1. OVERVIEW

The establishment of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) in 1995 led to significant changes in the education, training and development fields in South Africa. The process of change is ongoing, and many changes have already been implemented in the domain of higher education. For example, all existing qualifications had to be submitted to SAQA for interim registration by June 2000. The format for submission has required programme groups or departments of universities and technikons to develop outcomes for interim registration purposes, such as exit level and specific outcomes, and to ensure that critical outcomes are addressed. We at the Programme Group: Police Practice at Techikon SA (TSA) took the process further by formulating learning outcomes which led to the modularisation of the qualifications that we offer.

According to SAQA (2000:10) “Qualifications and standards registered on the NQF are described in terms of the learning outcomes that the qualifying learner is expected to have demonstrated. Hence there is an underlying commitment to a system of education and training that is organised around the notion of learning outcomes”.

This statement reiterates the fact that an outcomes-based philosophy is crucial when developing learning materials. We felt that our experience in this field could be of value to other education practitioners. This paper deals with
the process we followed within the parameters of action research to formulate learning outcomes, simultaneously linking activities (assessment) and content to those outcomes, thus leading to the modularisation of the qualifications that we offer. This specific process was followed to ensure overall quality. The learning outcomes were formulated for six exit level qualifications, namely:

- National Certificate: Policing
- National Higher Certificate: Policing
- National Diploma: Policing
- B Tech: Policing
- M Tech: Policing
- D Tech: Policing

2. ACTION RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

McNiff (1997:4) describes the action research approach as one intended to improve education through change by encouraging teachers/lecturers to be aware of their own practice, to be critical of it, and to be prepared to change that practice. An important concept underpinning action research is that of action learning. Zuber-Skerritt (1993:45) defines action learning as “learning from concrete experience and critical reflection on that experience, through group discussion, trial and error, discovery and learning from one another”. For action research purposes the process of action learning is taken one step further, as the reflective practitioners who are accountable make the results of their experience public (Zuber-Skerritt, 1997:47). Action research thus includes action learning, but the aim is not only to learn from one’s own and each other’s work; it is also to improve that work and to change situations and conditions (Zuber-Skerritt, 1991:81).

The action research approach is considered a useful framework in which to develop new strategies and competencies for complex tasks in an uncertain
environment of rapid social and technological change (Zuber-Skerritt, 1996:xiii).

Action research was first conceptualised by Lewin (1952) and further developed by Kolb (1984), Carr and Kemmis (1986) and others (Zuber-Skerritt, 1996:xiii). It consists of a spiral of cycles of action and research, and encompasses four major phases, viz. planning, acting, observing and reflecting. The planning phase includes problem analysis and a strategic plan; the acting phase refers to the implementation of the strategic plan; the observing phase includes an evaluation of the action through the use of appropriate methods and techniques; and reflecting entails reflecting on the results of the evaluation and on the action and research process as a whole. This may lead to the identification of a new problem, and the cycle may start again (Zuber-Skerritt, 1996:xiii, xiv).

Figure 1 depicts this process. The arrows linking the cycles indicate the continuous improvement of practice and knowledge (Pinchen & Passfield, 1995:13).

![Diagram of action research process]

**Figure 1** This diagram is adapted from Pinchen & Passfield (1995:13).
Figure 2 depicts an action research planner that provided us with guidelines on how to facilitate our process.

**Figure 2.** This diagram is adapted from Pinchen and Passfield (1995:21).

We decided to use the cyclic format illustrated in figure 1 to shape and document our process. Figure 3 below represents the cycles completed in our process. Note that each cycle included all the elements illustrated in figure 2, and that the process does not necessarily end with cycle 6. We also
decided that on completion, our research report would be distributed for critical evaluation by independent experts.

**Figure 3.** The six cycles used to formulate outcomes for qualifications.
3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATING TO THE PROGRAMME GROUP: POLICE PRACTICE AND PROCESS FACILITATORS

The Programme Group: Police Practice offers subjects divided into five subject groups, namely:

- Investigation of Crime
- Management Leadership
- Integrated Justice Studies
- Applied Legal Studies
- Languages

The programme group offers qualifications in policing as listed in section 1 of this document. An executive director, academic director and an operational manager manage the programme group.

