

# Proposal for SAQA to undertake a verification and incremental quality assurance process of the Kha Ri Gude adult literacy campaign for the years 2011 to 2013

---

## Preamble

The Minister of Basic Education has written to the Chairperson of UMALUSI about the quality assurance of Kha Ri Gude. In the letter she supports the Chairperson's view that:

“... the Kha Ri Gude Campaign forms an integral part of the Education delivery programme of the Ministry of Basic Education. We would therefore monitor that, even as an informal literacy programme, it meets its ABET level 1 outcomes”

The Minister continues:

“ In the light of constraints on your part, we concur with your view that SAQA should maintain the status quo by continuing to quality assure Kha Ri Gude as they have been doing since 2008 until we discuss any proposed changes to their current mandate”.

This letter was forwarded to the CEO of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) by the acting CEO of UMALUSI.

In response the CEO of Umalusi, Dr Rakometsi, wrote:

“It is Umalusi's understanding that in terms of the above letter, the Minister requires SAQA to continue to quality assure Kha Ri Gude”.

The proposal that follows is limited to a three year time- frame, during which time Umalusi and the Minister will develop the conditions which will enable Umalusi to discharge its obligations with regards to Kha Ri Gude.

## Background

In 2009, 2010 and 2011 the SAQA assisted the Kha Ri Gude Adult Literacy Campaign (KRG) in a limited quality assurance exercise. This was in response to a request of Kha Rii Gude (KRG) and the then Department of Education (DOE). On all three occasions the project was rated positively, but due to time and resource constraints, the range of verification activities was restricted to an affirmation of the standards and a scrutiny of the learner portfolios used in the programme.

In all of its final reports SAQA expressed itself satisfied with the perceived levels of the programme and the standard of portfolio assessment. Reservation was, however, expressed about the limits of the exercise in that no other verification elements such as site observation or regular, ongoing activities had been possible.

These limitations on the range of possible quality assurance activities were a consequence of the uncertainty about whose legislative responsibility the quality assurance of KRG was and where the financing responsibility lay.

The Ministerial letter quoted above clarifies the matter for the immediate future and indicates that SAQA should, pro tem, undertake a quality assurance for the KRG campaign.

In accepting this commission SAQA assumes that it can now give life to the recommendations contained in the final reports on the previous verification process. These reports indicate that for a credible quality assurance process to take place the activities of the Authority should include:

- a more interactive verification relationship with the campaign;
- on-site observations and on-site sample checking to determine whether the portfolio reflected learning has actually taken place;
- the regular calling for selected portfolios;
- involvement in the training of specific quality assurance dimensions, of campaign coordinators, supervisors and volunteer educators as well as verifiers and moderators;
- ongoing refining, extending, and updating of data and data-capturing processes for the NLRD;
- Using the NLRD data to follow the progress of students through the various ABET Levels.

An overriding consideration is that the programme needs a continuous, uninterrupted period of guaranteed involvement to plan, introduce, grow and evaluate a credible and sustainable programme whose learner achievements are credible and are recorded on the National Learners Data Base (NLRD).

## Framework and principles on which the project will be based

### 1. Duration of the Project

It is considered essential for the continuation of SAQA's role that KRG and SAQA commit to a three year programme as has been recommended in all reports.

This proposal will therefore cover the period 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011 to the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2013. There is a need to integrate this with the financial years of the DBE and SAQA results in parts of the programme being reflected in the financial years ending in March 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 (See table below).

The rationale for suggesting the three year conditionality is based on the following:

- While satisfactory portfolio verification and some quality training and reflection, can be achieved through the Verification Workshop and ongoing portfolio examination (described below), an extended period would alleviate the pressure of attempting to reach immediate statistically acceptable sampling of site activity. Site activity includes not only the physical verification of teaching and learning taking place, it also allows the site visitors to determine on a face-to-face basis whether portfolio evidence is supported by actual learner performance.

In the short term it would be impossible to undertake all the quality assurance activities which would satisfy all stakeholders. A three year horizon would allow for a more scaffolded, solid and credible programme to be introduced;

- Umalusi could use the extended period to adjust itself and KRG to its taking on of the responsibility of quality assuring the campaign. The Minister has indicated in the abovementioned letter to UMALUSI that:

“In the meantime we should explore the feasibility of your envisaged role i.e. the external monitoring of the verification process of KRG because of the financial implications involved.”

In the letter from the Umalusi CEO quoted above she mentions that:

“The outstanding matter to be agreed upon is Umalusi's role in the external monitoring and verification of the processes related to Kha Ri Gude as well as the funding of this activity”.

