benefits of the verification are that it will:

- Enable the public to have confidence that an external body has verified the results by examining a sample of portfolios in all languages and from all provinces.
- Give credit to the effort of all the participants in the Kha Ri Gude adult literacy campaign.
- Form an important part of the implementation of a full quality assurance system for the Kha Ri Gude campaign.
- Enhance the capacity of participants to be quality assurers within Kha Ri Gude.
- Make recommendations that can be incorporated into the future planning of Kha Ri Gude

The three groups involved in this verification

There are three groups of people participating in this verification::

- senior verifiers
- verifiers, and
- moderators.

The duties of the three groups are explained in this *Guide*.

What do the participants commit themselves to?

This verification is being carried out by the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) which has appointed three senior verifiers to oversee the process.

Each person, by participating in the exercise, commits her or himself to the highest level of professionalism and confidentiality in their conduct. Each moderator and verifier is accountable to SAQA for the duration of this exercise.

All moderators and verifiers are required to:

- Be unbiased and free of prejudice when moderating and verifying the LAPs.
- Complete all moderating and verifying according to these guidelines.
- Refrain from discussing and comparing learners' work and commenting on the work of classes and coordination districts.
- Recuse themselves from moderating or verifying any LAP or set of LAPs of which they have prior knowledge or responsibility or in which they have an interest.
- Refrain from altering the LAPs in any way.
- Abide by the arrangements made for the proper conduct of the verification sessions by adhering to instructions of and the times set by the senior verifiers

All moderators and verifiers are required to sign a commitment statement.

A Commitment Statement based on this page will be signed by each participant and handed in.

What do the senior verifiers do?

Five senior verifiers have been appointed by SAQA to be responsible for training and support in relation to the whole operation, and for guiding the verifiers in particular.

They are especially responsible for overseeing the smooth operation of the whole exercise, and for trouble-shooting and strategic adjustments where necessary.

It is their responsibility to ensure that the required number of LAPs in the particular languages are processed and that a fair proportion come from each province.

They will ensure that a suitable number of LAPs are compared with assessment results obtained from SAQA site visits to a sample of Kha Ri Gude classes.

What do the verifiers have to do?

The verifiers will oversee and advise a group of from ten to twenty moderators who will be working with the LAPs in the particular mother-tongue language.

They will answer queries, mediate in uncertain judgements and assist moderators who are struggling to find their level.

They will observe how the moderators are working and encourage them.

Later they will seek to check approximately 10% of the moderated LAPs.

They will in turn refer queries and problems to the Senior Verifiers – where they feel the need of a second opinion.

They will sign each completed data sheet and pass this on to the data capturers.

They will keep a tally of the number of portfolios they have processed and the provincial and language breakdown.

Where there is a large number of verifiers for a particular language a head verifier may be appointed for that group of verifiers.

What do the moderators have to do?

The moderators will do the actual checking of the marking of these LAPs. Their main task is to judge whether the marking has been done accurately.

The moderators will be issued with LAPs in a language in which they are competent. Their general task is to check all the required number of LAPs from all provinces (and not only from the province the moderators may come from). A moderator must not moderate any LAPs coming from learners in the classes for which she or he is a coordinator or for which there is any possible conflict of interests.

Moderators may also be asked to mark assessments written by learners during the SAQA site visits. These assessments enable a comparison to be made between the LAP marks and the Site visit marks.

The judgements the moderators have to make

The moderators have to make **three** types of **judgements**. The first judgment is really about the marker, the second is about the learner and the third is a comparison of two assessments. These judgements have to be indicated by you on the data forms.

Judgement One: Has the *marker* done the marking well?

The first judgement is on whether the educator who did the marking has done it well.

The moderator rates the **marking** as follows:

E = Excellent well judged accurate assessment.

A = Acceptable. There are differences between the mark given and the moderator's judgement on what should have been given, but this difference is not large nor serious enough to question the credibility of the overall result of the marking.

I = Inaccurate and/or inconsistent marking.

