



**National Qualifications 2013
Internal Assessment Report
Drama and Theatre Arts**

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

National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of NQ Units verified:

D193 10 Drama Skills
D193 11 Drama Skills
D196 12 Investigative Drama
D199 13 Devised Drama
F5KY 12 Drama: Acting Skills
F5LB 12 Drama: Theatre Skills in Performance
F5L4 12 Drama: Professional Theatre in Context

General comments

In almost all cases, at the central verification event, assessment evidence was clearly presented and almost all centres demonstrated a sound understanding of national standards.

In visiting verification, there was a mixed picture with some centres demonstrating a sound understanding of the requirements while others were a little unsure about Assessment Standards and Evidence Requirements.

Centres which had their assessment standards Accepted at verification had pitched their assessments and judgements at the appropriate levels.

At both the central event and in visiting verification, some centres were not using the marking schemes included in the NABs and Assessment Support Packs (ASPs) clearly or correctly.

Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials

Fifteen centres were selected for central verification in 2013.

In the majority of cases, the central verification event showed that internal assessors were using the correct documentation and it was evident that teaching staff were familiar with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials.

Four centres were not initially Accepted at the verification event; two for Unit D193 Drama Skills and two for Unit D196 Investigative Drama.

The reasons for Unit D193 Drama Skills not being Accepted at verification included:

- ◆ inconsistencies and a lack of clarity in how the assessment decisions were arrived at

- ◆ elements required by the NAB, eg identification of stimulus, explanation of form and structure and contribution to planning were frequently missing but had been judged overall as a Pass on the summative checklist
- ◆ requirements in the NAB for an explanation and justification for the ground plan were missing from candidate work
- ◆ Dramatic Commentaries lacked sufficient detail in all areas

The reasons for Unit D193 Investigative Drama not being Accepted at verification included:

- ◆ no evidence that candidates' work had been assessed or the marking scheme applied
- ◆ marks awarded where evidence was inadequate/unavailable
- ◆ breakdown of marks listed at the top of some of the scripts but how these were attributed was unclear

Eight centres were selected for visiting verification.

During the visiting verification process, in the majority of centres, assessors were using the correct documentation and it was evident that teaching staff were familiar with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials.

In these centres, marking instructions and assessment guidelines in the ASPs were being consistently applied accurately.

One centre was placed on Hold for Unit F5KY Acting Skills for the following reasons:

- ◆ None of the written work had evidence of having been assessed.
- ◆ There was no evidence of LO3 (the evaluation) having been attempted by any of the candidates.

Another centre presenting candidates for Unit F5LB Theatre Skills in Performance and F5L4 Professional Theatre in Context had to be revisited due to:

- ◆ the full range of evidence not being available on the first visit
- ◆ video evidence of practical work not being available

In two other centres visited there appeared to be a misunderstanding about Evidence Requirements and the guidelines in the ASPs had not been followed.

Following advice and guidance from SQA and a period of remediation, all four centres were subsequently Accepted.

Evidence Requirements

Most centres demonstrated a clear understanding of the Evidence Requirements for the Units detailed in the Unit specifications, and there was clear evidence of effective use of observational checklists (both ongoing and summative), journals

and logs of ongoing evaluations being used effectively. However, there was some uncertainty in some of the centres visited about exactly what evidence had to be available for verification purposes.

In some centres, it was very difficult to observe evidence of practical work due to lack or poor quality DVD evidence.

In a few cases, the Evidence Requirements detailed in the Unit specifications and ASPs were not fully understood.

Administration of assessments

The majority of centres were pitching their assessments and assessment judgements at appropriate levels.

Most centres used the marking schemes and assessment advice contained in either the NABs or ASPs.

Some centres had devised their own detailed observation checklists for practical activities.

The majority of centres had clearly laid out internal verification procedures, which in small departments often involved cross-marking as well as sampling. In single-teacher departments, procedures for internal verification were less clear and contributed to some of the verification difficulties.

Areas of good practice

In the majority of centres, good practice was observed and this included informative written feedback to candidates on their written work and evaluations. Good quality feedback was also given to candidates on their practical work.

Centres had devised and applied detailed marking schemes and gave clear advice to candidates in their logs and acting journals.

In most centres, the marks allocated to each of the separate sections of their evaluations were also included and clearly indicated on the scripts.

In a few cases, good quality student handouts were in use; these explained the purpose and assessment procedures of the Unit, with the Unit Outcomes clearly detailed.

In some cases, at Intermediate 1 and 2 levels, Ground Plans and Dramatic Commentaries were very thoroughly completed with the folio providing a good structure and comprehensive record of the requirements of the Drama Skills Unit.

In the Investigative Drama Units, there were some very good examples of written evaluations which were well structured, thorough and detailed, offering an insight into the drama process. Individual assessment sheets were attached to each extended response and outlined very clearly the task requirements for each area,

the available marks, the marks awarded and a detailed comment justifying the assessment decision.

The evaluation items for Advanced Higher were extremely well presented and it was evident that good quality learning and teaching had taken place.

In the Acting Skills, Theatre Skills in Performance and Professional Theatre in Contexts Units, the standard of practical work and acting was extremely high and, at times, exceeded the Unit requirements.

Specific areas for improvement

Centres should indicate clearly how marking schemes have been applied.

Marks should be indicated on candidates' responses.

In the practical Units all centres should provide video evidence if practical work cannot be observed live.

In the practical Units, centres should ensure that Evidence Requirements in the Unit specifications and assessment guidelines in the ASPs are adhered to.