Wholesale&Retail

LEADERSHIP CHAIR

Cape Peninsula
University of Technology

W&RSETA
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL SETA
Skills Development for Economic Growth

*"Collaboration opens the window
to a world of opportunities."*

ADDENDA

to REPORTS

2014/08A and 2014/08B

NOVEMBER 2015

APPLIED RESEARCH
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
SERVICE TO RETAIL COMMUNITY

PREFACE

This unpublished report provides two addenda that were originally included in reports "2014/08A A model for Assessment Centres for the W&RSETA QCTO qualifications" and "2014/08B Development of W&RSETA management system and procedures for AQP for QCTO retail qualifications".

After considerable debate and negotiations between the researchers, the W&RSETA and the QCTO, it was decided to exclude this additional material from the published reports. It was objected to on various grounds, e.g. that the documents used were only draft documents and that conclusions based on such draft documents should not be published, or that the material unfairly created a negative perception of the QCTO. Overall it was felt that they should not be in the public domain.

However, both the researchers and the W&RSETA felt that the findings and conclusions illustrated in the Addenda were important for the W&RSETA's planning and decision making and should be available for the operationalising of the W&RSETA as the AQP for W&RSETA QCTO qualifications.

Therefore the Wholesale & Retail Leadership Chair agreed to remove the Addenda from the published reports, but to combine them into a separate, unpublished, confidential and private report which will be made available only to the W&RSETA.

The two Addenda that follow are entitled:

- Unpublished Addendum A - to Project 2014/08A report - QCTO Draft Documents
- Unpublished Addendum A - to Project 2014/08B report - QCTO Policy Analysis.

UNPUBLISHED ADDENDUM A TO PROJECT 08A REPORT

QCTO DRAFT DOCUMENTS

Various draft documents and templates were released by the QCTO in 2014. The documents considered the practical application of the final summative assessment as well as the AQP's management thereof.

These documents focus largely on paper-based summative assessment and do not consider a combination of practical as well as theoretical assessments. In addition to this, they refer to actual paper-based assessments whereas the majority of the seven W&RSETA qualifications within the scope of this research include assessment specifications that allow for either paper-based or online assessment.

"Monitoring Instrument for an application needing an Assessment Centre Status" notes that an organisation can both offer lectures and examination (QCTO, 2014a:2). It also refers to qualifications and experience of lecturers as well as daily timetables (lesson plans) of the institution.

The "Development of Final External Integrated Assessment-Examiners Report" notes in terms of the assessment under the sub-heading "2. Content Coverage", only paper based assessments are evaluated and this is reinforced by the evaluation of the "Technical Aspects", which amongst other things evaluates whether the same font has been used throughout the assessment. In addition, there is a note of "Exit Level Outcomes" of the qualification having been met, when these do not feature in any documents, or in the "Qualification Assessment Strategy". In addition, there is only a reference to written assessments under section 2 "Content Coverage" (QCTO, 2014b).

"QA of the Final External Integrated Assessment by the QCTO" notes that content will be evaluated including "4-Content Coverage" although it will not have the technical knowledge, and only paper-based assessments, but does not note any practical assessment options (QCTO, 2014c).

In the "Final External Integrated Assessment-Templates for Use", it notes that the AQP will manage individual learners for admission to the Final Summative, or

Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA), and not the skills development provider that uploads multiple learners at one time. Skills development providers notify the AQP of registered candidates for the FEIA (although it is noted that the AQP must manage the individual registration). In addition, the workplace component, which is compulsory, is not noted on the documents for admission. Furthermore, dates need to be scheduled at least six months before the assessment; and the AQP will manage the marking of assessments, which is problematic for the model proposed, as examiners would need to be on site for the practical assessments of all learners on one singular day (QCTO, 2014d).

The "Learner Registration Form for FEIA" also only notes the requirement of a statement of results from a Skills Development Provider and not the workplace (QCTO, 2014e).

This is further entrenched in "Monitoring of the Final External Integrated Assessment" which solely looks at a paper based assessment (3.1-3.6) and no practical component, and also problematic is item 2.6 which notes, "The invigilator/assessor provided answers to the candidates" which implies learners could ask questions and receive answers from these role-players (QCTO, 2014f).