P = Problematic. Extremely questionable judgement by the marker that indicates either very poor marking or the marker has ignored problems or the possible indications of dishonest practice. (Note that if you give the marker such a negative rating it may need to be drawn to the attention of a verifier by a comment, for example in a case where the moderator may have suspicion of possible cheating or other dishonest practice.)

Please note well: this is a rating scale for the quality of the marking done **by the educator**. It is *not* a rating of how well the learner has done. Understand that you are rating the marker, *not* the learner.

If the educator gives the learner a mark that reflects “correctness”, but you see many errors in the learners’ work, there is a problem and you should may give the marking a **low** rating (I or P). Remember – you are rating the marker (low) not the learner (which would also be low).

If the educator gives marks that reflects “learner mistakes” but you see correct learner answers, this is a problem and you should give the assessment a low rating (I or P). Remember you are rating the marker (low) not the learner (in this example, high).

Sometimes it is not so easy to judge. If the educator has given a high mark because the student’s response is “meaningful” or well written, but you think the response is inappropriate to the task (because it does not really answer the actual question), you have to ask yourself whether this is a genuinely unsuitable answer, or that you simply disagree with the learner’s view. If in doubt, you should ask a verifier for advice in rating the assessment.

Judgement Two: Are the marks given to the learner fair and accurate?

The second judgement (which naturally follows from the first one) is whether the moderator think the marks given the learner should be left the **same**, or raised **up** or lowered **down**.

If the moderator believes that the actual mark given to the learner is too low or too high this must be shown using the following rating scale:

If you believe the mark given is accurate and fair – an **S** (the mark stays the **same**).

If the mark should be put up – a **U** (the mark should be put **up** higher)

If the mark should be brought down – a **D** (the mark should be brought **down** lower).

Judgement Three: How do learner marks in the LAP compare with the marks given by you to a site-based assessment?

This judgement is based on your comparison of the LAP completed by the learner with a site-based assessment (which you will mark).

The forms the moderators use

There are five forms the moderators can use:

Guidelines for verifying the marking of the LAPs

Data sheet 1

Data sheet 2

Data sheet 3

Data sheet 4

Guidelines for verifying the marking of the LAPs

This is a two page general checklist (printed on green paper) that can be used in an initial training or warm up round. If there is a warm up round then it is used only for the first three LAPs looked at. It is not handed in but, when these first three LAPs are looked at, a *Data sheet 1* should also be started, which will be handed in.

The questions in the checklist are designed to remind moderators of the things they have to look for when they are going through each LAP during the verification. Most Kha Ri Gude Coordinators will already be familiar with the questions in this checklist as they have used them in group moderation with their supervisors.

Data sheet 1

The *Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class set* is the form (printed on white paper) used for moderating a full set of LAPs from one class.

Data sheet 2

The *Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 2 – sample from class set* is the form (on blue paper) for moderating a sample of LAPs from one class. When these forms are issued, the Senior Verifiers will indicate how many LAPs from each class set pack are to be moderated. When using this form the moderator **must** record how many LAPs there were in the whole class set pack.

Data sheet 3

The *Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 3 – detailed analysis of one sample per class set* is the form (on pink paper) that is a simplified version of the *Guidelines for verifying the marking of the LAPs*. It is used to provide a detailed analysis of one or more LAPs from a class set. It is handed in.

Data sheet 4

The *Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4* (on yellow paper) is used to enter data from *Site Visit Record* sheets and your marks for the learner's site visit assessment, some corresponding marks from the learner's LAP and your judgement on the authenticity of the LAP as compared to the Site visit assessment.

Guidelines for moderating the marking of the LAPs

Question	✓	Comment
Administration		
Did the educator fill in the learner's unique number on the front cover?		
Did the educator fill in the learner's personal details correctly on page I?		
Did the educator transfer all the marks correctly to the mark sheet on page ii?		
Did the educator, supervisor and coordinator all sign the LAP on page ii?		
Has the date been written for each completed activity? (See pages 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34)		
For each activity did the educator add up the "ticks" correctly? (See pages 3, 4-5, 7, 8-9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20-21, 22-23, 24-25, 26-27, 29, 30-31, 32-33, 34)		
Were only some ticks added up?		
Were the ticks from both pages of a double page activity added up?		
Validity		
Has the educator used the Mark Criteria correctly? (See pages 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34)		
Does the educator's assessment accurately match the criteria set out in the LAP.		
Do you think the mark should be changed upwards or downwards?		
Has the marker been too lenient or too harsh?		
Does the marking seem to have been done in a careless way?		
Appropriateness of learner corrections		
Learners were allowed /encouraged to correct and improve their work at a later stage – have such corrections been made?		
If changes/corrections were made, do these look as if they were genuinely the learner's work?		
Do any corrections appear to reflect genuine growth of competence in the learner?		

