



## **MODERATOR APPLICATION FORM**

### **1. PURPOSE**

This Guide has been developed to assist constituent moderators to prepare for and apply for registration with the SASSETA ETQA. The SASSETA registers assessors and moderators as part of its quality assurance role to safeguard learners against prejudice, unfairness and corruption.

### **2. ASSESSMENT**

Assessment is process of gathering and weighing evidence in order to determine whether or not learners can demonstrate outcomes specified in unit standards and/or qualifications registered on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Assessors are those individuals who are appropriately qualified to plan and conduct learner assessments against the requirements of the NQF.

### **3. MODERATION**

Moderation is the process that checks that assessments are done according to acceptable standards and is the process of ensuring that assessments have been conducted in line with agreed practices so that results are fair, valid and reliable.

### **4. STEPS IN THE APPLICATION PROCESS FOR MODERATORS**

1. Applicants must complete the application form (see Section1) and submit it to the SASSETA ETQA. Applicants should ensure that the necessary documents outlined in the application form are attached.
2. Applicants must sign the **Code of Conduct (see Section 3)** and submit this to the SASSETA ETQA.
3. The SASSETA ETQA will evaluate the application and supporting documentation. The evaluators will submit recommendation to the HOD: ETQA, who will approve or dis-approve the recommendation.
4. The results of the decision will be communicated to the applicant in writing. If the application has been unsuccessful, a set of reasons will be provided. If the applicant deems it necessary, he/she can appeal the decision. Appeals should be submitted to the HOD: ETQA in writing 38 days after receipt of the decision. Providers should indicate clearly why the appeal is being made and provide reasons. The ETQA will conduct the necessary activities on receipt of the appeal.
5. If the applicant is successful, a registration Letter /certificate will be issued.
6. The status of registered assessors and moderators is reviewed every three years.

## SECTION: 1 MODERATOR DETAILS

1. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION								
Surname:								
First Name/s:								
Identity Number:								
Postal Address:								
							Postal Code	
Physical Address:								
							Postal Code	
Telephone number:								
Fax Number:								
Email :								
Gender: (For equity purpose)								
Race: (For equity purpose)	Black		White		Coloured		Indian/ Asian	
Disability Status: (For equity purpose)	Have disability status				No disability status			
Areas in which the moderator operates (Note: the provider might be based in urban or Rural area but operating in rural areas or both urban and rural areas)	Urban Areas Only			Rural Areas Only			Both Urban & Rural	
Did you gain access to the moderator programme through RPL?	Yes				No			
Please indicate employment status	Pre employed (never worked before)			Un employed (worked previously but not at present)			Employed	Self Employed
If employed , please provide Brief description of your roles and responsibilities in the workplace								
Name of the Employer (If Relevant )								
Accreditation status of Employer	Accredited with SASSETA			Accredited with another SASSETA			Not accredited	
Address of the Employer (If Relevant )								
							Postal Code	
Date of Submission:								
2. FORMAL QUALIFICATION								

<i>Please indicate the Highest education attainment levels to date, Please tick the most appropriate box</i>			
Less than Standard 8 (Grade 10) Or Equivalent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Standard 9 (Grade 11) Or Equivalent	<input type="checkbox"/>
Less than Standard 10 (Grade 12) Or Equivalent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Post Matric Diploma	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under Graduate Degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Post Graduate	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>What are your formal Qualification(s)? Please complete the table below :</b>			
Name of Qualification Or ( <i>Certificates achieved</i> )	Institution obtained	Duration of the programme	Date obtained
<b>3. RELEVANT OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE</b>			
<b>How many years of experience, do you have in your occupational field.</b>			
<b>Please describe your experience in the row below:</b>			

## SECTION 2

<b>4. DECLARATION</b>	
Applicant : I hereby declare that the above information is correct and valid and accurate	
Signature of the applicant :	
Date:	
Employer or Provider : I hereby endorse this application and declare that the information is correct	
Signature of the Employer/ Provider	
Date :	

<b>5. DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Certified ETDP Statement of Results</li> <li>b) Certified Id document</li> <li>c) Certified copies of certificates (Relevant to the Unit standards )</li> <li>d) Signed code of conduct for the moderator</li> </ul>	

## 6. How to access and obtain a unit standard

- Go to the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) website on [www.saqa.org.za](http://www.saqa.org.za);
- Select Qualifications and Unit Standard;
- Select the registered unit standard and qualification by choosing either “select qualification” or “select unit standard”;
- If you know the unit standard no. click on “select unit standard”;
- If you are not sure about the unit standard title, select qualification;
- A table will appear which will allow you to select one or more of the following:
- SGB — Select one of the following:
  - Corrections
  - Defence
  - Intelligence
  - Security
  - Policing
  - Firearm
  - NSB
  - Provider
- ETQA — Select SASSETA

## SECTION 3

### 7. Code of Conduct for Moderators

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

#### The Code of Conduct to which I agree is as follows:

1. I shall conduct my work as a SASSETA 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 candidates' and assessors' cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds;
2. Any conflict of interest such as a financial or family relationship between myself and any candidate or assessor shall be declared in advance, and, if requested, I shall recuse myself from the process in specific instances;
3. All information received during my work as a 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 SASSETA ETQA about this problem and ask them 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 SASSETA ETQA; these will include:
  - a. unplanned environmental, personal or other problems which may have interfered with the performance of the candidate
  - b. suspected or proven irregularities committed by the candidate
  - 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 candidates or assessors
  - e. any grounds for doubting the authenticity of the evidence presented during the assessment process;
7. Any constructive comments about the standards or qualifications which I receive from assessors or note in my own work shall be collated and included in my reports to the SASSETA HOD: ETQA. These will be forwarded to the relevant SGB for inclusion in the review process;
8. 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 SASSETA HOD: ETQA; 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.

9. I shall conduct my work in line with the vision and mission of the SASSETA, particularly in relation to improving the quality of education, training and assessment for all learners and assessors in the sector, giving guidance and support to all involved to achieve their full potential.

Name in full (printed): .....

Signed: ..... Date: .....

### Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments

SAQA US ID	UNIT STANDARD TITLE			
115759	Conduct moderation of outcomes-based assessments			
ORIGINATOR				
SGB Assessor Standards				
PRIMARY OR DELEGATED QUALITY ASSURANCE FUNCTIONARY				
ETDP SETA - Education, Training and Development Practices Sector Education and Training Authority				
FIELD			SUBFIELD	
Field 05 - Education, Training and Development			Higher Education and Training	
ABET BAND	UNIT STANDARD TYPE	PRE-2009 NQF LEVEL	NQF LEVEL	CREDITS
Undefined	Regular	Level 6	Level TBA: Pre-2009 was L6	10
REGISTRATION STATUS		REGISTRATION START DATE	REGISTRATION END DATE	SAQA DECISION NUMBER
Reregistered		2015-07-01	2018-06-30	SAQA 10105/14
LAST DATE FOR ENROLMENT		LAST DATE FOR ACHIEVEMENT		
2019-06-30		2022-06-30		

#### 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. 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 is 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.

- 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.

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.