The "Invigilator Report" notes a paper based assessment and not a practical one. There is no comment on how to invigilate (or consider a practical invigilation) of assessments (2, 3, 10) (QCTO, 2014g).

In the "Final External Integrated Assessment Assessor/Markers report", there is mention of learners completing a "competency performance". However, this is problematic when the remainder of the report only refers to paper based assessment (2.3 c, d, e). This is repeated in the "Final External Integrated Assessment Moderators report" (2.3 b, f, g) (QCTO, 2014h).

Until these issues are resolved, the methodology employed in the assessment instrument choices, namely theory and practice, will be a challenge to the AQP for implementation.

UNPUBLISHED ADDENDUM A TO PROJECT 2014/08B REPORT

QCTO POLICY ANALYSIS

A1.1 CONSIDERING A MODEL FOR DEVELOPMENT, MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

A1.1.1 Introduction

The primary reason for this analysis is in relation to research commissioned by the Wholesale and Retail Sector Education and Training Authority (W&RSETA). The research, conducted by the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT), considers a model for the development, management and implementation of an Assessment Quality Partner (AQP). The AQP is a feature of the Quality Council for Trades and Occupations (QCTO) landscape, in terms of the National Qualifications (NQF) Act of South Africa (Act 67 of 2008).

The following is an evaluation of QCTO policy and guidelines available in the public domain at the time of this research study. These policies and guidelines include functions and criteria, timelines, standard operating procedures, evaluation instruments and industry expectations. This analysis is conducted for utilisation in exploring whether a model can developed. Any such model would be for application by an AQP in order to ensure the fulfillment of its functional deliverables. These deliverables are outlined in the QCTO "Assessment Quality Partner Criteria and Guidelines". These criteria and guidelines would be the performance standards against which the performance of the AQP could be measured and evaluated. In order to conduct analysis, the following source documents were referenced:

- QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines" (AQPCG)
  - This document has been evaluated in terms of:
    - pp. 7-8 for Function and Role of an AQP
    - pp. 8-9 for criteria to evaluate the Function and Role of the AQP (to help create a SOP for delivery as an AQP or the Standard Operating Procedure that could be used or monitored)

- p.14 Timelines
- (Other functions noted in the abovementioned document refer to the signing of Service Level Agreements, AQP reporting requirements, Quality Assurance and Monitoring of an AQP (which is a process of monitoring rather than criteria by which any evaluation would take place) and a code of conduct)
- QCTO Policy on the Accreditation of Assessment Centres (QAAC)
  - Due to the nature of the document, being criterion-based, the analysis thereof has been included in the criteria section of the table which follows.

A1.1.2 Analysis

The analysis of the abovementioned documents identified the following:

- Based on documentation available in the public domain, whether on the QCTO website or as provided by the ETQA of the W&RSETA, it appears that there is no guideline or standard operating procedure in place to clarify the functional role of an AQP
- The evaluation instruments developed appear to refer to the various checklists provided to the W&RSETA ETQA, by the QCTO, on 04 November 2014

The evaluation result is depicted in tabular format hereinafter, and the following should be noted:

- Industry Expectation refers to existing research (Damons, le Grange, Louw and Mason, 2015) on a suggested model for summative assessment in the Wholesale and Retail sector. The analysis explores whether the sector is able to meet the requirements of the QCTO Policy and Criteria document, as well as challenges noted with the current quality assurance process. In the table, a tick indicates "meeting sector needs", while a cross indicates "not meeting sector needs"
- Fields in the table coloured in grey infer that at the time of the research no documentation could be found in the public domain to guide implementation

