



**Higher National and Vocational Qualifications
Internal Assessment Report 2013
Clothing and Textiles**

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in Higher National and Scottish Vocational Qualifications in this subject.

Higher National Units

General comments

One college centre was visited and the following Higher National Units from the HND Fashion: Design and Production with Retail course were externally verified:

F18A 34 Fashion: Textile Technology

F18D 34 Clothing: Production, Trimming and Finishing Techniques

F1F4 35 Designing and Producing Fashion Garments: Advanced

F1P8 35 Complex Pattern Development and Customisation

The centre had a good to excellent standard of candidate evidence and a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards. An exciting range of work was evidenced. The Units verified showed improvement in the standard and consistency of evidence produced. Internal verification procedures were robust and there was clear evidence of a supportive staff.

Discussions of candidate evidence, sharing assessment instruments, marking schemes and sharing of good practice at the annual Qualification Support Team meetings has helped standardisation and has supported the centre in working towards a national standard.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

The centre is familiar with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials. A holistic integration of Units and assessments clearly linked the design and production processes creating more meaningful learning for candidates.

The centre had its own 'bank' of exemplars to assist with standardisation — photographs, garment samples, annotated drawings, marking schemes. They work closely with other centres to share assessment materials.

Evidence Requirements

The centre demonstrated a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the Units.

Candidate evidence was at the appropriate level for the Unit and very good progression from level 7 to level 8 was evident.

Candidates demonstrated an excellent application of the knowledge gained in moodboards and folios in Fashion: Textile Technology and Designing and Producing Fashion Garments: Advanced.

Administration of assessments

All instruments of assessment were current and appropriate for the subject, course delivery and were at the appropriate level for the qualification. They reflect the Group Award and provide the candidates with the knowledge and skills required.

Robust internal verification procedures were evident. Constructive feedback and support was evidenced in all candidate feedback on assessment decisions.

The centre had an internal verification schedule. Standardisation minutes and discussions with staff confirmed that the Verifier and assessor had regular discussion regarding candidate evidence.

The centre had a creative approach to delivery. Where appropriate, various Units were integrated to make a more meaningful candidate experience and a holistic approach to assessment.

Instruments of assessment were approved by the internal curriculum group before use. Instruments of assessment were available in hard copy and electronic format on the VLE giving candidates and staff online access.

General feedback

A large group of candidates were available for discussion. Candidates were happy to hear comments from the Verifier on the excellent standard of work produced. They were enthusiastic and praised the excellent tuition and support they had received. This was further evidenced in the constructive written feedback and support on assessment decisions.

Many candidates commented on the open access to online teaching notes, instruments of assessment and online 'blog' with links to support students as well as to 'showcase' their achievements.

The centre commented on the positive benefits of attending the annual Qualification Support Team meeting — such as standardisation, sharing of good practice and establishing a good working relationship between centres.

Areas of good practice

- ◆ The integration of several Units creating a holistic approach to assessment eased the assessment burden and created a meaningful learning experience for candidates. Linking the design and production processes created a more meaningful learning experience for candidates.
- ◆ The excellent application of knowledge gained was demonstrated in moodboards and folios of candidate evidence in Fashion: Textile Technology and Designing and Producing Fashion Garments: Advanced.
- ◆ Robust internal verification procedures were evident.
- ◆ A college-devised checklist for the new risk rating approach to external verification visits helped to prepare and support staff for external verification.

- ◆ Constructive feedback and support was evidenced in all candidate feedback on assessment decisions.
- ◆ The use of the college VLE to give candidates 24/7 access to teaching notes.
- ◆ The excellent online Fashion 'blog' with links to support students as well as to 'showcase' their achievements.

Specific areas for improvement

There were no specific areas for improvement.

Higher National Graded Units

Titles/levels of HN Graded Units verified:

Three college centres were visited and Higher National Graded Units from the following courses were externally verified: HND Textiles, HND Fashion Design and Manufacture, HND Fashion Technology and Manufacture with Design.

