



NQ Verification 2016–17

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Verification group name: | Drama |
| Verification event/visiting information | Visiting |
| Date published: | June 2017 |

National Courses/Units verified:

H233 74 National 4 Drama: Performance (Added Value Unit)

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Most centres continue to be fully prepared for the verification visit, with candidate evidence available and well organised. There is generally a clear understanding of the application of national standards and candidates are given a range of opportunities to perform well. Visiting verification continues to be a very positive experience and suggests that centres are approaching assessment with greater confidence.

Some centres continue to have both National 4 and National 5 candidates working alongside each other, and, in most cases, this seems to have a positive impact on the quality of National 4 responses. For acting, where centres have presented National 4 candidates with an individual textual extract from which to develop their performance, this approach can often result in candidates not meeting the requirements for some assessment standards within the Drama: Performance (National 4) Added Value Unit.

For example, for assessment standard 1.1, this can result in candidates responding to either a limited range of stimuli or in some cases a single stimulus. In addition, candidate performances may not be sustained for the required 10 minute duration. However, some centres are aware of the need to adapt this approach to assessment where candidates choose to devise their drama from a stimulus rather than develop script extracts from a text.

There continues to be a need for centres to support candidates further in generating evidence of their awareness of form and structure.

Centres are presenting candidates with a range of approaches to assessment to meet assessment standard 1.2. The approaches that have been specifically designed and developed to support candidates in their responses to their chosen performance role continue to be most successful in generating the appropriate evidence to meet this assessment standard. There was clear evidence of candidates producing creative ideas while preparing for their performance in both acting and production team roles.

For assessment standard 1.3, where centres have completed this assessment, evidence continues to be predominantly recorded material. Most centres submitting digital evidence for this assessment standard had gathered good quality, clearly identifiable candidate evidence.

For assessment standard 1.4, 'Reflecting on their work and that of others', centres should ensure that the requirements of this assessment standard are fully met. Candidates should be supported in their responses while reflecting on their strengths and areas for improvement. In addition, they should be given the opportunity to reflect on the contribution of two others within the production team.

Assessment judgements

Visiting 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 most centres, there is evidence of reliable, consistent and valid judgements being applied to candidate evidence. In cases where the approach to assessment was specifically designed to meet the requirements of an assessment standard, the centre assessor was able to confidently and correctly judge the candidate evidence by referring to the SQA unit assessment support pack.

It is clear that centre assessors are showing greater understanding of the relationship between approaches to assessment and assessment judgements and how the former support reliable assessment judgements.

03

Section 3: General comments

In general, centre staff have a clear understanding of the standards for the Drama: Performance (National 4) Added Value Unit.

Overall, centres were well prepared for the visit and keen to ensure they had sufficient evidence for all assessment standards being verified.

Positive feedback was received about this model of visiting verification, allowing one-to-one dialogue between the visiting verifier and internal assessors. Centre

staff showed a keenness to engage in professional dialogue and took the opportunity to have their questions or concerns discussed.

The approach to assessment using annotated scenarios/scripts should be appropriate for all candidates and support all performance roles for it to be valid.

In addition, all evidence submitted should be attributable to the assessment standard to which it relates; centres are reminded to label candidate evidence appropriately by indicating the related assessment standard on it.

There was clear evidence of centres engaging with and applying effective internal quality assurance processes. Some centres are using local authority level documentation, filtering this for use within their own centre and further applying this within their subject-specific faculty or department. Where centres had a rigorous system in place, this impacted positively on both development of approaches to assessment and the consistency of assessment judgements.

There was evidence of some centres using the SQA Internal Verification Toolkit to support their internal quality assurance processes. This can be found at www.sqa.org.uk/IVToolkit.