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
Recommendation by the QCTO to approve external assessment specifications document for registration on the OQF	QAAC: 5. 2.a determine criteria for accreditation of assessment centres to be able to conduct the external integrated summative assessment			Qualification Assessment Specification: Addendum- External Integrated Assessment Specification Document AQP Project Details and Timeframe (This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p.14) Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA): Templates for use (QAS Addendum)	None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
AQP to develop and maintain a national data-base, or bank, of instruments to be used external assessments	AQPCG: iv. have access to communities of expert practitioners in the occupation/s concerned; ***Possible evidence:*** *Attendance registers; reference to extracts from websites with links to CEPs or any other relevant information such as an indication as to where the AQP will source expertise to design assessments*	Develop and validate nationally standardised assessment instruments appropriate to assessment strategy, and secure a system to manage scheduled assessments (2 months before first assessment)		AQP Project Details and Timeframe (This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p14) Development of Final External Integrated Assessment Examiner Report Development of Final External Integrated Assessment Moderator Report QA of the Final External Integrated Assessment by the QCTO	None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
AQP to publish exemplars of external assessments	AQPCG: iv. have access to communities of expert practitioners in the occupation/s concerned; **Possible evidence: *Attendance registers; reference to extracts from websites with links to CEPs or any other relevant information such as an indication as to where the AQP will source expertise to design assessments;*** QAAC: 5.2.a In respect of each occupational qualification or part qualification falling within its scope and requiring the accreditation of an assessment centre an AQP will: -ensure standardisation of the external integrated summative assessment through the development of nationally standardised assessment instruments;			AQP Project Details and Timeframe (This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p14 Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (QCTO website) Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Examiner report; Moderator report)	None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
AQP to recommend to the QCTO the accreditation and withdrawal of accreditation of skills development providers for the knowledge and/or practical skills component using criteria and guidelines provided by the QCTO	QAAC: The relevant AQP will recommend to the QCTO, in the form and manner required by the QCTO: a) the accreditation of assessment centres for all occupational qualifications and part qualifications that require the use of assessment centres for conducting external summative assessments; and b) the de-accreditation of accredited assessment centres where required.			Monitoring Instrument for an Applicant Needing an Assessment Centre Status Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Recommendation of Assessment Centre)	None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Note 1: The Evaluation Instrument only refers to a singular assessment centre, a College (as referred to in the document) and not to Skills Development Providers with outsourced venues, nor to venues for practical off-site assessments (where assessment specification documents indicate such requirement)

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
AQP to register assessors and moderators for the external assessments	AQPCG: *iv. have access to assessors and other human resources necessary to perform the AQP functions using criteria and guidelines provided by the QCTO.* **Possible evidence**: *Database of assessors*				None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
AQP to develop criteria for the accreditation of assessment centres or the approval of assessment sites for external assessments; recommend to the QCTO the accreditation and withdrawal of accreditation of assessment centres; and recommend to the QCTO the accreditation and withdrawal of accreditation of skills development providers for the knowledge and/or practical skills component using criteria and guidelines provided by the QCTO.	AQPCG: *vii. have a proposed fee structure funding model to maintain the delivery of AQP services for a minimum of five years aligned to the QCTO Fee Structure Policy* QAAC: *5.3.a* provide criteria, guidelines and procedures for enrolment for assessment 5.5 In terms of section 26A of the Skills Development Act, the NAMB will recommend to the QCTO the accreditation of trade test centres 5.6 Trade test centres currently accredited by the SETAs will be deemed accredited by the NAMB for trades recorded on the NLRD for a period of 3 years from the publication date of the Trade Test Regulations during which a recommendation to be accredited by the QCTO must be submitted by NAMB	Develop criteria for the accreditation of assessment centres / approval of assessment sites (depending on the relevant strategy) 3 months after appointment			None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

1.2   ASSESSMENT CENTRE/S

1.2.1   Function

The following is noted as a QCTO function; however, it is interlinked with the criteria for accrediting providers (as noted above):

The QCTO will accredit an entity as an assessment centre for a specified occupational qualification or part qualification if recommended by an AQP and if that entity satisfies the criteria listed below.

The entity must:

   a) be a juristic person registered or established in terms of South African law;

   b) have a valid tax clearance certificate issued by the South African Revenue Service if applicable;

   c) have a suitable and compliant MIS in accordance with QCTO specifications;

   d) be safe, secure and accessible to candidates;

   e) meet the relevant standards for occupational health and safety;

   f) have the required physical resources (e.g. venue; equipment, machinery or protective clothing), specified by the AQP to assess learners' competence regarding the occupational qualification or part qualification;

   g) have appropriately qualified human resources as specified by the AQP; and

   h) make provision for any other requirements specified for the relevant trade, occupational qualification or part qualification.