Growth and consistency		
Does the LAP show that the learner has continuously improved?		
Is any inconsistency of performance within portfolio not explainable by development through programme?		
Are there fluctuations of standard in the LAP?		
Problems are signalled by answers that stand out as much better in a set of poor answers.		
Any sense that the educator or a relative or friend has intervened to influence the result should be seen as problematic.		
Is the handwriting genuinely the learner's handwriting? Or did someone else write for the learner? [Handwriting may improve, but not change unrecognisably, nor be highly variable so that it looks as though several people have done the writing.]		
Where there are chances for personality or opinions to show through, there should be some sense that they are the work of the same person.		
Does it seem that learner or a group of learners copied the answers off the board?		
Mistakes or formulations that are found repeatedly in a class or district (suggesting copied or dictated responses) all signal problems that might need to be investigated further.		
Reliability		
When working through a class set of LAPs has the educator made the same sort of judgement for the same kind of work?		

General comment	
-----------------	--

Moderator name: _____ Identity number:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

 Unique number:

--	--	--	--

Province of portfolio:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolio:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	09 Tswana	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

[illegible]

Kha ri gude: Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class set

Moderator name: _____

Identity number: _____

Unique number: _____

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	09 Tswana	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

Educator name: _____

Identity number: _____

	Whole portfolio						Q 7						Q 9						Q 16						Comments
	E	A	I	P	S	U	D	E	A	I	P	S	U	D	E	A	I	P	S	U	D				
1																									
2																									
3																									
4																									
5																									
6																									
7																									
8																									
9																									
10																									
11																									
12																									
13																									
14																									
15																									
16																									
17																									
18																									

Verifier name: _____ Signature: _____

Date: _____ 2016

Kha ri gude: Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 2– sample from class set

Moderator name: _____

Identity number: _____

Unique number: _____

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	09 Tswana	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

Educator name: _____

Identity number: _____

	Whole portfolio				Q 7				Q 9				Q 16				Comments					
	E	A	I	P	S	U	D	E	A	I	P	S	U	D	E	A	I	P	S	U	D	
1																						
2																						
3																						
4																						
5																						
6																						
7																						
8																						
9																						

Number of LAPs in pack:

This must be filled in.

Verifier name: _____ Signature: _____

Date: _____ 2016

Kha Ri Gude: Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 3 – **detailed analysis of one sample per class set**

Moderator name: _____ Identity number:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

 Unique number:

--	--	--

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 Ndebele	04 Swati	05 Xhosa	06 Zulu	07 Sotho	08 Pedi	09 Tswana	10 Venda	11 Tsonga
--------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

Educator name: _____ Identity number:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Number of LAPs in pack:

--

Question	✓	Comment
Administration		
Did the educator fill in the learner's unique number on the front cover?		
Did the educator fill in the learner's personal details correctly on page I?		
Did the educator mark all the work done?		
Did the educator transfer all the marks correctly to the mark sheet on page ii?		
Did the educator, supervisor and coordinator all sign the LAP on page ii?		
Has the date been written for each completed activity?		
For each activity did the educator add up all the "ticks" correctly?		
Validity		
Has the educator used the Mark Criteria correctly?		
Do you think the mark should be changed upwards or downwards or stay the same? [U D S]		
Has the marker been too lenient or too harsh?		
Does the marking seem to have been done in a careless way?		

