



NQ verification 2022–23 round 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Drama
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	June 2023

National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
J28T 76	SCQF level 6	Drama Skills
J28Y 76	SCQF level 6	Drama: Production Skills
J28V 77	SCQF level 7	Drama Skills

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

There was an opportunity to review and verify the Drama Skills units at SCQF levels 6 and 7, and the Drama: Production Skills unit at SCQF level 6. There continues to be evidence that centres are developing approaches to assessment that support candidates in demonstrating the required skills for the assessment standards. These were successful when they had been designed to capture the skills outlined in the judging evidence table of the chosen unit assessment support pack and provide opportunities for personalisation and choice.

For Drama Skills (SCQF level 6), some approaches to assessment were in the form of booklets or individual assessment tasks. These were well laid out, clearly supported the candidates on their creative journey, and met the requirements of the assessment standards. Centres also offered a range of appropriate stimuli. Where this was not the case, approaches to assessment did not relate directly to the judging evidence table in the chosen unit assessment support pack. Some approaches to assessment did not provide structure or space for candidates to respond with the necessary depth and complexity.

It was clear from some approaches that a range of practical activities was taking place; however, these were often not clearly evidenced or captured in the centre submission.

Where digital evidence was available for a final performance, this was excessively long for some centres.

For Drama: Production Skills (SCQF level 6), the evidence submitted shows approaches to assessment which provided the candidates with the opportunity to explore and develop the two required production skills. However, the approaches to assessment did not provide equal support for both. Additionally, the approaches to generating evidence were lacking in the development of production skills and their application. The evidence suggests that centre assessors are becoming more reliant on observational comments and brief assessor commentaries as their approach to assessment, for gathering candidate evidence for the practical application of skills.

For Drama Skills (SCQF level 7), there continues to be a good understanding of appropriate approaches to assessment. Centres are approaching assessment standards with clarity and supporting candidates in exploring and developing knowledge of theatre practitioners. There is creative use of ICT in the form of PowerPoint presentations, mood boards, as well as the use of Google Drive to share ideas and provide evidence of research and exploration of theatre practitioner methodologies. Additionally, centres supported candidates in their creative exploration by engaging with outside stakeholders to provide practical workshops in their chosen field.

Assessment judgements

Unit verification requires the centre to make clear assessment judgements to accompany candidates' evidence, allowing the verifier to reach an informed decision that the centre is making reliable, consistent and valid assessment judgements which are in line with national standards.

For some centres, there was evidence of reliable, consistent and valid judgements being applied to candidate evidence. However, there was also evidence of some lenient assessment judgements across the reviewed units. This is due to a range of factors:

- ◆ The approach to assessment did not fully support the candidate in demonstrating the required skills.
- ◆ The candidate response lacked specific terminology, depth, detail and complexity expected at the specific level.
- ◆ The centre did not provide sufficient candidate evidence in the submission to justify the judgement.
- ◆ Assessor comments or commentaries on observations did not provide the detail necessary to evidence the skills applied. For example, when the chosen approach to assessment does not provide digital footage or show practical application of skills, the assessor must provide enough detail in their comments for the verifier to validate the judgement.

The evidence submitted clearly shows an increase in the number of judgements being applied, in which centre assessors rely only on their comments to provide evidence that an assessment standard has been met.

Section 3: general comments

Overall, centres submitted evidence which demonstrated candidates meeting the requirements of most assessment standards, approaches and judgements. However, centres should take note of the following details to support their submission and avoid confusion during the verification process:

- ◆ Centres should indicate the unit assessment support pack that they used to assess the unit and include this detail on the candidate flyleaf.
- ◆ When a centre has included their own stimuli or made minor changes to the chosen unit assessment support pack, this does not constitute a 'centre devised' assessment.
- ◆ All candidate evidence should be labelled with the relevant assessment standards (if they are integrated) to ensure clarity and validity during the verification process.
- ◆ When the chosen approach to assessment is 'discussions', they must be evidenced and attributed to individual candidates.
- ◆ Centre assessors must ensure candidates are using level appropriate terminology in their responses to ensure they meet the national standard.
- ◆ Whether the submission is interim or complete, the evidence submitted should demonstrate the process and development of ideas for drama. An evaluative response or summative performance would not demonstrate this.

There was evidence of centres engaging with and applying internal quality assurance processes, such as cross-marking and other internal verification approaches to assessment and judgements. However, there is ongoing inconsistencies in some centres' application of internal verification processes. This is evident where the approaches to assessment do not support candidates meeting the requirements of specific assessment standards at a specific level. This results in the application of assessment judgements that are unreliable or invalid.

There was evidence of some centres using the SQA [Internal Verification Toolkit](#) to support their internal quality assurance processes.