- A three year period would allow SAQA to contribute a meaningful reflection of the process. A longitudinal view would be possible as achievements would be recorded on the NLRD as learners enroll in and progress to higher levels.

## 2. Site visit considerations

### 2.1. Overall framework

- An incremental sliding scale leading to an acceptable sampling configuration of site visits will have to be agreed upon. The size of the sample would depend inversely on the quality and credibility of other factors such as monitoring as well as the extent and credibility of statistical information and ongoing reported activity. The categories of data collected could also be extended to allow for analysis of portfolio questions as well as other data found being useful for item analysis.
- Stakeholder confidence in the verification can be built if the exercise can be shown to be more process driven and ongoing and not only subject to once off workshops or visits. Portfolios could be verified on a random basis (subject to a predetermined sampling procedure) and also be assessed as part of the visiting process. Other information could also be checked during site visits. Coordinators, monitors and KRG officials would be trained to undertake internal monitoring activities on an ongoing basis and be encouraged to look for growth and change as well as portfolio authenticity.
- Site “visitors” could also be trained to do focused tests to check portfolios against actual performance;
- The sites will be chosen on the basis of a spread of coordinators, geography and language. Other factors could emerge after further discussion between the parties;
- SAQA will appoint, train, logistically support and monitor local site verifiers/visitors. SAQA officials would also visit sites to confirm the visitor reports as well to keep a hands-on approach to the assessment verification approaches.
- The verification process will be shared with KRG. Local verifiers will be trained in a cost effective manner – possibly using distance education methods. This would leave KRG with a resource enabling future capacity building.

## 3. The current situation

### 3.1. Numbers:

KRG reported the following figures for 2010:

• Learners :	618 000
• Centres:	38 424
• Coordinators	170
• Supervisors	3 394
• Volunteer Educators	38 424

It is however anticipated that these numbers will diminish in future years and that the programme will begin to access more remote, less easily accessible, communities. The actual extent of this is difficult to estimate.

### **3.2 Verification for 2011 (Academic Year 1):**

The learning centres will not be open until after the verification workshop to be held in March 2011 has taken place (see below). However the programme intends to undertake limited verification activities in January and February 2011.

#### **3.2.1 Limited Site Visits before March 2011**

This will involve the setting up of a team of 10 chosen people (including the senior SAQA verifiers) chosen for their experience, judgment and geographical range who will visit some 50 centres, randomly chosen. An attempt will be made to ensure a fair spread of language and coordinators. The members of the SAQA team will work with KRG to make contact with the chosen site coordinators in order to meet as many of the learners of the chosen site as will be possible.

The purpose of this exercise is to verify the following:

1. What is the level of literacy of the learner compared to her/his portfolio
2. The accuracy of the marking of the Learner Assessment Portfolio (LAP)
3. The level and experience of the learner before their entering the programme
4. The general integrity of the portfolio.

#### **3.2.2 Verifying a sample of LAPS (Learners Assessment Portfolios) before the March Verification Workshop**

1000 LAPS would be collected and assessed during December-January by the SAQA Verifiers. The sample should represent about 3% of centres and cover the jurisdiction of all coordinators.

#### **3.2.3 Site Visits post the March Verification Workshop- April to October (7 months)**

Using the already trained site visit verifiers it would be possible to visit two sites per coordinator over the 7 month period. The activity would not start immediately, but would enable the verification process to gain a developing view of the activities on the ground. The verifiers would be covering the same elements as described in 3.2.1 3.2.2. above. The findings could be informally passed on to the KRG management to support an ongoing monitoring process.

## **4. THE VERIFICATION WORKSHOP**

### **4.1. The workshop itself**

The verification workshop for this cycle should be held in March 2011.

The workshop is expected to involve some 195 coordinators and monitors, the majority of whom were trained during the previous verification event.

The staffing of this event will involve:

Three Senior Verifiers (the SAQA team)  
10 Verifiers (drawn from senior Coordinators and some KRG officials)  
160 Moderators (drawn from the Coordinators)

A subset of this group will be two moderators and two verifiers who will focus on the Braille portfolios of blind learners.

The first evening will focus on evaluating how the insights and techniques learned during the previous events were applied with what impact during the current years KRG activities. The logistics for the next two days will also be explained.

