



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Fashion and Textile Technology
Levels	N4 – Higher
Date published:	October 2016

This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2015-2016.



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.

NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Fashion and Textile Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H253 74	National 4	Making a Fashion/Textile Item
X728 75	National 5	Fashion and Textile Technology
X728 76	Higher	Fashion and Textile Technology

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres made good and consistent use of the assessment support documents and marking instructions. The candidate workbooks were used at National 5. Some centres used the National 5 candidate workbook as a template for Higher. Others created their own templates and a few allowed candidates free reign on how to present their work.

Candidates selected from all the briefs at each level, which facilitated personalisation and choice, though naturally, some briefs were more commonly used than others. This was particularly evident at Higher, where the majority of candidates chose the brief 'Develop a fashion/textile item suitable for a teenager to wear at a music festival'.

Most centres kept very good observational records, and a good range of photographic evidence. All used the recording documentation provided.

Assessment judgements

Centres used the marking instructions and most applied them consistently. A number of centres included highly detailed commentary on assessment judgements; others included briefer, but still valid, commentary. Accurate records were kept and there was good evidence of internal verification at most centres. The level of accuracy in decision making was good. However, some centres had incorrectly identified some construction processes. Some centres were given advice regarding the criteria for awarding marks for investigations at National 5 in the areas of identifying sources of information, asking multiple questions and drawing progressive conclusions.

03

Section 3: General comments

Centres considered candidates' overall abilities regarding both sewing skills and supporting work, and most felt that candidates had been entered at the appropriate level to suit their strengths.

There was a good range of projects for each brief at National 5. However, at Higher the majority of candidates chose the brief about the music festival. The verification team were very impressed by the quality and creativity of many of the items created by the candidates, and some centres were recommended for exemplification.

Some centres incorrectly identified construction processes. This worked to the candidate's advantage in some cases, and disadvantaged them in others.

Most centres used the correct documentation for 2015–16 and used the marking instructions accordingly, allocating a judgement mark to each construction process as well as the overall standard of quality. However, a small minority of centres continued to mark in the manner of the previous year's documentation, awarding full marks for each construction process attempted regardless of quality, and only making a quality judgement in the overall standard of construction.