Appropriateness of learner corrections		
Learners were allowed /encouraged to correct and improve their work at a later stage – have such corrections been made?		
If changes/corrections were made, do these look as if they were genuinely the learner's work?		
Do any corrections appear to reflect genuine growth of competence in the learner?		
Growth and consistency		
Does the LAP show that the learner has continuously improved?		
Is any inconsistency of performance or fluctuations of standard within portfolio not explainable by development through the programme?		
Do some of the answers seem not to be those of the learner?		
Is the handwriting genuinely the learner's handwriting throughout the LAP?		
Does it seem that learner or a group of learners copied the answers off the board?		
Reliability		
When working through the LAP has the educator made the same sort of judgement for the same kind of work?		

General comment	
-----------------	--

Kha Ri Gude: Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4

Moderator name: _____

Identity number: _____

Unique number: _____

Province of portfolios:

1 Eastern Cape	2 Free State	3 Gauteng	4 KwaZulu-Natal	5 Mpumalanga	6 Northern Cape	7 Limpopo	8 North West	9 Western Cape
----------------	--------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------

Language of portfolios:

01 Afrikaans	02 English	03 isiNdebele	04 siSwati	05 isiXhosa	06 isiZulu	07 seSotho	08 sePedi	09 seTswana	10 tshiVenda	11 xiTsonga
--------------	------------	---------------	------------	-------------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------	--------------	-------------

Educator name: _____

Educator ID: _____

Educator Unique Number: _____

#	Learner Unique Number									Site visit record							LAP									Compare	
										Sch	Rpl	Fif	Wor	Lee	Tod	Num	Add	Yrs	Lpr	Total	A2	A4	A5B	A7	A13	A14	Ove
1																											
2																											
3																											
4																											
5																											
6																											
7																											
8																											
9																											
10																											
11																											
12																											
13																											
14																											
15																											
16																											
17																											
18																											

Verifier name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____ 2016

The moderation process using the first four data forms

The moderation of each batch of LAPs from a single class set involves completing the following tasks:

1. Fill in your name, identity number and unique (coordinator) number on the data capture form (Data sheet 1 – the white form for class sets).
2. Mark with a cross the province from which the LAPs come.
3. Mark with a cross the language of the LAPs (and if there are more than one language, enter the number of them in each language in the block provided).
4. Write in the name and identity number of the voluntary educator who marked the LAPs (from LAP page ii).
5. Rapidly review the marking of the portfolio as a whole, checking that:
All completed activities have been marked, and
There are no obvious problems.
6. Rate the quality of the marking of the whole portfolio by placing a ✓ in one of the first four columns: the marking was Excellent (E column) or Acceptable (A column) or Inaccurate (I column) or Problematic (P column).
7. Then rate the fairness of the mark by placing a ✓ in the appropriate column: the mark stays the same (S column) or should go up (U column) or should do down lower (D column).
8. Then closely review the educator's marking of activities 7, 9, and 16 and give your ratings of the marking and the learner's mark in the appropriate columns of the data capture form. Here you will be especially concerned with the validity of the mark.
9. *Only if necessary*, write a short comment concerning problems the LAP in question.
10. If the problems seem particularly serious note down the ID number of the Learner concerned in the comment space as well.
11. *Only if necessary*, draw the attention of the verifier of your group to problems and queries in a particular LAP.
12. Go on to the next portfolio.

If the senior verifiers or verifiers at any stage ask you to moderate a smaller number (from 9 down to 1) of LAPs drawn from each class pack, you need to change to the **blue** form (*Data sheet 2*).

If the senior verifiers or verifiers at any stage ask you to analyse a LAP in more detail from a pack, you need to change to the **pink** form (*Data sheet 3*).

Note the following:

If the whole LAP has not been done by the learner leave the data sheet row blank. Such LAPs should **not** be recorded as not having been marked – they have not been done by the learner. If one or more of the Activity Questions has not been done, leave that part of the data sheet row blank.

One was tick for each correct answer.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Example: Martha's baby touched the paraffin stove.

The baby burnt her leg.

Martha ran to the shop.

The taxi driver took Martha and the baby to the clinic.

The sister cleaned the baby's hand.

The sister told Martha to keep her home safe for children.