Graded Units verified (Units verified in more than one centre are in bold):

F295 35 Fashion Technology and Manufacture with Design: Graded Unit 2

F3HR 34 Fashion Design and Manufacture: Graded Unit 1

F1RF 35 Textiles: Graded Unit 2

General comments

All centres are using the most up-to-date Unit specification. All assessment specifications are relevant and appropriate to the Unit and award.

One centre delivers F295 35 Fashion Technology and Manufacture with Design: Graded Unit 2 and F3HR 34 Fashion Design and Manufacture: Graded Unit 1. There was a consistent standard across all delivery with detailed feedback to candidates for the various mentoring stages. A few grades needed to be reviewed due to a slight inconsistency in marking between different lecturers. The 'tone' of some written candidate feedback did not reflect the final grade. The majority of A, B, C grade pass and fail candidate evidence was graded appropriately.

Two centres delivering F1RF 35 Textiles: Graded Unit 2 were externally verified. Although the centres demonstrated a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards it is evident that further standardisation between centres delivering the Textiles award would be beneficial. Feedback on the design development process, what constitutes a 'concept' garment, the final textile product and Graded Unit marking scheme is a common discussion point and all centres delivering this award would benefit from a Qualification Support Team meeting to discuss and agree on what is required.

In all of the Graded Units verified, the instruments of assessment were well written and open to a wide range of contexts. Marking schemes were available for all centres, which showed evidence of internal standardisation. Not all centres used the same marking scheme. Further standardisation at the Qualification Support Team meeting would facilitate a uniform national marking schedule. This has been suggested in previous reports but requires all centres to participate in the QST meeting. In all centres there was evidence of thorough marking of candidate evidence and good constructive feedback to candidates. In all centres there was clear candidate evidence of the integration of the key Units within the award.

Centres were asked to grade candidate evidence as A, B, C or fail. The External Verifier selected a sample to see if they agreed with the centres' decisions. In most cases the External Verifier agreed with the judgment of the centre and the grades awarded. In a few centres it was recommended that the grades should be reviewed.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

A Practical Assignment was the most appropriate instrument of assessment for all of the Graded Units verified.

It was evident that all centres are familiar with the Unit specification, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials. However, centres delivering the Textiles Graded Unit would benefit from a Qualification Support Team meeting to discuss and share exemplification materials. Centres need to ensure that there is a clearer link between the design development and the samples produced in terms of scale, proportion, colour and fabric quality. Centres also need to ensure that the final product emphasis is on the 'textile surface decoration' rather than the construction of a garment to reflect the 'textile' nature of the Unit. Where centres choose the 'Fashion' route in the Textiles Graded Unit, a 'concept' garment is more appropriate than a fully constructed garment. Attendance at QST meetings is essential to ensure that all centres discuss, agree and share a common understanding of the national standards. This would suggest that there is still room for improvement in the delivery of the Textiles Graded Unit.

There was evidence in all of the Graded Units verified that candidates had fair access to assessment, as well as inclusive design briefs exploring different cultures and identities.

Group discussions at the Qualification Support Team meetings at SQA have helped to standardise and bench mark student work. Centres who do participate would agree this is an essential and excellent event to share good practice.

Evidence Requirements

All centres verified have a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the Unit. Some centres used prior verified instruments of assessment which is a useful aid to centres which wish to ensure correct interpretation of what is required.

All centres had well written briefs which were open to a wide range of contexts. Most centres use a team approach to produce exciting and appropriate briefs for candidates and the assessment specifications. Centres could create a 'bank' of exemplars with SQA.

Marking schemes were available for all Graded Units, however a review of some marking schemes would be beneficial. Although robust internal verification procedures were evident in all centres, in a few cases the External Verifier recommended that a few of the grades should be reviewed.

Candidate evidence was at the appropriate level for the Unit.

Assessment instruments were available in hard copy and also on the VLE with support notes.