1.2.2   Functional criteria

The following is noted as being the criteria to apply to be an Assessment Centre with the AQP:

ii. A centre that applies for accreditation to conduct the external integrated

summative assessment for a specified occupational qualification or part qualification must provide evidence of:

a) the required physical resources (e.g. venue; equipment, machinery or protective clothing), specified by the AQP to assess learners' competence with regard to the relevant occupational qualification or part qualification;

b) the required technical expertise (qualified personnel) to conduct the integrated external assessment for the relevant occupational qualification or part qualification;

c) compliance with the quality assurance requirements needed to conduct that particular assessment; and

d) systems to handle complaints and appeals.

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-coordinate and manage external assessment processes;	AQPCG: *vii. have a proposed fee structure funding model to maintain the delivery of AQP services for a minimum of five years aligned to the QCTO Fee Structure Policy* QAAC: 5.3.b provide criteria and guidelines on security processes required to curb irregularities during the assessment process 5.3.e ensure that candidates are not assessed or moderated by the facilitator responsible for their training 5.4 In the event of de-accreditation of an assessment centre, the AQP must arrange an alternative assessment centre for candidates already enrolled for assessment. 12.1 The assessment centre must address irregularities relating to the integrated external summative assessment of learners/candidates 12.2 The AQP must address irregularities relating to the integrated external summative assessment by assessors and moderators	Develop and publish on website with link to QCTO website the following information related to external assessment: iii. template, and procedure for application for assessment; iv. procedures and template for reporting irregularities and lodging complaints or appeals; v. procedures for applications for concessions related to barriers to learning and assessment; vi. language/s of assessment; and *vii. agreed cost structure.* (6 months) Develop a website with links to QCTO website in terms of: a. accredited assessment centres or assessment sites; and b. registered assessment practitioners. (2 months before first assessment)		* Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (AQP: own criteria and guidelines) *.Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Learner Registration form) *.Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use *.Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Confirmation of Invigilation/Assessment *.Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA Templates for use (Own AQP Monitoring tool: Monitoring of the Final External Integrated Assessment) .*Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Invigilator Report) *.Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Irregularity Report) *.Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use (Assessor/ Marker Report)	None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Note 1: The time line is problematic, as one process is required to be completed within six months, while other processes are required to be completed two months before the first assessment.

Note 2: In the case of Evaluation Instrument for Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) (Templates for use), the "Own AQP Monitoring tool: Monitoring of the Final External Integrated Assessment" only refers to paper-based assessments and not practical assessments.

Note 3: The documentation states, "The Invigilator/Assessor provided answers to the candidates." Normally this action would invalidate the assessment and result in the process being halted.

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-record and upload learner external assessment applications and achievements to the QCTO	AQPCG: *v. have access to a reliable management information system in the format required by the QCTO; **Possible evidence:** Organogram or reference to an organisation to whom this function has been outsourced;* QAAC: 5.3.c provide criteria and guidelines for capturing learner achievements according to the QCTO's MIS requirements	Develop a candidate record system in line with QCTO requirements including candidate information, entries, results, and certification details (6 months)		AQP Project Details and Timeframe (This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p14	None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-moderate at least 10% of learner external assessments	QAAC: 5.2.c.conduct external moderation to ensure that the external integrated summative assessment is conducted in an appropriate manner			Final External Integrated (FEIA)-Templates for use (Moderators Report)	X (as no guideline or standard operating procedure exists)

Note 1: It could become a challenge to conduct this for some on-site (in-house) and/or practical assessments

Note 1: Logically the following Function/Role should have been referred to before the previous Function/Role, as one should not recommend certification without conducting moderation. However, the available documentation has these Function/Roles reversed.

