



Higher National and Vocational Qualifications Internal Assessment Report 2015 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 were externally verified:

F18D 34	Clothing: Production, Trimming and Finishing Techniques
F188 34	Garment Pattern Construction: Blocks, Manipulation and Production
F1PD 34	Drape and Flat Pattern Making: Basic Techniques
F1P8 35	Complex Pattern Development and Customisation
F1PC 35	Design and Manufacture a Bridal or Eveningwear Garment

The rationale for selection was to gauge the improvement of standards of candidate evidence, standardisation and team work within the centre, and adherence to the national standards for the selected Units.

The centre had shown significant improvement in the judgement of candidate evidence and a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards in all Units.

The Units that were 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.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

The centre was familiar with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials. Holistic integration of Units and assessments linked the pattern and clothing production processes, creating more meaningful learning for candidates.

The centre had a team approach to standardisation, evidenced in the internal verification reports and minutes of team meetings. Garment samples and marking schemes assisted in this process.

Working collaboratively with other centres at the Qualification Support Team meeting to share assessment materials will further assist with standardisation. Further clarification on the Evidence Requirements of Outcome 2 style variations for F188 34 will be discussed at the next Qualification Support Team meeting. This will help with delivery and standardisation of assessment decisions across all centres.

Evidence Requirements

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

All candidate evidence was at the appropriate level for the Units. It was judged appropriately and good progression from SCQF level 7 to level 8 was evident.

Administration of assessments

All instruments of assessment were current and appropriate for the Units and course delivery and were at the appropriate level for the qualification. They reflected the Group Award and provided the candidates with the knowledge and skills required.

A robust internal verification procedure was evident. Constructive feedback and support was evidenced in all candidate feedback on assessment decisions.

The centre had an internal verification schedule. Standardisation minutes confirmed that verifiers and assessors 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.

The 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

Candidates were not available for feedback sessions. However, the constructive written feedback on assessment decisions was clear evidence of supportive staff.

Areas of good practice

Formative assessment using photographic evidence of various stages within F1PD 34 helped to reinforce knowledge and understanding.

Specific areas for improvement

Documenting how Outcomes in Units are integrated.

Higher National Graded Units

Three college centres were visited and the following Graded Units were verified:

F293 34	Fashion Technology and Manufacture with Design: Graded Unit 1
F3HS 35	Fashion Design and Manufacture: Graded Unit 2
F2EJ 34	Fashion: Design and Production with Retail: Graded Unit 1
F2EK 35	Fashion: Design and Production with Retail: Graded Unit 2
F1RF 35	Textiles: Graded Unit 2

General comments

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

There was a consistent standard within each centre with detailed feedback to candidates for the various mentoring stages. In all centres candidate evidence was graded appropriately.

All centres demonstrated a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards.

In all the Graded Units that were 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. In all centres there was evidence of thorough marking of candidate evidence and good constructive feedback to candidates.

The External Verifiers agreed with all of the centres' grading decisions.

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.

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 during the Qualification Support Team meetings at SQA have helped to standardise and benchmark student work. Centres that participate would agree this is an essential and excellent event to share good practice.

Evidence Requirements

All of the centres verified had a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the Graded Units. Benchmarking at the SQA Qualification Support Team standardisation meeting has helped this process.

All centres had well written briefs which were open to a wide range of contexts. Most centres used a team approach to produce exciting and appropriate briefs for candidates, covering the assessment specifications. One centre used briefs from the SQA bank of exemplars.

Marking schemes were available for all Graded Units. Robust internal verification procedures were evident in all centres.

Assessment instruments were available in hard copy and also on VLEs with appropriate support notes.

Administration of assessments

All centres had a creative approach to delivery of the Graded Units. In most centres 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.

A robust internal verification system was evident in all centres. Pre-delivery, 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.

One centre 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 one centre, no candidates were available for discussion due to the timing of the external verification visit. Where candidates were available they commented on: enjoyment of the 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, and how they could use what was learned in future projects.

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

Areas of good practice

In some centres, candidates' used a 'visual diary' and reflective log to record development and progress.

There was clear feedback to candidates at all stages.

In one centre, the double-marking of the candidate evidence by the assessor and internal verifier of the candidate presentation, to aid standardisation.

Specific areas for improvement

In one centre, a schedule with specific mentoring dates would be useful to give candidates a clear indication of allocated mentoring time slots.

SVQ awards

General comments

Two centres were externally verified for Manufacturing Textile Products at SVQ Levels 1, 2 and 3. Both demonstrated a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards at the appropriate level of the award for their candidates.

A satisfactory 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 Manufacturing Textile Products Levels 1, 2 and 3 within an industrial workplace.

Centres 2, a training provider, managed the delivery of SVQ Manufacturing Textile Products Levels 1 and 2 within a number of 'cottage industry' work places and industrial mills 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.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Assessors in both 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 judgement.

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 both 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.

In both centres, the candidates view the SVQ as a method of certifying that they are highly skilled and competent in the production of branded cloth. They use relevant machinery and equipment in an environment appropriate to the industry. Candidates and employers are very proud of the achievements of their workforce and value the qualification.

Administration of assessments

Both centres administer assessments at an appropriate level and within an appropriate assessment environment. They included workplace assessment/simulation of health and safety situations which rarely occur, or which are unlikely to occur. In both centres a robust internal verification system was evident.

In both 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 both 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.

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

General feedback

In both 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.

Both centres recorded feedback to candidates offering constructive comments.

Candidates demonstrated 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. Where English was not the first language, appropriate candidate support in the candidate's native language was available.

Areas of good practice

- ◆ A large number of qualified assessors and the training of new assessors to cover the various shift patterns and job roles
- ◆ The 'team' approach to revising and updating log books to record assessment evidence
- ◆ Weekly meetings conducted by the internal verifier to support assessors in their role
- ◆ Assessors participating in standardisation exercises to review each other's work with the verifier
- ◆ The creation of a 'Loom Maintenance and Repair' manual and DVD by staff, to help employees
- ◆ The inclusion of additional courses which have given candidates additional work-related skills and the confidence to repair and maintain their loom
- ◆ The repeat order of a work-related task, or employment within the mill for the candidate, is a clear indication of industry endorsement of valid and reliable assessment decisions

Specific areas for improvement

There were no recommendations.