Administration of assessments

All centres had a creative approach to delivery of the Graded Units. Key dates for the delivery were indicated to candidates: planning, development and evaluation stages. It was evident that independent learning had occurred and that the candidates enjoyed the learning experience.

One centre delivered the Graded Unit after completing all the other Units. This worked well for the candidates and the centre. In another centre, the Graded Unit was delivered at the end of the first semester.

A robust internal verification system was evident in all centres. Pre-, ongoing and post-delivery checklists with candidate feedback where appropriate were available, as were minutes of meetings.

There was a strong team approach to internal verification where candidate evidence had been marked by the assessor and a sample cross-checked by the Internal Verifier. All centres had an internal verification schedule. Standardisation minutes and discussions with staff confirmed that the Verifier and assessor had regular discussion regarding candidate evidence.

In most cases, final assessment decisions were accurate, reliable and recorded.

Not all centres used the same marking scheme. Further standardisation at the Qualification Support Team meeting would facilitate a uniform national marking schedule. This is particularly applicable to centres delivering the HND Textiles Graded Units.

Some centres used prior verified assessment materials and marking schemes. This aided the external verification process. Centres can access the assessment bank and share assessments and marking schemes.

General feedback

In some centres, no candidates were available for discussion due to the timing of external verification visits. In centres where candidates were available they were encouraged to hear comments from External Verifiers on the good and very good standard of their course work. Many commented on: enjoyment of Unit, what was learned, the planning and organisational skills developed, independent learning, and meeting deadlines.

Recorded written feedback from candidates reflected on what was learned within the Unit, what they would do differently if repeated, how they could improve on a particular technique, how they could use what was learned in future projects.

A good and very good standard of candidate evidence and tutor support was evidenced with very good constructive comments to candidates at various stages.

Areas of good practice

- ◆ Constructive feedback and support evidenced in all candidate feedback on assessment decisions.
- ◆ Mentoring sessions prepared in a booklet format.
- ◆ Clear visual presentation of the theme research and the Fashion/Interior research presented on A2 boards.
- ◆ A5 journal style of sketchbook offering a clearer visual of the thought process allowing the students to experiment with fabrics and keep a note of costs.
- ◆ Underpinning knowledge of a particular process demonstrated in annotated sketchbooks.
- ◆ A large amount of very experimental work evidenced individual learning.
- ◆ Holistic integration of Units and assessments clearly linked the design and production processes creating more meaningful learning for candidates.

Specific areas for improvement

- ◆ There is room for further development between centres that deliver the HND Textiles award.
- ◆ Develop a standardised marking scheme at the Qualification Support Team meeting to facilitate a uniform national marking schedule. This is particularly applicable to centres delivering the HND Textiles Graded Units.
- ◆ All centres, particularly centres delivering HND Textile awards, to participate in the annual Qualification Support Team meeting at SQA to standardise and benchmark student work. Centres which do participate would agree this is an essential and excellent event to share good practice.
- ◆ Centres need to ensure that there is a clearer link between the design development and the samples produced in terms of scale, proportion, colour and fabric quality.
- ◆ Centres delivering the Textiles Graded Unit need to ensure that the final product emphasis is on the 'textile surface decoration' rather than the construction of a garment to reflect the 'textile' nature of the Unit.

SVQ awards

General comments

Three centres delivering the Manufacturing Textile Products at SVQ Level 1 and Level 2 were visited. All demonstrated a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards at the appropriate level of the award for their candidates.

A good to excellent level of candidate evidence was observed — similar to previous sessions — indicating a standardised approach to delivery and assessment.

Centre 1, a college provider, managed the delivery of SVQ Level 1 within a 'cottage industry' workplace to produce a branded cloth. They also managed the delivery of SVQ Level 2 Manufacturing Textile Products within an industrial workplace.

Centre 2, a training provider, managed the delivery of SVQ Level 2 within an industrial workplace.

Centre 3, a training provider, managed the delivery of SVQ Level 2 within a 'cottage industry' workplace to produce a branded cloth.

