



## NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Fashion & Textile Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	March 2016

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H24V National 4 Textile Technologies  
H24V National 5 Textile Technologies  
H24V Higher Textile Technologies

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

All centres sampled had used the SQA Unit assessment support packs effectively. All centres sampled had used the Unit-by-Unit approach. All had kept good photographic evidence and had used the SQA candidate workbook effectively. Some centres had added further checklists and further activities in order to enhance candidates' learning.

#### Assessment judgements

All centres sampled had made use of the judging evidence tables in the Unit assessment support packs. Most had made very good judgements in accordance with the guidelines, though some were felt to have been rather lenient in their judgements of Outcome 1.2 as candidates had indicated some understanding of properties and characteristics of textiles, but had not then related them to the items they were making.

## Section 3: General comments

There was very good evidence of personalisation and choice as candidates at all centres had made a good range of items. Practical work was completed to a very good standard. In many cases, centres had kept good photographic evidence of the items made, but should be reminded that the actual physical items need to be kept for verification.

There was a variety of evidence of internal verification: some centres supplied very thorough and detailed evidence of internal verification, along with details of school and/or local authority policies and details of planning and review meetings. Some centres had not indicated marks or internal verification feedback on candidates' work, making it time consuming for the external verifier to establish which marks and feedback applied to which candidates.

Some centres showed examples of good practice, adding extra checklists and further activities such as mind-mapping exercises and evaluation activities in order to enhance the candidates' learning. Many candidates had made items with enough processes for a higher Unit level (ie National 4 candidates had made items complex enough to suit National 5), however it was felt that the presentation levels were correct in most cases when the additional requirements for the Units were taken into account.