Three instructional designers from the Centre for Courseware Design and Development (CCDD) at Technikon SA, namely Christo du Preez, Michelé van Wyk and Riana Rheeder, and the academic director of the programme group, Elise Engelbrecht, facilitated the process. The three instructional designers attended a seven-day workshop entitled “Outcomes-based Qualifications” presented by the external consultancy Devtrain. They then adapted the suggested process to meet the specific needs of the programme group. As indicated in the discussion of each cycle, the process was reviewed during the steps in the reflection phase and further adapted to suit the changed and changing needs.
4. CYCLES 1 AND 2: PRIOR PROCESS

Cycles 1 and 2 will be only briefly discussed to give the necessary background to the process we followed to formulate the learning outcomes.

4.1 Cycle 1

**Step 1: Formulate activities/tasks**

**Step 2: Cluster the activities into broad learning areas**

**Step 3: Formulate an exit level outcome for each cluster of activities/tasks**

**Step 4: Formulate a purpose statement for the qualification**

**Step 5: Formulate four to six specific outcomes (see comment below) for each exit level outcome**

**Step 6: Formulate assessment criteria for each specific outcome**

On completion of the six steps in this cycle we typed up the data and completed the pro formas.

We realised the importance of using a uniform numbering system for all the learning tasks and keeping them together in applicable clusters for later use.

4.2 Cycle 2

A workshop was held to obtain input and approval from the other technikons regarding the completed pro formas.
5. CYCLE 3

5.1 Planning

It was necessary to present the exit level and specific outcomes to our industry, namely the South African Police Service (SAPS). This was done in two ways. First, on 27 July 1999 these outcomes were presented to the National Advisory Committee. This committee, which meets twice a year, consists of senior members of the programme group, members of the SAPS, union members and other relevant role-players. The main purpose of this committee is to offer advice on our curriculum and syllabi. The National Advisory Committee gave their consent for us to continue with our process.

Second, we planned three workshops to deal with the four qualifications below the level of M Tech and D Tech. We decided that since the M Tech and D Tech are research based, it was not necessary to deal with them at this level.

When analysing the specific outcomes generated, we realised that we could divide them into three broad categories for further workshop purposes, namely Policing, Management Leadership and Investigation of Crime (which included Law). Since specific outcomes across all the learning areas addressed communication and language issues, the subject group Languages was requested to ensure representation at all three workshops. The subject groups were requested to arrange their respective workshops and to ensure the relevant industry, union and learner representation.

The goal of the first and the last two workshops of this cycle differed, since we had to make certain changes after the first workshop.
Initially, the goal of the workshops was to:

formulate learning activities from the specific outcomes in order to formulate learning outcomes at a later stage.

After the first workshop the goal was reformulated as follows:

to obtain input from external stakeholders and lecturers on all aspects of the qualifications and to generate additional learning activities.

Since the subsequent phases of the cycle were carried out differently for each workshop, they will be discussed in the context of the individual workshops.

**Policing workshop**

5.2(1) Acting

The lecturers from the subject group Integrated Justice Studies, representatives from the other subject groups, members of the SAPS as well as learners (approximately 50 people) attended this workshop, which was held on 14 September 1999.

We explained the purpose of the workshop as well as the process followed for the previous workshops. All the purpose statements, exit level outcomes and specific outcomes of the qualifications as developed at the previous workshops were put up on the walls.

The group was requested to generate activities based on each specific outcome. All the activities were collected and an endeavour was made to cluster the activities. We realised that we were working back to clusters of the specific outcomes, and the process was stopped. We then requested group
members to list all the competencies a member of the SAPS should have within the field of general policing. Members of the group had to complete this exercise individually, and write each competency on a separate piece of paper.

All the input was gathered and evaluated after the role-players had left, and the information was incorporated with the existing activities for future use.

5.3(1) Observing

The group was too large and too diverse. Some of the learners had no idea what was expected of them, even after this had been explained several times.

The activities generated by the role-players included too many activities related to investigation and management. This could be attributed to the fact that we had put up the data relating to all the categories (Policing, Investigation of Crime and Management Leadership) on the wall.

5.4(1) Reflecting

The result of this workshop reinforced the fact that all role-players must be included in the process from the beginning.