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-recommend the certification of learners to the QCTO	AQPCG *vii. have a proposed fee structure funding model to maintain the delivery of AQP services for a minimum of five years aligned to the QCTO Fee Structure Policy* QAAC: make recommendations to QCTO for the issuing of certificates	Develop a candidate record system in line with QCTO requirements including candidate information, entries, results, and certification details			None: No guideline or standard operating procedure found in the public domain

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-Implement an appeals policy as guided by an assessment policy	QAAC: 13.1 Complaints and appeals against irregularities under 12.1 must be referred to the relevant AQP. 13.2 Complaints and appeals against irregularities under 12.2 must be referred to the QCTO.	Develop and publish on website with link to QCTO website the following information related to external assessment: -template, and procedure for application for assessment; -procedures and template for reporting irregularities and lodging complaints or appeals; -procedures for applications for concessions related to barriers to learning and assessment; -language/s of assessment; and -*agreed cost structure.* (6 months)		Request for Re-mark Form; Learner Appeals Form	

Note 1: The evaluation instrument does not take into account practical assessments, and only refers to "re-mark" implying a written/captured assessment.

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-conduct learner tracer studies;	AQPCG- *ix. have research capacity even if through a third party arrangement;*			AQP Project Details and Timeframe (This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p.14	

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-promote continuous professional development of AQP associated practitioners;		Establish criteria and procedures for the monitoring and evaluation of accredited assessment centres / approved assessment sites and post on the website (4 months)			

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-report to the QCTO on the performance of its functions in the form and manner required by the QCTO	AQPCG: *ix. have research capacity even if through a third party arrangement;* QAAC: 5.3.f report to the QCTO on the assessment centre's performance in the form and manner required by the QCTO			AQP Project Details and Timeframe (This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p.14	

Function Role	Criteria	Timeline	Guideline/Standard Operating Procedure	Evaluation Instrument	Industry Expectation
-provide a mechanism for RPL (although the AQP is no longer involved in this process)					

Note 1: QCTO Policy for the implementation of Recognition of Prior Learning (2014) notes that RPL is devolved to the QCTO and the AQP is not a role-player in this process.

1.2.3 Non-functional criteria

The following is a list of those Criteria of the Approval of AQP that do not link to a Function/Role.

i. be recommended to the QCTO by the relevant DQP during the occupational development process at a point when they submit an occupational profile. ***Possible evidence***: *letter of recommendation from the DQP; Attendance register; DQP progress report with endorsement of the selected body by constituency to ensure trust and acceptance; extracts from minutes of scoping meeting where the decision took place;*

iii. *have standing in the occupation or occupations concerned;* ***Possible evidence:*** *cross reference to websites**,** publications and any other relevant information*

vi. *have the financial resources necessary to establish the AQP function and implement effective, efficient and transparent financial management and internal control systems, verified by means of a written commitment by its relevant authority;* ***Possible evidence:*** *evidence that the functions have been catered for in the organisation budget; a letter from the AQP's relevant authority committing the necessary financial resources to fund the AQP;*

vii. *be willing to sign the QCTO Code of Conduct (Schedule 4) if delegation is approved;*

x. *Proof that the organisation is a juristic person*

QAAC requirements:

5.3. d   monitor the performance of the accredited assessment centres

AQP Project Details and Timeframe:

- This is different to the timelines noted in QCTO Assessment Quality Partner (AQP) Criteria and Guidelines p.14.

- Establish criteria and procedures for the monitoring and evaluation of accredited assessment centres or approved assessment sites
- Evaluation Instrument: Final External Integrated Assessment (FEIA) Templates for use recommends that an Examination Panel meets to validate results before submitting these to the QCTO. There is no function or criteria against which this can aligned or costed.

A2.1   SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS ON POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

This analysis, although extensive, proved to be the most suitable methodology for investigating the validity of whether a model could or could not be developed.

From the information provided there does not seem to be sufficient, clear guidance available to outline and detail various functions and/or roles that an AQP is seemingly required to fulfill. "The Function of the AQP", which is pre-eminently the primary document to consider in this exploration, only details the overall functioning of an AQP, with little or no guideline, guidance and/or detail. The inclusion of various criteria, noted within the same document, does not clarify what activities should be performed by an AQP operationally. As with the list of functions, the criteria merely list further (or duplicated) output requirements, without any indication or leadership as to suitable and/or acceptable processes required to achieve those outputs.