The level of skills demonstrated in the different workplaces was a true reflection of the national standards and credited candidates with appropriate SVQ Units in their various vocational areas.

The Assessment Strategy stipulates that F0JK 04 Maintain Health and Safety at Work must be verified annually and is the key Unit across all levels of the award. Each centre demonstrated a standardised approach within the workplace. It was evident from talking to the candidates, assessors and Verifiers that they all had a very good awareness of the importance of Health and Safety in the workplace — fault reporting, emergency evacuation procedures, manual handling, and isolation of machinery if working on faulty machinery.

There was a difference of opinion between two centres on the suitability of the SVQ 3 Manufacturing Textile Products for the branded cloth both produce. Further discussion between centres about the delivery would be beneficial.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Assessors in all centres demonstrated a high level of familiarity with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials. This was evidenced by well documented Unit packs with appropriate instruments of assessment, exemplar answers, assessment schedules, detailed Performance Criteria checklists, minutes of standardisation meetings, and candidate folios of evidence. Direct observation, questions, discussions, witness testimony, work

products, photographs of various processes and end-products were all used to record Unit evidence. Conversations with assessors and Internal Verifiers confirmed this judgment.

It was evident that all of the programmes are planned to take account of learner needs. Assessment in each centre occurs when candidates have gained sufficient skills and have a realistic expectation that they will achieve the assessment criteria. Regular feedback to candidates in each centre is evident. Teaching materials are regularly reviewed.

Evidence Requirements

Well documented candidate evidence appropriate to the level of the award and minutes of standardisation meetings confirmed that all centres had a very clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements of the award. Appropriate Units were selected for the different types of workplace and end-products.

All centres administer assessments at an appropriate level and within an appropriate assessment environment and use workplace assessment/simulation for health and safety situations which rarely occur or are unlikely to occur. In all centres there was a robust internal verification system evident.

In centres 1 and 3, the candidates view the SVQ as a method of certifying that they are highly skilled and competent in the production of the branded cloth. They use relevant machinery and equipment in an environment appropriate to the industry.

Administration of assessments

All centres administer assessments at an appropriate level and within an appropriate assessment environment and use workplace assessment/simulation for health and safety situations which rarely occur or are unlikely to occur. In both centres there was a robust internal verification system evident.

In all centres, candidates are assessed when competent in the skills. At the end of each observation the candidate will read what has been written and sign-off the response discussing any points raised.

In all centres, the candidates view the SVQ as a method of certifying that they are highly skilled and competent. They use relevant machinery and equipment in an industrial environment appropriate to the industry.

All centres deliver and assess in line with the Creative Skillset Assessment Strategy.

General feedback

In all centres, it was evident from discussions with candidates, assessors and Internal Verifiers that meaningful and enjoyable learning has taken place. There was an excellent supportive relationship between candidates, assessors and Verifiers.

All centres recorded feedback to candidates offering constructive comments.

Candidates demonstrate competence in the workplace at the appropriate award level.

There were no evident barriers to assessment. There was a wide range of age, gender and nationalities. In several centres where English was not the first language, appropriate candidate support in the candidates' native language was available.

There was a difference of opinion between two centres on the suitability of the SVQ 3 Manufacturing Textile Products for the branded cloth both produce. Further discussion between centres about the delivery would be beneficial.

Areas of good practice

- ◆ Thorough induction programme for all assessors and Verifiers.
- ◆ Clearly documented roles and responsibilities of all involved in the assessment process, internal verification and quality assurance was evidenced.
- ◆ Standardised approach to gathering candidate evidence in detailed and comprehensive log books with sample answers and a consistently high standard of work across all candidate evidence.
- ◆ Excellent assessor and Verifier support to candidates and excellent documentation of candidate evidence available from all centres.
- ◆ Colour coding used to track candidate progress and identify the assessor and Verifier.
- ◆ Strict compliance with all SSC and SQA requirements.
- ◆ Development visits prior to centre approval clarified what was required at external verification.

Specific areas for improvement

None identified.