When learners are invited to participate in workshops of this nature, one should consider involving learners who are more experienced in the subject field.

After our observation session we realised we had to amend the process for the next workshop. One of the major changes involved focusing only on the data for the particular category (Policing, Management Leadership or Investigation of Crime).
5.2(2) Acting

Approximately 25 people attended the workshop, which was held on 15 September 1999. These included the lecturers of the Management Leadership subject group, and representatives from other subject groups, industry and the unions.

The process followed for the previous workshops as well as all the terminology relating to the qualifications was explained.

The group was requested to concentrate on one qualification, namely the B Tech, and to evaluate the qualification in terms of its applicability and relevance to industry needs.

All recommendations were written on flipchart paper and put up on the wall next to the qualification. The recommendations related to issues ranging from learning tasks to exit level outcomes.

The group was then divided into three smaller groups to evaluate the remaining three qualifications. The groups rotated and each group made recommendations for every qualification. The recommendations were written on flipchart paper and put up on the wall next to the qualifications.

The whole group then evaluated all the recommendations and decided which recommendations would be implemented and which eliminated. Group members then had the opportunity to confirm all the changes.
5.3(2) Observing

The fact that we started with the B Tech may have been confusing, especially for the representatives from industry. Since they see the qualifications in a holistic manner, they had difficulty in translating this into the different qualification levels.

At certain stages the group members felt that they did not fully agree with the exit level outcomes and specific outcomes we presented. Since the other technikons had already approved them, we did not want to alter them at all. Some of the external group members found this frustrating.

5.4(2) Reflecting

In future it may be better to start with the lowest qualification and work upwards.

It is important to implement changes when the group agrees that these are critical.

We again realised the importance of including representatives from industry right from the beginning.

Investigation of Crime workshop

5.2(3) Acting

As indicated earlier, this group also included aspects of law. Approximately 30 people attended this workshop. Participants included members of the Investigation of Crime subject group, representatives from other subject groups and industry, and union representatives.
We followed the same process as set out in section 5.2(2), but we were more flexible in allowing suggested changes to the already set exit level and specific outcomes.

5.3(3) Observing

The fact that we allowed changes made the group very positive and the contributions were very fruitful. This strengthened the idea of ownership.

The facilitators did not all use the same numbering system. This poses a problem and could lead to time being wasted in trying to identify the correct place for activities, as well as the danger of losing data.

5.4(3) Reflecting

The success of this last workshop demonstrated that we should have been more lenient in allowing all the groups to make the changes they suggested. This would have ensured an end product that met the needs of our clients. This reinforced the necessity of including all role-players from the start.

We decided that it was necessary for all subject groups to review the final products of the workshops during the next cycle.

6. CYCLE 4

6.1 Planning

The lecturers belonging to the various subject groups were invited to a workshop, the purpose of which was the final revision of the outcomes of the qualifications in the three identified categories (Policing, Investigation of Crime and Management Leadership).
6.2 Acting

A workshop was held on 22 September 1999 with the lecturers.

The group was divided into three according to the categories of Investigation of Crime, Policing and Management Leadership. Each group reviewed the learning areas for the different qualifications and approved them.

6.3 Observing

We realised the importance of this reviewing cycle, since it allowed all members of the programme group to make their final contributions and ensured ownership of the product.

We were satisfied with the data obtained, and it provided us with the basis for continuing with the development of the learning objectives.

6.4 Reflecting

At this stage we were informed that we had to decide whether each specific outcome represented core, fundamental and/or elective learning, and to allocate credits to each one. This led to cycle 5.

7. CYCLE 5

7.1 Planning

We decided to conduct a workshop with representatives of each subject group. The goal of the workshop was to:

\[ \text{decide whether a specific outcome represented core, fundamental and/or elective learning and to allocate credits to each specific} \]
outcome, with a maximum of 120 credits for each exit level qualification.

As Elise Engelbrecht was the only facilitator available, she conducted the workshop.

7.2 Acting

The workshop was held on 4 October 1999 to determine the core, fundamental and/or elective learning as well as credits for each specific outcome. The various concepts were debated in depth, as it was very difficult to determine what precisely was meant by ‘core’, ‘fundamental’ and ‘elective’. We used the following definitions to explain these concepts:

Core learning is compulsory.

