



**Higher National Qualifications 2011
Internal Assessment Report
Clothing and Textiles**

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

Higher National Graded Units

Titles/levels of HN Graded Units verified

F3HS 35	Fashion: Design and Manufacture Graded Unit 2
F2EK 35	Fashion: Design and Production with Retail Graded Unit 2
F3HR 34	Fashion: Design and Manufacture Graded Unit 1
F2EJ 34	Fashion: Design and Production with Retail Graded Unit 1
F1RF 34	Textiles Graded Unit 1

General comments

Four college centres were visited and Graded Units from the following courses were externally verified: HND Textiles, HND Fashion Design and Manufacture, and HND Fashion: Design and Production with Retail.

F3HS 35 and F2EK 35 were verified in two different centres.

Most centres had a good or very good standard of candidate evidence and a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the national standards.

Centres were asked to grade candidate evidence as A, B, C or Fail. The External Verifiers then selected a sample to see if they agreed with the centre's decision. The External Verifiers agreed with the judgement of the centres and the grades awarded. It was evident that there is a strong team approach to standardisation of assessment decisions within centres.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

All centres are familiar with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials. It was noted that marks have not been allocated to the planning, development and evaluation stages of F3HR 34 Fashion: Design and Manufacture Graded Unit 1, which will be resolved to create a standardised approach across all centres.

It is essential that all centres participate in the annual Qualification Support Team meeting at SQA to standardise and benchmark student work. Centres who do participate would agree this is an essential and excellent event to share good practice.

Evidence Requirements

All centres do have a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the Graded Units. Some centres had used prior verified instruments of assessment and marking schemes, which is a useful aid to centres who wish to ensure correct interpretation of what is required. This is also beneficial at external verification and helps standardisation.

In one centre, many candidates had over produced the amount of evidence required. The evidence produced was of a high standard and relevant to the award.

Administration of assessments

All centres had a creative approach to delivery. All instruments of assessment were appropriate for subject and course delivery, and reflected the specialist nature of the course.

Some centres delivered the Graded Unit from the middle of the academic year and ended it approximately four weeks before the end of the course. One centre delivered the Graded Unit during the final weeks of the course. All centres had built in sufficient time for remediation.

Some centres used prior verified assessment materials and marking schemes. This aided the external verification process and standardisation across centres. Access to the assessment bank with shared assessment exemplars and marking schemes created close links and discussion between centres.

All centres had a strong team approach to internal verification where candidate evidence had been marked by the assessor and a sample was identified for internal verification. Minutes from this standardisation process and discussions with staff confirmed that the verifier and assessor had regular communication regarding candidate evidence.

Further general feedback

In discussions with External Verifiers, candidates discussed whether they enjoyed the Unit and what they had learned from their course.

Most candidates did enjoy the Graded Unit and their course, and were pleased to be informed that verifiers agreed with the assessors marking of candidate evidence.

Many were surprised at how much they knew and how they had progressed. Candidates enjoyed exploring the design briefs. They liked the independence and the freedom it gave them. They appreciated the scheduled meetings and the constructive feedback given.

Many had found Graded Unit 2 more challenging and they were encouraged by the development of skills to a higher level.

The candidates enjoyed the process of being in control of their own learning, decision making, problem solving and time management — and finding out that they ‘can do it’ without asking questions. There was evidence that candidates had fair access to assessment, as well as inclusive design briefs exploring different cultures and identities.

Verifiers reported a ‘good’ to ‘excellent’ standard of Graded Unit evidence and agreed with the judgement of assessors and Internal Verifiers on grades awarded.

Large class sizes of 16 candidates and over was a recurring issue in most centres. Centres indicated that insufficient teaching staff and resources such as industrial machinery may impact on the quality of teaching and learning.

Areas of good practice

There was evidence of:

- ◆ the integration of key Units
- ◆ candidates using SWOT analysis in the planning stages of the Unit to help develop good analytical skills

- ◆ clear objectives being identified by candidates in the research planning stages
- ◆ the use of structured time slots for various stages of the internal assessment schedule
- ◆ 25% sampling of candidate evidence for internal verification
- ◆ the use of prior verified SQA exemplars — instruments of assessment and marking schedules
- ◆ a team approach to internal verification
- ◆ the use of photographs in sketchbooks to show the various stages of candidate work