The next two days will be devoted to verifying and moderating some 14 000 LAPS (Learner's Assessment Portfolios). This sample of LAPS will be created within the following framework and procedure:

- There are some 3 400 Supervisors who manage about 11 Educators. Each Educator teaches a group of 18 Learners – as a result each supervisor is responsible for about 11 packs containing 18 portfolios (likely because of dropout, etc. to average about 15 rather than 18).
- The groups of packs of each supervisor are randomly marked from 1 to 11. Pack 5 containing 18 LAPS will be provided to SAQA for moderation and verification;
- The SAQA moderators will initially randomly select 4 portfolios of the "18" in the pack;
- The SAQA verifiers will initially randomly choose 2 moderated portfolios from each pack.
- Moderators and verifiers will be presented with SAQA certificates at the end of the process.

There are at least 600 000 learners in the system. The process will allow for a 2.5% sample based on an acceptable spread of geography, language and administrative responsibility. Further dimensions can be derived from the downloading process undertaken by SB&T and the SAQA NLRD.

On the basis of the verification process recommendations can be made with regard to accepting the credibility of the LAPS as well as raising or lowering the marks. A tentative baseline for this is in place from the 2009 and 2010 results.

#### **4.2. Activities around the workshop**

- SAQA will prepare and submit training materials for the workshop at the end of January 2011;
- In Jan-March SAQA will continue to refine and record KRG results on the NLRD;
- Late Feb/early March SAQA will inspect the portfolios in the KRG warehouse and meet with KRG/ to finalise administrative arrangements;
- Post the workshop SAQA will review the total QA process and its findings and prepare a report with recommendations for KRG.

#### **5. Revisiting and reporting on curriculum levels to meet queries raised by Umalusi.**

Umalusi, has indicated that it would like to understand the processes involved in establishing the levels of KRG in relation to NQF and UNESCO levels. A formal memorandum will be developed so that they can enter negotiations with the Minister with confidence in this regard.

## 6. ALIGNING FINANCIAL AND ACADEMIC YEARS

The table below shows the alignment of January to December academic years for the period 2011 to 2013 with the Financial years which cover the period

	ACADEMIC YEAR 1 Jan – Dec 2011		ACADEMIC YEAR 2 Jan – Dec 2012		ACADEMIC YEAR 3 Jan-Dec 2013		FINAL VERIFICATION WORKSHOP
activities	<i>F.Y. 1 Jan-Mar 2011</i>	<i>F.Y.2 Apr– Dec 2011</i>	<i>F.Y.2 Jan-Mar 2012</i>	<i>F.Y.3 Apr-Dec 2012</i>	<i>F.Y.3 Jan-Mar 2013</i>	<i>F.Y.4 Apr- Dec2013</i>	
Site Visit pre March	•						
Verificatio n Workshop	•		•		•		•
Site Visit post March		•		•		•	
NLRD		•		•		•	
Project Mngment Reporting	•	•	•	•	•	•	

## 7. ACADEMIC YEAR 2 (2012) AND 3 (2013)

The activities in these next two years will be focused on shifting the emphasis of the verification from range to intensity with some emphasis on the longitudinal aspects of the programme.

As mentioned earlier the numbers are anticipated to drop and the geographic spread to increase. However, since this may not be the case and the extent of the change uncertain, the budget is based on the 2010 situation.

These verification aspects for 2012 and 2013 include:

- Preparing training materials and training methods for 2012 and improving them for 2013;
- Training potential site “visitors” to use the visit to intensively examine a number of verification factors including attendance; spot checking the authenticity of portfolios; quality of teaching; morale of learners and staff.
- Determining an incremental site visit schedule so that by 2013 an acceptable site visit sample has been reached;
- Arranging site visits and preparing monitoring reports;
- Calling for and verifying portfolios during the year
- Appropriately preparing, running and reporting on an annual verification/moderation workshop;
- Ongoing NLRD updating and data accumulation as well as following progress by learners through the ABET sector;
- Regular management and project review meetings which should involve SAQA, Umalusi and KRG officials.