Fundamental learning is essential grounding needed for the particular education and training at that level.

Elective learning is that from which a selection is made to ensure that the purpose of the qualification is achieved.

Credit is the value assigned by SAQA to 10 notional hours of learning. SAQA has also estimated that a notional study year is equal to 1 200 notional hours or 120 credits (this is based on a 40-hour week and a 30-week working year).

The group worked through each specific outcome, determining whether it was core, fundamental and/or elective. Credits were allocated to each outcome and we ensured that, when added together, the credits for each qualification did not exceed 120.
7.3 Observing

This process should have been conducted at the time of developing each specific outcome, as this would have been much easier and less time-consuming. The concepts should have been more clearly defined to eliminate any debate on their meaning.

7.4 Reflecting

In order to improve the process, this cycle should form part of cycle 1.

Since we were satisfied with the data obtained, we could move on to the next cycle for the development of learning objectives.

8. CYCLE 6

8.1 Planning

We were now in a position to determine the learning outcomes. We decided to keep to the three categories (Policing, Management Leadership and Investigation of Crime), and to ask the subject groups to arrange two-day workshops for each category. For these workshops we decided that the groups would be smaller, consisting of lecturers and two or three external representatives from industry.

The goal of the workshops was to:

formulate learning outcomes from the specific outcomes, to link content to the outcomes, and to decide on forms of assessment as well as learning activities.
8.2 Acting

The three workshops were conducted on the dates below:
19–20 October 1999: Management Leadership
8–9 November 1999: Policing

Since the same process was followed for each one, a single description will be provided.

The activities generated in cycle 1 as well as those generated by the Policing workshop in cycle 3 were used as a point of departure. The group looked at all the activities/tasks (generated during previous cycles) related to a certain specific outcome. The activities were clustered where necessary.

Guidelines on how to formulate learning outcomes were given: we stated that a learning outcome should be in the form of an action verb, a noun and a qualifier. Learning outcomes were formulated from the activities/tasks. Content and forms of assessment were linked to each learning outcome as it was formulated.

All the information was written on flipchart sheets and put up on the wall with the exit level and specific outcomes. The group then evaluated the qualifications to make sure that the levels were correctly represented, and amendments were made where necessary.

8.3 Observing

- We felt that the formulation of learning outcomes was much easier because the previous cycles had been dealt with in detail. We again realised the importance of dealing properly with data obtained in previous cycles and the value of a proper numbering system. We
realised the importance of determining both content and assessment methods and learning activities whilst formulating learning outcomes. It was necessary to ensure that participants do not only focus on common methods of assessment, eg questions, case studies and assignments. The methods of assessment should accommodate different learning styles on different cognitive levels. We were satisfied with the data obtained, and it was tabulated so as to reflect modules according to the specific outcomes. See Annexure A for an example.

8.4 Reflecting

We felt that the data obtained was sufficient to allow us to move into the design, development and implementation phases.

9. EXTERNAL CRITICAL EVALUATION

The completed research report was distributed to the following people for critical evaluation and their comments incorporated:

Prof. Ntabiseng Ogude: Dean of Academic Research, Technikon SA
Dr Marlena Kruger: Acting Service Manager: Instructional Design Service, CCDD, Technikon SA
Ms Janet Sheldon-Heeg: Language practitioner, CCDD, Technikon SA
Mr Tobie Engelbrecht: Action learning and research practitioner and lecturer from the Programme Group: Police Practice, Technikon SA

Valuable suggestions were received, including the following:

- Provide a ‘bigger picture’ of the process at the beginning. A diagram was developed for this purpose.
- Summarise the information relating to cycles in table form. For this, see Annexure B.
- Change the title to be more descriptive and incorporate the words ‘Technikon SA’. This was done.
- Change the term ‘specific outcomes’ to ‘specified outcomes’, based on the argument that specific outcomes are used in the unit standards and that they are not the same as the ‘specific’ outcomes in qualifications. We, however, felt that it would be acceptable to retain the SAQA terminology and to refer to ‘specific’ outcomes.
- Change ‘subject area’ to ‘learning area’. This suggestion was implemented.
- Change the heading ‘Conclusion’ to ‘Critical reflection’, since action research is a continuous process. This change was implemented.
- Include a paragraph on the impact of this action research project. We included this under the section entitled ‘Critical Reflection’.

