

GUIDE FOR KHA RI GUDE SITE VISITS, 2011

Status of this document

This document is a draft guide for pilot visits to six Kha ri Gude (KRG) sites, three in Gauteng and three in KZN. The site visits must take place before the major moderating event for portfolios of the 2010 KRG intake at the beginning of April 2011.

Purpose of the site visits

The site visits are intended to support and inform the overall process of moderation and verification. They are part of the progressive development of an appropriate quality assurance system for KRG.

In the first two years of moderation, various constraints meant that SAQA could only endorse the validity of the assessment of the portfolios themselves by overseeing the moderation of a large sample of some 600 000 portfolios. Ideally, over time, SAQA should be able to have confidence in the internal assessment, moderation and verification procedures of KRG. When that is the case, a much smaller sample might be collected and moderated.

Because of the demands of the SAQA approach so far, the logistics and data management in KRG have been developed to a high level. As yet SAQA has not been in a position to check assumptions which require some measure of independent verification.

Key questions for verification

In essence, the site visits involve two key verification questions:

1. The identity of the learners? (Are they real and not fictitious? Are they the people who completed the portfolios?)
2. Is there a credible fit between their skills ascertained in a brief independent test and appearing in the portfolio? (When compared with the actual portfolios, are the skills and handwriting comparable?)

At the same time there are other important questions for quality assurance development:

3. To what extent can the learners' levels of literacy and numeracy be attributed to Kha ri Gude rather than to prior learning? While this question is not strictly relevant to the validity of the result on the portfolio, it is well within the concerns of quality assurance.
4. How good / how real is the process of internal quality assurance?:
 - 1.1. Voluntary educators are required to mark the portfolios, supervisors moderate them and coordinators verify them - all signing off the marking. Insight is needed into how real and effective this process is.

- 1.2. How insightful are the people concerned regarding the required levels of achievement? (Have they had relevant training in assessment? Have they internalised and put into practice adequate processes?)

SUGGESTED APPROACH AND PROCEDURES

It is important to remember that we are not conducting a comprehensive evaluation of Kha ri Gude. The centre of our concern is the validity of the results that SAQA aims to record on the NLRD. However, the insights needed for verification use evaluation methods.

The site visitor should adopt a stance of positive ethnographic inquiry, with a non-intrusive curiosity about the working of the learning site and an affirmative approach to educators and learners. (Appreciative evaluation.)

Much will be learnt from conversations, with gentle, unobtrusive probing.

The visit may well start with a group encounter in which the educator and learners talk to the visitor about the experience of Kha ri Gude. How did they come to participate in the programme? What do they think about it? Do they recommend it to friends? What difference has it made to their lives? What were the best things they learnt?

However, it is essential that some “confidential” individual encounters are also reported, to avoid the distortion of group pressures. Conversation, whether with the educator or with individual learners, should yield a clear judgement of the genuineness of the activities and achievements of the learning site.

Some possible questions

To the educator

1. What did you find most satisfying about running the programme?
2. Tell me about the learners who made the most rewarding progress? What factors do you think helped to make them successful
3. Tell me about the more difficult challenges of KRG work?
4. In helping the learners to do well on their portfolios, how did you guide them without actually “giving them the answers”?

To the individual learner

1. Could you read anything before you started KRG? Please describe
2. Could you write anything before you started KRG? Please give examples
3. Could you count or calculate before you started KRG? Please describe
4. What were the most important things you learnt from KRG? What can you do now that you couldn't do before?
5. Did you need a lot of help to do your portfolio? Who helped you ? How did your family help you? Would you say that your portfolio is mainly your own work?

THE TEST

The test can be done as a group or individually and should be unobtrusive and unthreatening. Assure the learners that they and their teachers are not going to be judged in any way by this, and that it is to help us improve KRG.

Each learner should be given a blank, lined sheet of A4 writing paper. Ask them successively to:

1. Write their name, ID number and address at the top of the page. Observe them as they do this.
2. Write the date and time.
3. Write the names of two best friends.
4. Make a list of three things they need to buy at the shop.
5. Write a sentence to the Mayor about something good or something bad in your town.

Then hand out a copy of the numeracy exercise from the portfolio and ask them to write their name at the top and complete it.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Please:

1. Remember that it is essential for us to be able to link each learner's test and any relevant observations to the particular portfolio. The learner's ID number is the key here. If the learner has forgotten her ID number, the facilitator should be able to provide this from the records.
2. Keep the tests and any other documents relevant to the verification exercise in a clearly marked file with the centre name and number.
3. Write a brief report indicating your impression of the learning site in relation to the questions on page one.
4. Provide a score out of 10 for your estimate of the genuineness and integrity of the teaching, learning, and ABOVE ALL, assessment at the site. Be prepared to argue and defend this score.

THANK YOU