## 8. PROPOSED BUDGET 1/3/2010 – 31/3/2012

### 8.1. Total

The proposed budget, which is provided in Annexure 1, is rounded off to:

FY 1 ending March 2011	FY 2 ending March 2012	FY3 ending March 2013	FY4 ending March 2014
R 566 957	R 1 506 637	R 1 014 016	R771 777

### 8.2. Activities

The budget reflects the following activities:

#### 8.2.1 SAQA Coordination, reporting and data recording:

- SAQA coordination; the writing of analyses and reports by SAQA officials ;
- Periodic random calling for and assessing a sample of 1000 portfolios- an effort of 25 days;
- NLRD recording and reporting particularly on learner longitudinal progress;
- Consultation and SAQA Executive involvement

#### 8.2.2. Site Visits

- Preparing site visit material to effectively assess the site learning environment; training agreed number of site “visitors” for two years of activity; evaluating and improving learning methods;
- Arranging and monitoring site visits based on:
  - 2011: - 50 centres (limited time available)
  - 2012: - At least 2 centres per coordinator = 350 centres
  - 2013 - At least 1 centre per coordinator = 175 centres
- In 2012 and 2013 Site “visitors” will visit two sites a day. Thus:
  - 2012 = 175 visiting days;
  - 2013 = 88 visiting days
- No airfares will be required for site visits – all visits must be planned so that road transport will be used and paid for;
- No accommodation costs will be incurred for site visits;
- Provision is made for SAQA officials to visit 10% of agreed sample.

#### 8.2.3 Coordinators Workshop

- The planning for the workshop will involve:
  - 3 days of the 3 SAQA “experts” i.e. 9 budget days including discussions with KRG Logistical support;
  - 3 days of workshop leadership by the SAQA Team i.e. 9 budget days;
  - 2 days for reviewing the evidence and writing the workshop report i.e. 3 budget days;

**ANNEXURE 1**  
**BUDGET SAQA KHA RI GUDE VERIFICATION PROCESS FYE 2011-2014**

ACTIVITY	Basic Cost Component	ORIGINAL Actual FYE 2011 ( Nov 2010 –March 2011)	ORIGINAL Est. FYE 2012 (April 2011 – March2012)	VIREMENT Actual FYE 2011 ( Nov 2010 – March 2011)	VIREMENT Est. FYE 2012 (April 2011 – March2012)
			350 visits 5% escalation		350 visits 5% escalation
<b>2. SITE VISITS</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visitor days (including per diem)</li> <li>Digital Training days (include preparation)</li> <li>SAQA Prep + training</li> </ul>	(?sites per day ) = ?visitor days @R  ? new visitors ? xdaysxR  ? Officials x ?days x R?	$40 \times 2625 =$ <b>R 105 000</b>  $8 \times 1 \times 2625 =$ <b>R 21 000</b>  $3 \times 3 \times 3675 =$ <b>R 33 077</b>	$(350/2) = 175 \times 2756$ <b>R 482 300</b>  $10 \times 1 \times 2756 =$ <b>R 27 560</b>  $3 \times 2 \times 3859 =$ <b>R23 154</b>	<b>R0.00</b>  <b>R0.00</b>  <b>R0.00</b>	$(350/2) = 175 \times 2756$ <b>R 482 300</b>  $30 \times 1 \times 2756 =$ <b>R 82 680</b>  $3 \times 15 \times 3859 =$ <b>R173.655</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>travel costs (visitors?+3 SAQA)</li> </ul>	? sites @300 kms (ave) x R	$13 \times 300 \times 4 =$ <b>R 15 600</b>	$(175+3) \times 300 \times 4.40 =$ <b>R234 960</b>	<b>R0.00</b>	$(175+3) \times 300 \times 4.40 =$ <b>R234 960</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAQA Officials monitoring</li> </ul>	? sites x R3675  Travel @ R3500 /visit	$10 \times 3675 =$ <b>R 36 750</b>  <b>R0.00</b>	$17 \times 3859 =$ <b>R 65 603</b>  <b>R0.00</b>	<b>R0.00</b>  <b>R0.00</b>	$10 \times 3895 =$ <b>R 38 590</b>  <b>R 35 000</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visitor o'night accommodation</li> </ul>	¼ of visits est @R1600 per night.	R0.00	R0.00	<b>R0.00</b>	<b>R70 400</b>
•					

\*Travel from and to Pietermarizburg as well as printing, accommodation and logistical costs to be borne by KRG budget.

Comparative totals

	TOTAL 2011/12 ORIGINAL	TOTAL 2011/12 PROPOSED VIREMENT
• visitor days (including per diem)	• 587 300	• 482 000
• Digital Training days (include preparation)	• 48 560	• 82 680
• SAQA Prep + training	• 56 231	• 173 655
• travel costs (visitors?+3 SAQA)	• 250 560	• 234.960
• SAQA Officials monitoring	• 102 353	• 73 590
• Visitor o'night accommodation	• 0.00	• 70 400
• <b>TOTALS</b>	• 1 045 000	• 1 117 285

Current total deficit R 72 285