10. CRITICAL REFLECTION

We as facilitators of this process experienced it as a tremendous learning opportunity concerning both the process and our roles as facilitators. Our use of the action research approach and documentation of the whole process has extended our knowledge to the extent that we feel that we have a definite contribution to make to this new field within higher education.

The benefit of the action research approach lay in the opportunity for critical reflection throughout the cycles and enabled us constantly to adapt and improve our process.

Our reflections during the cycles brought certain important recurring aspects to the fore, namely:
The same participants and facilitators should participate throughout all the cycles.

Before starting the process, facilitators should decide on a uniform numbering system for use during all the cycles.

It is important to put up all developed data on the walls to enable participants to see the ‘bigger picture’. This allows them to evaluate the completeness and correctness of each qualification.

During the whole process time limits should be decided and adhered to as far as possible so as to eliminate irrelevant discussion.

It is essential to keep an attendance register for each workshop for record purposes and follow-up contact.

If we could have involved all role-players from the beginning we could have shortened the process by at least a third, which would not only have saved time, but also reduced costs. Involving the same role-players throughout would have obviated the need for repeated explanations of already completed processes and terminology. The process should have proceeded without time lapses between cycles. This would probably have required the participation of more facilitators, however.

This action research project will have a significant impact in the field of higher education, since this is the first time that the process outlined in this document has been documented and applied in this fashion. The results of the research project will ensure that educational institutions are able to adopt this process when deriving outcomes for qualifications. The fact that this documented process has subsequently been successfully applied by the instructional designers in conjunction with the Programme Group: Public Management at Technikon SA emphasises the fact that the process can be applied in different disciplines. If educational institutions wish to ensure modular outcomes-based learning materials incorporating relevant industry input, this process can be recommended as an invaluable starting point.
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## CERTIFICATE: POLICING

**Annexure A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOMES</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Investigation of Crime I**  
(33 credits)  
Investigation of Crime I: Module 1: Crime scene (16 credits) | Identify the crime and the crime scene according to principles of the law  
- National Instruction (parts?)  
- How to identify the crime scene  
- Module on crime scene: basic detective course |  
- Recording of actions in investigations diary  
- Explain action steps taken on the crime scene  
- Case study based on photographs and graphics  
- Portfolio |
| Gather and evaluate information to link the perpetrator to the crime |  
- Conduct inquiries: investigative aids  
- Identify possible sources of information (informers)  
- Information and intelligence  
- Interview and interrogation techniques (who, not what, and how)  
- Sections 26 and 27 of Criminal Procedure Act  
- Knowledge of observation  
- Section 14 of Constitution  
- Applicable common law principles |  
- Case studies and questions  
- Evaluate information in a given situation  
- Reflecting |
| Take control of the crime scene where appropriate | - Section 13(11) of Police Act  
- National Instruction (relevant parts)  
- Basic module in detective course  
- SAP5 | - Record actions in pocket book and in investigations diary  
- Case study  
- Questions  
- Scenario |
|---|---|---|
| Identify objects that could assist in individualising the perpetrator or victim of a crime | - General elements of a crime  
- Identification of the crime  
- Knowledge of forensics (general)  
- Link perpetrator with crime  
- Identify identification methods  
- Real evidence  
- Documents | - Case studies  
- Photographs and graphic representation  
- Illustration  
- Reflecting |
| Collect and handle evidence in order to prove the identity of the perpetrator/victim | - Sections 20–36 of CPA  
- Principles of law of evidence (continuity of possession, preservation of integrity, types of evidence [oral, real, documentary], admissibility)  
- Interview of witnesses  
- Standing orders 133—135  
- Taking evidence  
- SAP 13  
- National Instruction (packaging, dispatch, etc)  
- Basic module of detective course  
- Introduction to sections 204 and 205 of CPA | - Case study, questions  
- Reflecting |
| Make a primary evaluation of the crime scene | - National Instruction  
- Basic module of detective course | - Case study  
- Photographs and graphic representations |