☒	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐

Mark	Criteria	Date:
☐ 5	Learner answered 4/5 questions correctly.	
☐ 4	Learner answered 4 questions correctly.	
☐ 3	Learner answered 3 questions correctly.	
☐ 2	Learner answered 2 questions correctly. Let the learner re-read the newspaper article about Martha and her baby and try to answer again at a later stage.	
☐ 1	Learner has only one correct answer. Let her or him try to do this activity again at a later stage. Also check whether she or he understands how to fill in and false answers, or whether she or he has specific reading problems.	

WRITING

Activity 9



Let learners do this activity after they have completed theme 9.



Write a paragraph of 5-6 sentences about a wedding. Say what was interesting about it, the wedding. Say whether you enjoyed it and why.

Mark	Criteria	Date
5	All sentences are well constructed and meaningful.	
4	Learner has made some mistakes but sentences are meaningful.	
3	Learner has made many mistakes but sentences are understandable.	
2	Sentences are not understandable. This or he should redo the activity.	
1	Learner was not ready to do the activity and should redo it later.	

6 Kua Ri Grade Assessment Portfolio

WHAT SHAPE IS THIS?

Example:  Circle

 Circle

Circle was tick for the correct answer for correctly shading the drawing.



	Circle the shape then shade 1/2
	Circle the shape then shade 1/2
	Circle the shape then shade 1/2
	Circle the shape then shade 1/2

Max	Criteria	Date
☒	Learner has given N - 5 correct answers.	
☒	Learner has given D - 3 correct answers.	
☒	Learner has given B - 1 correct answers.	
☒	Learner has given L - 2 correct answers.	

Learner was not ready to do this activity.
Let learner redo the exercise at a later stage.



REMEMBER
Shade in the right hand page.

Total number of ticks for activity is 10



[illegible]

Moderation using the *Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4*

The purpose of this verification activity is to **compare** the way the Learner Assessment Portfolios (LAPs) were completed with the results of a brief set of assessment exercises the learners did during a site visit to the class by SAQA personnel in late 2013 and early 2014..

The process

Each moderator will have a pack of **LAP**s from the class visited and a set of **Site Visit Record** sheets completed by learners in that particular class (though not necessarily from all the learners in the class).

- A. Take the yellow **Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4** and fill in your Name, ID, and Unique Kha Ri Gude number, and then the Province, Language, Educator name and the Educator ID for the set of LAPs you have in hand. If there is more than one language in the set, use a separate data sheet for each language.
- B. It will be useful at this point to put the pile of **Site Visit Record** sheets and the **LAPs** in the order of the Learner's unique number (01 to 18) because you have to match the **Site Visit Record** for each learner with that learner's **LAP**.

Now take the first **Site Visit Record** sheet and the matching **LAP** and complete the steps C, D and E below.

- C. Look at the **Site Visit Record** sheet and complete the steps 1 to 9 below in the section on the **Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4** in the sections 'Learner Unique Number' and 'Site visit record'.

*Note: All the handwriting in green is by the SAQA visitor. Do not mark **green** text in the answers – it is **not** by the learner.*

- 1. Fill in the "Learner Unique Number" (on front cover of LAP and on page i of the LAP).
- 2. Enter the learner's answer for "Number of years learner attended school" (0 to 5) on page i of the LAP into the column *Sch*.
- 3. Enter the learner's answer to the question "Could you read before the start of the Kha Ri Gude programme?" (No = 1; A little = 2; Yes = 3) in column *Rpl*.
- 4. Mark the learner's performance on the "Fill in this form" activity out of 8 (using the 8 blue mark blocks – each block ticked is a mark for a adequate answer by the learner) in column *Fif*.
- 5. Mark the learner's answers to the "Read and fill in the right word" reading comprehension by filling in the five missing words in the text out of 5 (a mark for each plausible word) in column *Wor*.

