

# NQ Verification 2014–15

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Drama
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2015

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H233 74 National 4 Drama: Performance Added Value Unit

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Most centres were fully prepared for the visit, with candidate evidence available and well organised. There is generally a clear understanding with regard to the application of national standards and candidates are given a range of opportunities to achieve these. Where this is the case, visiting verification continues to be a very positive experience and suggests that centres are approaching assessment with greater confidence. Where centres have had both National 4 and National 5 candidates working alongside each other this seems to have had a positive impact on the quality of National 4 responses.

There are some centres that have a policy to present all candidates for both National 4 and National 5. In some cases this resulted in the standard of work from some candidates being beyond National 4.

Centres continue to find creative ways of generating evidence through practical exploration in Assessment Standard 1.1: 'Selecting ideas, showing an understanding of social and cultural influences on drama'. Assessors are offering candidates a variety of innovative and challenging stimuli, reflecting good practice in relation to this Assessment Standard.

Centres are enabling candidates to meet the Assessment Standard by offering stimuli that gives personalisation and choice. Centres are also aware of the need

to adapt the approach to assessment where candidates choose to devise their drama from a stimulus rather than develop a script extract from a text.

There is, however, a need for centres to support candidates further in evidencing their awareness of form and structure.

Centres are presenting candidates with a range of creative approaches to assessment to meet Assessment Standard 1.2. The approaches that have been specifically developed to support candidates in their responses to their chosen performance role continue to be the most successful in generating the necessary skills to meet the Assessment Standard clearly. There was clear evidence of candidates producing creative ideas while preparing for their performance in both acting and production team roles.

Assessment Standard 1.3 saw a mix of live and recorded material. Most centres submitting evidence for this Assessment Standard digitally had generated good quality, clearly identifiable candidate evidence. Centres are reminded that any audio-visual recordings of performances of candidate work should be able to be readily accessed for verification purposes. Poor quality filming can make it difficult for verifiers to review candidate evidence.

Centres are advised to make every attempt to make candidates available on the day of the verification visit given the nature of the Added Value Performance Unit. This will give candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their application of skills gathered throughout the National 4 Course.

For Assessment Standard 1.4: 'Reflecting on their work and that of others', centres should ensure that enough time is spent on this Assessment Standard and that the requirements are fully met. Candidates should be supported in their responses while reflecting on their strengths and areas for improvement. In addition they should be given the opportunity to reflect on the contribution of two others within the production team. In some cases centres were not approaching this with a clear structure to support candidate responses.

Concerns emerged when centres had not adapted their approaches to assessment to suit the specific requirements of Unit Outcomes and individual Assessment Standards. Thus candidates were not fully supported in demonstrating the required skills. There was often repetition in tasks and evidence was not attributable to any individual candidate.

The approach using an annotated scenario/script should be suitable for all candidates and support all performance roles for it to be valid. In addition, all evidence submitted should be attributable to the Assessment Standard to which it relates. For verification purposes, centres are reminded to label candidate evidence appropriately by indicating on it the related Assessment Standard.

There have been instances where centres have over-documented written evidence requirements for this Unit. This clearly has impacted on the time available to allocate to practical work.

## Assessment judgements

External verification requires the centre to make clear assessment judgements to accompany a candidate's evidence, allowing the verifier to reach an informed decision as to whether the centre is making reliable, consistent and valid assessment judgements that are in line with national standards.

For most centres, there was evidence of reliable, consistent and valid judgements being applied to candidate evidence. In cases where the approach to assessment was specifically designed to meet the requirements of an Assessment Standard, the centre assessor was able to confidently and correctly judge the candidate evidence by referring to the SQA Unit assessment support pack.

In cases where an approach to assessment lacked clarity, structure and support for candidates, the judgement was often questionable. This resulted in some judgements being applied either too severely or too leniently. Centre assessors are encouraged to seek clarity in their understanding of the relationship between an approach to assessment and an assessment judgement.

03

## Section 3: General comments

In general, centre staff had a very clear understanding of the standards for the National 4 Added Value Unit.

Centres were very well prepared for the visit and keen to ensure they had sufficient evidence for all Assessment Standards being verified. Candidates were engaged and often performing to very high standards for this level.

Feedback to this model of visiting verification, allowing one-to-one dialogue between visiting verifier and internal assessors, was received very positively. Staff showed a keenness to engage in professional dialogue and seize the opportunity to have their questions or concerns discussed.

There was clear evidence of centres engaging with and applying effective internal quality assurance processes. Some centres are using local authority level documentation, filtering this for use within their own centre and further translating this policy for use within their subject-specific faculty or department.

Where centres had a rigorous system in place, this impacted positively on both development of approaches to assessment and the consistency of assessment judgements.

There was evidence of some centres using the recently published SQA Internal Verification Toolkit to support their internal quality assurance processes. This can be found at [www.sqa.org.uk/IVToolkit](http://www.sqa.org.uk/IVToolkit).