**Investigation of Crime I: Module 2: Obtaining information (6 credits)**

| Identify possible sources of information/intelligence in order to link the perpetrator to the crime | - Informers  
- Crime pattern analysis  
- Debriefing of reliefs  
- Docket analysis  
- Analysis of court procedures  
- Modus operandi  
- Investigative systems | - Case studies  
- Questions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYCLE</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>ACTING</th>
<th>OBSERVING</th>
<th>REFLECTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Goal: to determine the purpose statement, exit level outcomes, specific outcomes and assessment criteria of each qualification • Workshop over 3½ days with lecturers</td>
<td>For each exit level qualification: • Formulate activities • Cluster activities into broad learning areas • Formulate an exit level outcome for each cluster of activities/tasks • Formulate a purpose statement • Formulate 4–6 specific outcomes for each exit level outcome • Formulate assessment criteria for the specific outcome • Complete pro formas</td>
<td>• Lack of industry-related input a drawback • Core, fundamental and elective learning should be indicated when specific outcome is formulated • Lecturers tended to focus on their specific learning fields • Lecturers tended to focus on smaller assessment tasks rather than on assessment criteria • Very important to use uniform numbering system</td>
<td>• Industry representatives must be invited • Participants must be constantly reminded to concentrate on whole qualification and not specific learning areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goals: • Obtain input from other technikons • Amend pro formas • Obtain final approval Workshop planned with other technikons</td>
<td>Workshop held and attended only by TSA and Border. Pretoria submitted written pro formas. Terminology and previous process were explained and data presented. Data evaluated and recommendations discussed.</td>
<td>There is a need to orient participants, as new participants have difficulty in understanding process. Participants should refrain from concentrating on own learning area.</td>
<td>Representatives from other technikons should be included in process from the start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapted pro formas re-submitted to other technikons for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | Needed input and comments from industry (SAPS)  
   1) National Advisory Committee  
   2) Three workshops with three identified fields: Policing, Investigation of Crime and Management Leadership  
   Goal: to generate additional learning activities |

|   | Process for 1st workshop differed from process for other two.  
   **Policing workshop:** Generated activities based on specific outcomes. This process was unsuccessful. Participants then requested to list competencies needed by SAPS official.  
   **Management Leadership workshop:** Explained previous process & terminology. Started with one qualification, B Tech, to evaluate applicability and relevance to industry. Recommendations on flipchart sheets next to qualifications. Smaller groups to evaluate other three qualifications. Rotated to obtain |

|   | **Policing workshop:**  
   Group too large and diverse. Too many activities from Investigation of Crime and Management Leadership.  
   **Management Leadership workshop:**  
   Starting with B Tech confusing to industry members. Group did not fully agree with previous decisions.  
   **Investigation of Crime workshop:**  
   We allowed changes – group more positive. Facilitators did not all use same numbering system – confusion.  
   **Policing workshop:**  
   All role-players should be part of process from the start. If learners are involved, they should be more experienced. We decided to amend process for other two workshops.  
   **Management Leadership workshop:**  
   Start with lowest qualification. Implement changes when group agrees that these are critical. Include industry representation from the beginning.  
   **Investigation of Crime workshop:**  
   Success of this workshop indicated that we should have been
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal: final revision of the outcomes of the qualifications by lecturers in programme group</th>
<th>Group reviewed outcomes and approved them.</th>
<th>Reviewing cycle very important – give group opportunity to make final contributions and ensure ownership. Satisfied with data obtained.</th>
<th>Had to decide whether each specific outcome represented core, fundamental and/or elective learning and allocate credits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goal: to decide whether specific outcome represented core, fundamental and/or elective learning and to allocate credits</td>
<td>Workshop held with two representatives of each subject group. Terminology debated. Core, fundamental and/or elective learning determined and credits allocated.</td>
<td>This process should be conducted when each specific outcome is developed. Concepts not very clear.</td>
<td>This cycle should form part of cycle 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal: formulate learning outcomes, link to content and decide on assessment criteria</td>
<td>Three two-day workshops were conducted for each field: Policing, Management Leadership and Investigation of Crime. Same process was used for each session: Activities generated in cycle 1 were used as point</td>
<td>Formulation much easier because previous cycles had been dealt with in detail.</td>
<td>Satisfied with data obtained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of departure and were clustered. Learning outcomes were formulated for each cluster. Content and forms of assessment were linked to outcomes. Information written down and put up on wall for evaluation.