NQ Verification 2016–17 Key Messages Round 2

01 ▸ Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Art & Design
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June2017

National Courses/Units verified:

H204 74   National 4   Art and Design: Practical Activity (Added Value Unit)

02 ▸ Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The added value unit is one unit with two outcomes: outcome 1 — Expressive; and outcome 2 — Design. The majority of centres have a clearer understanding of the purpose and requirements demanded by the units. No centres chose to develop their own or significantly alter the unit assessment support packs (UASPs) and therefore the prior verification service was not required. In Art and Design, centres continued to use the published UASPs because they can already choose their own context unlike other subjects where the task is specified.

The majority of centres are clearly referring to the judging evidence tables in the UASPs and are working directly from these. Centres were able to meet the added value unit requirements and work tended to be focused and relevant. Some centres encouraged candidates to produce highly detailed development work that exceeded the requirements for the added value unit. The main reason for this is that often National 4 and National 5 candidates are being taught together in multi-level classes and working in a similar way. There is no issue with candidates exceeding the requirements; however, it is important to remember that, for National 4, candidates are required to show planning for assessment standards 1.2 and 2.2. This can be a simple written description of their intentions for the final piece, annotated simple sketch/sketches, mind maps or a combination of all of these.

Outcome 1 and outcome 2

For both Expressive and Design final art/design work demonstrated a wide range of themes, choices of media and techniques. Clearly, candidates had built on the experiences gained within the National 4 Expressive and Design units.

For outcomes 1 and 2, centres were allowing candidates to experiment with a wide variety of different materials and techniques to inspire, engage and motivate candidates. This allowed candidates to be experimental, especially with regards to the planning stage of the added value unit. For outcome 2, design sketches showed thorough consideration of function and evaluations clearly linked to the candidates' design briefs making the added value unit flow and show coherence.

Genres/themes

It was evident that in most centres candidates exercised choice and personal engagement in their individual themes and use of materials and techniques. The range of themes for the Expressive outcome was similar to those at other levels. The most common themes were portraiture and still-life. For the Design outcome the most common themes tended to be graphics, fashion/textiles, jewellery and product design.

Areas of misunderstanding

At the planning stage for outcomes 1 and 2 a small number of candidates had produced purely descriptive/reflective comments merely describing what they had done. At this stage candidates should be identifying and planning how they plan to develop their art and design works. This should be completed in future tense. For round 2 verification, centres should only present the added value unit for verification and not the National 4 unit.

Assessment judgements

The majority of centres were correctly entering candidates for the appropriate level. On the whole, centres had an excellent understanding of the national standards. In this round all centres were either 'accepted' or 'accepted*'. This is due to centres having a clearer understanding of what is required and expected. Nominee training and Understanding Standards events have also helped to cascade and share good practice across all sectors. On the whole, centres are confident in the national standards, what the requirements are, and in making assessment judgements.

Areas of strength/examples of good practice

A large number of candidates had clearly identified starting points from their unit work and continuity was evident in their final art/design works from earlier development and planning stages. Identifying starting points from units proved helpful to the verifier. Candidates were encouraged to reflect on and evaluate their final art and design works. They clearly identified areas that were successful and others that were less successful, rather than using purely descriptive

language. On whole, candidates were encouraged to use higher-order thinking skills.

A large number of centres/candidates made good use of ICT/Photoshop, CAD and digital photography to engage candidates. For outcome 2, relevant, structured and meaningful design briefs allowed candidates to fully explore the design process. Some excellent examples of 3D ceramic outcomes were seen.

There was evidence of many centres working with others in their authorities to sample and cross-mark. This is proving to be helpful in maintaining, sustaining and applying national standards across all levels. Various systems of internal verification have been developed by centres and are increasingly being seen as integral to the effective delivery of units. There was evidence of dual assessment, cross-marking and sampling throughout centres. Unit work was reviewed regularly with candidates being given clear feedback at each stage. Comments from assessors were clear, encouraging, relevant and helpful. Records to support assessment took a variety of forms including departmental minutes, spreadsheets and quality assurance calendars with key dates.

Most centres used individual record-of-work booklets/sheets for candidates with a simple checklist outlining each assessment standard for both outcomes. This could then be ticked off when each assessment standard was achieved. Some centres had developed their own assessment sheets; other centres used the SQA assessment/record sheets. Some centres chose to use digital diaries to record pupil progress, all of which were acceptable. Student logs were used to highlight next steps and learning targets for improvement. Other centres had developed worksheets to create effective plans for outcomes 1 and 2. Further worksheets had also been developed to aid assessment and reflection, allowing candidates to fully analyse their areas of strength and areas for improvement for both Design and Expressive.

03 ▶ Section 3: General comments

The aims of verification are to ensure standards are maintained, share knowledge about the national standards, to support centres and increase centres' confidence in making assessment decisions.

♦ Round 2 is verification of the National 4 added value unit only.
♦ Round 2 ran from March 2017 until May 2017.
♦ The National 4 added value unit is one unit with two outcomes: Expressive and Design.
♦ The sample size is 12.
♦ Centres can choose which candidates they put forward for verification within the level that is being verified.
♦ If a centre is presenting at one level and there are fewer than 12 candidates, then evidence for all candidates at that level should be provided.

- Complete or interim evidence can be used for verification — however, the work must have been assessed (passed or failed) at a minimum of one assessment standard.
- Work does not need to be mounted but should be neatly laid out for verification and preferably labelled with which assessment standard has been passed/failed.
- The verifier will look at all relevant paperwork — including the internal verification policy, assessment sheets, UASPs and all available evidence.
- Evidence can be paper or electronic or both.
- The verifier will look at the centre's approach to assessment — students should be doing work that enables them to achieve the assessment standards stated in the UASPs.
- The verifier will look at the assessment judgements made by the centre — do they meet the national standards and have they met the standards and outcomes that are stated in UASPs?
- All units are assessed, passed or failed by centres and are subject to external verification.
- The standards remain the same from previous qualifications — the national standards have not changed.
- Centres will assess the candidates' work and will keep a record of this with whatever assessment standard the candidate has passed or failed. This evidence is kept and made available for external verification.
- Verification focuses on the centre's approach to assessment and the centre's assessment judgements — are they reliable and valid and in line with the national standards?
- Verifiers will only look at unit work and not course assessment work.
- All unit evidence should be kept by the centre until 31 July of each year.

Useful links

[Internally-assessed Art and Design unit exemplars](#)
(Look under the Art and Design Event Presentations tab)

The SQA Internal Verification Toolkit: www.sqa.org.uk/IVtoolkit

[Art and Design updates](#)
(Look under the Subject Updates tab)