In a similar fashion, the information supplied in the evaluation checklists again supplies only the criteria against which output will be evaluated. No guidance as to processes that may be required, suitable and/or acceptable to achieve those outputs is provided.

Without guidelines in place which could inform the anticipated processes, linked either to standard operating procedures (or some list of inter-dependencies or some indication of how the QCTO expects the attainment of the Function and Criteria to be achieved), it would be fruitless and wasteful in terms of both cost and time to create any semblance of a model which could assist in meeting the outputs required of an AQP. Of substantial concern is that the process of developing of a model, or even the requirements of a model. Any process required for an AQP to deliver any identified output, for example the offering of national summative assessments, would need to be both documented and agreed upon by the various stakeholders, as there

could be expectations which each of the various role-players has. These expectations need to be debated, agreed upon and documented in a transparent manner. With this as a basis, evaluation of the achievement of AQP outputs cannot be openly and fairly achieved in order to come to any acceptable conclusion regarding success (or not) and/or endorsement (or not). This shortcoming was the position at the time when this research was conducted and it may well have been rectified. If not, such status quo, coupled with the immense cost of piloting the development, management and implementation of an AQP (with concomitant obligations) could be expected to result in wasteful and fruitless expenditure by an AQP in attempting to meet stakeholder expectations.

In addition to the abovementioned, timelines noted from the various public documents that formed part of this research study, also appear to be challenging. The processes and timelines in place at the time of this research do not, for example, consider the likely possibility that one body, such as a SETA, could elect to act as the AQP for multiple qualifications registered on the OQF at the same time. In terms of practical anecdotal experience, the timelines as laid out in the public domain documentation do not appear to be practical, realistic or flexible. This is borne out in the challenges faced by the W&RSETA initiating the process to act as AQP for only one registered occupational qualification, initially. The process has been reported to have been fraught with regard to being able to meet various timelines.

In addition to this anecdotal evidence, the overlaying of the legislative framework could also affect the timeframes suggested by the QCTO. As an illustration, should some of the processes and/or deliverables be outsourced by the AQP for example, other legislation could affect the process and timeframes. In this illustration, for example, the use of public funds is constrained by a raft of legislation, but in particular the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) and the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA). These both require public tender processes, under certain conditions, and outline in particular procurement procedures and timelines. These may well conflict with those suggested by the timeframes envisaged by the QCTO, which may unintentionally ensure the legislative non-compliance by the AQP.

A2.1.1 Conclusion

At the time of this research study it is clear that many documents in the public domain need to be, and possibly are in the process of being, reformulated. With no

practice to build on it is understandable that this learning and developing process will unfold through trail, error, adjustment and improvement.

It is recommended that pilot progress be used to test and adjust current information. In the case of the W&RSETA acting as AQP, for example, the apparent requirement from the QCTO for a non-sectorally based assessment model would not be of value to the industry. This is due to the accepted and extensive sub-sector framework that distinguishes this cornerstone of the economy. In addition, expectations from industry include that summative assessment include some form of practical application assessment that takes place in the workplace in addition to any knowledge-based assessment.

It is therefore the recommendation of this research study, that extensive consultation be expedited among a broad range of stakeholders across the various sub-sectors of the Wholesale and Retail industry. This consultation should include, among others (such as, for example, best-practice process facilitators): industry, private and public institutions, labour, government and civil society. This consultation should be such that educational practitioners, quality assurance bodies and corporate enterprises as well as other organisations and the public at large are motivated, empowered and enabled to participate in the comfort that various inputs and expectations that they may propose will be given due and democratic attention. This consultation should be properly, openly and transparently facilitated and managed in order to lead to a proper consensus, where the expectation of one or more party may not be imposed on some or all of the other participants. This consultation should be aimed at detailing flexible, suitable, and acceptable methodologies that are productive, efficient and effective in identifying and achieving agreed-upon responsibilities and outputs required from an AQP, while clarifying the rights and role of such.