



Responses to the NQF Bill B20-2018

Amendment of Act 67 of 2008, as amended by section 8 of Act 26 of 2010

| Amended Section reference | Page reference | Comments/Queries |
|---------------------------|----------------|--|
| 1(a) – 1(g) | 2-3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, the addition of the relevant definitions will assist in clarifying issues of interpretation and application of the Act. • The amendments will also serve to reduce fraudulent behavior and will allow QCs and SAQA to exercise their authority to non-conformance. • The Act should also clarify the use of the term “Part Qualification” particularly in relation to short courses or Learning Not leading to a qualification (LNQ). • A definition should be inserted for the term “programme” or “learning programme”, since these terms are often used interchangeably with “qualification” by several institutions, leading to confusion in the sector. • Clarify the relationship between qualifications on the HEQSF and OQSF, particularly with regards to articulation and access. • When you refer to part- qualification perhaps this should be clearly spelt out in terms of what constitutes a part-qualification. E.g. is it credits from with a whole qualification, is it one year completed etc. |
| 1(a) | 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section may inadvertently stigmatize short course offerings if LNQ courses are not contextualized and defined/referenced above. |
| 1(e) | 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section refers to misrepresentation of qualifications by accredited and registered institutions. • The impression created is that unaccredited and “fly by night” institutions will not be subject to the same of scrutiny as accredited providers. The scope and application of this definition should be clarified. Perhaps also include a new definition for unaccredited or unrecognized providers. • Will this section not be in contravention of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (PAJA), and the Consumer Protection Act, if the fault lies with the education institutions? Educational institutions will be liable to lawsuits etc. • Clarify the reference to “different lower level”. Perhaps clarity on whether it is a different or lower level. |
| 4(e) | 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In verifying qualifications and part qualifications, certain “characteristics” appear to impinge on institutional autonomy. In |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>particular, there are references to checking class attendance and the number of assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In addition, will educational institutions now need to comply with giving access to SAQA regarding attendance registers etc.? If so will attendance be captured onto our ITS system, will this be a new requirement. In what format will SAQA request this info. Currently many academic staff capture manual registers.• Will this section be delegated to the relevant Quality Council or done by SAQA themselves. If so what timeframes, will educational institutions be given.• These are huge added responsibilities to SAQAs mandate, will there be costs charged to the educational institutions or will this be covered by the DHET, as indicated in the Bill that a budget has been provided.• Ideally the regulations regarding this BILL will need to be clearly spelt out for institutions. |
|--|--|---|