6. Write in the score written down for “Reading aloud” (Could not read at all = 1; With great difficulty = 2; Slowly and with some difficulty = 3; Adequately = 4; Fluently = 5) in column *Lee*.
 7. Mark the learner's completion of the question “Write what you do during the week at these times” out of 6 (a mark for each meaningful statement) in column *Tod*.
 8. Mark the learner's answers to “Fill in the missing numbers” out of 10 (a mark for each correct number) in double column *Num*.
 9. Mark the learner's completion of “Add the following” addition sums out of 4 in column *Add*.
- D. Next take the matching LAP belonging to that learner and complete the steps 1 to 9 below in the section “LAP”:
1. Fill in the number of “Number of years learner attended school” (one of 0 to 5) on page i into column *Yrs*.
 2. Fill in the answer to “Has learner ever learnt to read and write before joining the Kha Ri Gude?” (1 (Yes) or 2 (No)) in column *Lpr*.
 3. Copy the “Total Combined Mark” from the mark sheet page i into double column *Total*.
 4. Fill in the learner's **Total number of ticks** for Activity 2 “Filling in a form” on page 3 of the LAP (out of 8) in column *A2*.
 5. Fill in the learner's **Mark** for Activity 4 “Reading speed” on page 7 of the LAP (out of 5) in column *A4*.
 6. Count the number of ticks for Part B *only* of Activity 5, “Now say what you do during the week at these times” and fill in this mark (out of 6) in column *A5B*. [Do not use the mark in the **Total number of ticks** block, as it is for both parts A and B. We are only looking at part B.]
 7. Fill in the learner's **Mark** for Activity 7 “Comprehension” on page 13 of the LAP (out of 5) in column *A7*.
 8. Count the number of ticks the “Fill in the missing numbers” part of Activity 13 on page 21 only (out of 10) in column *A13*.
 9. Count the number of ticks for the first 4 blocks in Activity 14 “Addition and subtraction” on page 22 only and fill in this mark (out of 4) in column *A14*.
- F. Now, on the basis of your looking at the learner’s **Site Visit Record** and **LAP** do a comparison in the section “Compare” :
1. Fill in your **own** assessment of the authenticity of the **LAP** compared with the **Site Visit Record** (Clearly different writers/handwriting = 1; Problematic, difficult to judge = 2; Mixed - most is clearly by the same learner = 3; Fully authentic = 4) and fill it in column *Ove*.

Outline of the verification process in 2016

Training session for new moderators

This will be done separately.

Introduction

Information will be given about the timetable, the purposes of the verification (See page 1.) and signing of commitment form (See page 2).

Introductory moderation session (if required)

Participants will initially work in groups of three at a table.

Generally moderators will be seated in language clusters of about ten to twenty moderators assisted by a verifier. Larger groups may also have a head verifier.

Overview of initial procedures and timing and roles of various staff.

Explanation of the *General Checklist for verifying the marking of the LAPs* and the three data capture forms and rating scales (See pages 4-11.)

Issuing of three class sets of LAPs to each group of three moderators.

The group of three moderators together look at three LAPs (one from each class set) using the *Guidelines for marking of the LAPs*.

The group then fills in the data for these three LAPs on their *Kha ri gude Learner Assessment Portfolio verification: data sheet 1 – class sets* and notes any additional comments.

The group of three appoints a spokesperson to report on general impressions and issues and select exemplary or problematic portfolios. (Additional notes are kept for later plenary discussion).

Plenary reports back and discussion. Questions and answers.

Normal moderation sessions

Each person continues moderating the class set until it is completed and they hand it in, together with the data sheet at the appropriate language table.

For and all the later sessions the moderators should sit in the appropriate language group.

Further rapid moderation sessions

Further instructions will be given and sets or randomly selected individual portfolios moderated using Data sheet 2.

Further detailed moderation sessions

Further instructions will be given and sets or randomly selected individual portfolios moderated using Data sheet 3.

Special sessions using the Site Visit Correlation: data sheet 4

These will take place parallel to the normal sessions with selected groups of verifiers and moderators.

The participants should sit in the area designated for the particular language group.

The special site visit pack will be distributed to each moderator. In the pack will be a file with a set of Site Visit Records for a particular class of learners and the pack of the corresponding LAPs for the class.

Instructions will be given on how to fill in the data sheets (see pages 13, 16-17)

Once the set from a class is completed, another pack can be collected.

