



# NQ Verification 2014–15 Key Messages Round 1

01

## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Art and Design
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	March 2015

### National Courses/Units verified:

H202 Art and Design: Expressive Activity (National 3, 4, 5 and new Higher)

H204 Art and Design: Design Activity (National 3, 4, 5 and new Higher)

02

## Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

Almost all centres followed a Unit-by-Unit approach with most having a clearer understanding of the purpose and requirements of Units than last year. Those centres delivering National 3, National 4, and National 5 for the second time were of the opinion that they were able to meet Unit requirements more quickly than last year. They also noted that the work being produced this time was more focused.

Many centres using sketchbooks demonstrated highly effective integration of Outcomes 1 and 2. The more successful examples of this clearly demonstrated the influence of the studies on the development of the practical work.

### Outcome 1

There was evidence of many centres encouraging candidates to investigate artists and designers without being restricted to a particular style or genre. This is in keeping with the question papers at National 5 and Higher and allows candidates to develop a broad awareness of artists and designers.

Many candidates were producing evidence beyond the minimum requirement and selecting artists and designers of personal interest to themselves and relevant to their practical work.

A small number of centres were delivering Outcome 1 after Outcome 2. This meant that the study of artists and designers had not informed the development of their own practical work and so they were not following the approach contained in the Unit assessment support packs. The most effective examples had Outcomes 1 and 2 delivered almost concurrently and this allowed candidates to gather a more meaningful understanding of artists and designers.

Centres should be aware that at National 4, National 5 and Higher, in the expressive activity and in the design activity, Outcome 1 requires candidates to study a minimum of two artists and two designers respectively, and two works by each artist or designer. At National 3, candidates are required to study a minimum of two works by one artist and two designs by one designer.

### **Outcome 2**

There was evidence of many candidates taking a looser, more experimental approach to investigation and development work, and often going beyond minimum requirements. There were no issues with ensuring that candidates were using a minimum of two media within the evidence produced for Outcome 2.

## **Assessment judgements**

Most centres were correctly entering candidates for the appropriate level.

There were many centres working with others in their authorities to sample and cross-mark evidence. This is proving to be helpful in maintaining and applying national standards.

Systems of internal verification have been developed by centres and are increasingly being seen as integral to the effective delivery of Units. There was evidence of dual assessment, cross-marking and sampling. Unit work was reviewed regularly with candidates given clear feedback at each stage and comments from assessors were clear, encouraging and helpful. Records to support assessment took a variety of forms including departmental minutes and quality assurance calendars with key dates.

Most centres use individual record of work booklets/sheets for candidates with a simple checklist outlining each element of the Outcomes. This is ticked off when each Assessment Standard is achieved. It is good practice to also indicate where the evidence can be found and to provide space for the assessor/verifier to put in comments.

### **Outcome 1**

In most cases, judgements were accurate at all levels. Issues arose where the evidence consisted almost entirely of biography with irrelevant links to the theme or where the candidate's understanding of the work was superficial.

### **Outcome 2**

Almost all centres had a strong understanding of standards at the various levels. Effective internal verification has helped here and centres are more confident in their understanding of levels.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

For visiting verification, the sample size is 12 candidates over a maximum of three levels. If delivering three levels then there should be four candidates from each level. If delivering two levels there should be six candidates for each level. For verification, all assessment judgements must be accompanied by the relevant evidence to support those judgements. Without this the verifier cannot decide on the accuracy of the centre's assessment of candidates.

Most candidates were well prepared for Unit assessment and were able to meet the Assessment Standards required. Centres delivering National 4 and National 5 for the second time considered that delivery was more focused and less time was required to overtake the Assessment Standards.

If a candidate has been assessed on any aspect verbally, then a record of the questions asked and the candidate's responses should be provided to allow both internal and external verification of the assessment decision(s).

The majority of centres are effectively incorporating the study of artists and designers into the practical work. In many cases it informs the practical work significantly and is not seen as an 'add on'.

Some centres were mainly seeing Outcome 1 as preparation for the written exam at National 5. In most cases artists and designers studied in the Units will be those referenced in answers within the question paper but for the purposes of the Unit they must be relevant to the practical work. A small number of centres had delivered Outcome 2 before Outcome 1, which is not an appropriate approach.

The use of ICT throughout the Unit work allowed candidates to explore a range of concepts in both design and expressive work.