HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROFESSIONAL BOARD FOR EMERGENCY CARE

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMME MODERATION REPORT

Purpose: To document external appraisal of HPCSA PBEC approved programmes in the interest of quality and compliance leading to professional registration with the PBEC.

Please note that no part of this template may be deleted. If a section of the template is not applicable to the moderation conducted, please reflect as such. You may add additional assessments and/or programme specific information if deemed relevant to the report.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.	**Institute being moderated**	
2.	**Programme being moderated**	
3.	**NQF level of the qualification**	
4.	**Module/s being moderated**	
5.	**NQF-level of the module/s being moderated**	
6.	**Please tick the relevant box:**	
	End of Year Report (end of January)	
7.	**Programme Manager**	**Name**	
		Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	
		Email address	
8.	**Head of Department**	**Name**	
		Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	

		Email address	
9.	PBEC moderator	Name	
		Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	
		Email address	

2. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Include a brief introduction as to the process followed for the moderation cycle for the current academic year. Maybe include a few examples that we would want to see in this section perhaps? This can include dates contact was made and supporting documentation was received, any major challenges and how they were overcome?

3. <u>PRE-MODERATION</u>

The period of pre-moderation must take place within a reasonable time period to allow for changes to be considered and implemented within the module/programme being moderated. This process should ideally take place at least two weeks prior to the start of the current academic year. Matters related to module content, learning outcomes, pedagogic strategies, assessment criteria and strategies should be considered. The PBEC is aware of the need for institutions to declare/seek approval for major structural curricular changes, however, institutions are also encouraged to allow for module/programme refinement within reason.

3.1 Did you receive the relevant academic documentation related to the modules which must include the outcomes?   Yes ___ No ___

3.2 Did you require any changes to be made to any of the relevant academic.
    documentation?   Yes ___ No ___

If you answered yes to 3.2, what changes were required:

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.3 Was PBEC Moderator feedback linked to the areas above adequately incorporated into the activities being moderated. Please provide commentary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. <u>MODERATION LINKED TO THE PROGRAMME:</u>

	Yes	No
Judgments were made against specific, measurable criteria, objectively & consistently?		
There is evidence of diagnostic, and formative assessment during the learning programme.		
Criteria for performance during assessments are clearly defined to determine competence.		
Organisation & control of process, including student movement & integrity was adequate		
Re-assessment procedure arrangements are consistent with the PBEC & the Institutions policy?		
Validity:		
In the assessment, the criteria matched the assessment task and the learner/student outcomes?		
There was evidence of internal moderation (pre and post)?		
The internal moderator endorsed the criteria set by the assessors.		
Feasibility:		
The assessment was practical/pragmatic?		
There was acceptable time allowed?		
The assessment resources were acceptable.		
Reliability:		
There was consistency of assessment against the criteria provided by the examiner.		
Learners/students were assessed fairly?		
There was inter-assessor consistency of the assessors.		

The assessment was reliable in that specified standards, outcomes and competencies and their accompanying criteria were the basis upon which the assessment was planned and administered?		
Was the internal moderation process (where there was PBEC involvement) for the programme reliable, valid and fair?		
Were module moderation reports if applicable as well as assessments made available to the moderator throughout the year?		
Is there evidence that any concerns highlighted in these moderation reports have been addressed by the institution?		
Are programme standards in accordance with the HEQSF, SAQA level descriptors and the HPCSA PBEC minimum standards?		

Should you have answered no to any of the questions above, please provide a detailed narrative below:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

5. GENERAL COMMENTS:

5.1 This section may be utilized to add any additional comments on items which have not been addressed in the report under the previous sections. If there are no additional comments, please state "not applicable".

5.2 Make recommendations (if needed) with regards to programme changes and/or improvements in the best interests of the programme, staff and students. If there are no recommendations, please state "not applicable".

5.3 Make recommendations to the PBEC that the graduate cohort has met the PBEC minimum standards inclusive of the minimum clinical learning requirements to register on the relevant register with the HPCSA.

Full Name:	
Qualifications:	
HPCSA Registration Number:	
Date:	
Signature:	

ANNEXURE - MODERATION LINKED TO SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS:
Please complete this annexure for each specific assessment being moderated.

Assessment Description: _____
Date of the Assessment: _____
Year of Study: _____
NQF Level of Assessment: _____
Pre-requisites: _____
Co-requisites: _____

1.	Module lecturer	Name	
		Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	
		Email address	
2.	Examiner	Name	
		Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	
		Email address	
3.	Internal moderator	Name	
		Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	
		Email address	

4.	External moderator	Name	
	(if applicable)	Qualification	
		HPCSA Reg. No.	
		Contact number	
		Email address	

1. Pre-Moderation of Assessment:

	Yes	No
Did the assessment cover the relevant content?		
Did the assessment cover the relevant outcomes?		
Was the assessment comprehensive, with reasonable spread?		
Did you receive the assessment in fair time to moderate (at least two weeks prior to the scheduled date)?		
Did you receive a memorandum/assessment guide/rubric indicating the assessment criteria?		
There was adequate control of the assessment security?		
Did the institution follow their own assessment policies & guidelines?		

Should you have answered no to any of the questions in 3.1 above, please provide a detailed narrative below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Assessment output:

	Yes	No
Did you moderate at least 20% of the completed assessments?		
Was the memorandum/assessment guide applied consistently?		
Where multiple markers/assessors were used was the marking consistent?		

Should you have answered no to any of the questions in 2, please provide a detailed narrative below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Assessment results:

Are copies of the results of all learners for the assessments moderated attached?

Yes ____ No ____

3.1 Comment on any specific trends or aspects of the students' performance in the assessment and possible reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.2 Comment on suggested follow up actions to address these possible reasons where. applicable:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.3 General comments and recommendations on the type/s of assessment used:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____