

NWU BUSINESS SCHOOL

 Tel: 018 299 1406
<http://commerce.nwu.ac.za/business-school>
 Email: Jan.vanromburgh@nwu.ac.za

NWU BUSINESS SCHOOL EXTERNAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

MODULE TITLE	Managerial Economics
MODULE CODE	CCMM 515
NQF LEVEL	8
CREDITS	12
MODULE OWNER/PROGRAM PRESENTER	Mr. Anton van Wyk
EXTERNAL MODERATOR	Prof. Marianne Matthee
ASSESSMENT DATE	

TABLE 1 Documentation needed for moderation

Please indicate the documents attached for the attention of the moderator in order to moderate the module

Mark with an X if applicable (The document could be embedded here or send separately to the moderator)	
Study guide	X
The module outcomes	X
Examination paper or PoE	X
Marking scheme or memorandum	X
Other assessment methods and documentation: Please specify	

This report consists out of 3 different sections. **Section A** is the evaluation of the study guide, module content and module outcomes. The module needs to be updated at least every 3rd year. **Section B**, moderates the exam paper and **Section C**, moderates the answering papers or PoE's.

A. STUDY CONTENT AND OUTCOMES OF THE MODULE

	YES	NO	IF NO, PLEASE PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS
Is the learning content adequately and appropriately covered in this module?		X	I am a bit concerned by the level at which this course is taught and assessed. The outcomes are too general, and the assessment criteria are difficult to match to the outcomes. Furthermore, this module is on an NQF level 8, which requires students to be able to do the following: “Problem solving, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to use a range of specialised skills to identify, analyse and address complex or abstract problems drawing systematically on the body of knowledge and methods appropriate to a field, discipline or practice.” “Accessing, processing and managing information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to critically review information gathering, synthesis of data, evaluation and management processes in specialised contexts in order to develop creative responses to problems and issues.” Source: https://www.saga.org.za/sites/default/files/2019-11/level_descriptors.pdf In my opinion, the students are not required to demonstrate the above. I do understand that a lot of material – both micro and macro – must be covered, however it seems that the result is a superficial understanding. What value is such superficial understanding for students on this level? I make this statement based on the content of the study guide as well as the content of the assessments. The layout of the study guide is poor and is difficult to navigate through.
Does the curriculum (by means of outcomes) address the required management skills?		X	
Are the module workload and requirements appropriate for the program level?		X	
Is the required learning content adequately addressed by the prescribed book or other study material in terms of exercises or examples, where applicable?		X	
Is the module well organised?		X	
Any general comments regarding the layout of the module.			

Section B is the evaluation and moderation of the exam paper or Portfolio of Evidence

B. EXAMINATION PAPER or Portfolio of evidence (PoE)

	YES	NO	IF NOT, PLEASE PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS
The level of difficulty corresponds with the NQF level descriptor. (See level descriptors attached.)		X	The assessments are on an NQF level 6. On an individual basis, students had to answer multiple choice questions based on knowledge-type questions (which I assumed was done through an open book format). Therefore, on an individual level, the students were not able to display any evidence of the above-mentioned NQF level 8 descriptors. Moreover, it is stated in the study guide, as one of the assessment criteria, that the students must be able to “conduct a fundamental analysis of economic phenomena in the context of decision-making on a managerial/executive level”. No evidence of this is present at an individual level. Where an analysis was required, it was through a group assignment, which cannot redeem the lack of analytical and problem-solving assessment on an individual level. In the rubric, the allocated marks to these elements were disproportionately low (whereas stylised elements counted 20 out of the 50 marks, which should be much less at this level). There are several other ways in which the assessment could have taken place, for example a 4 to 5-hour exam paper that students had to write while being monitored / invigilated on Zoom. Or even a 24-hour take-home exam would have sufficed.
The paper or PoE is set according to the learning outcomes of the module.	X		
The paper or PoE contains a good balance between the different levels of knowledge testing (Bloom’s taxonomy) and the NQF level.		X	
The time-frame of the paper or PoE is realistic for the average learner to complete.	X		
The marking scheme / memorandum / mark rubric is complete in order to assess all questions.	X		
Questions or instructions are well formulated with measurable action words.	X		
Overall the paper or PoE is of acceptable international standards.		X	
Does the exam paper or PoE contribute (add value) to the overall achievement of the program outcomes?		X	
The lay-out and technical editing of the paper or PoE is in order.	X		

Section C Moderation of Answering papers or PoE (At least 10% of the module needs to be moderated but should not exceed 50 papers moderated)

C. MODERATION OF ANSWERING PAPERS or PoE

	YES	NO	RECOMMENDATION
The marker used the memorandum/mark rubric appropriately (discretion is used where necessary)	X		
The marking is fair and consistent.	X		Marking was done consistently. However, the fact that 20 out of 50 marks were allocated to stylised issues inflated the marks. I also think that the marks allocated to the "body and discussion" could have been a bit stricter.
Marks are added correctly, and calculations are done correctly.	X		
The distribution of marks in the exam paper or PoE present a fair assessment opportunity.			The marks are high, which is expected from the type of assessment followed.
Indicate how many answer books and/ or questions you have moderated. If the summative assessment was another assessment method than a written exam, please indicate this, and the number you have moderated.			I looked at 3 group assignments, as the rest of the assessments were all conducted through multiple choice tests.

GENERAL

Any remarks not covered by the above?

Prof. M. Matthee



8 July 2021

**Initials and surname of
moderator**

Signature of Moderator

Date