



NQ Verification 2016–17 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 2017

National Courses/Units verified:

H253 74 National 4 Fashion & Textile Technology (Added Value Unit)
X728 75 National 5 Fashion & Textile Technology: Practical Activity (IACCA*)
X728 76 Higher Fashion & Textile Technology: Practical Activity (IACCA)

*Internally-assessed component of course assessment

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Centres have generally made good and consistent use of the assessment support documents and marking instructions. All centres visited had used the 2017 briefs. The candidate workbooks provided by SQA were used at National 5, with a couple of candidates not realising they could add extra sheets to present their investigations. Some centres had used the National 5 candidate workbook as a template for Higher, others had created their own templates to scaffold the candidates' work. Some had allowed candidates freedom on how to present their work.

Candidates had been offered all the briefs at each level which facilitated personalisation and choice. Although, naturally, some briefs were more commonly used than others, there was a good spread across all the briefs.

Most centres had used the candidate guides. Most centres had kept very good observational records, and a good range of photographic evidence. All centres visited had used the marking sheets provided in the assessment support packs. One centre had inserted a relevant photograph into the marking sheet for each construction technique that was marked.

Assessment judgements

Centres had used the marking instructions and most had applied them consistently. Some had filled in highly detailed information on assessment judgements, others were briefer but still valid. Accurate records had generally been kept and there was good evidence of internal verification at most centres, but not all.

The level of accuracy in decision making was generally good. However, some centres had incorrectly identified some construction processes, and some were confused over the use of the marks tariff. In these cases, training was given during the verification visit. Some centres were also given advice over criteria for awarding marks for investigations at National 5, such as identifying sources of information, asking multiple questions and, in particular, drawing progressive conclusions in order to generate 'points of information'.

03

Section 3: General comments

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

There was a good range of projects undertaken for each brief at National 5 and at Higher. 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 had issues with digital media with some files being lost, and the costs of colour printing being prohibitive.

Some centres had incorrectly identified construction processes. This worked to the candidates' advantage in some cases, and disadvantaged them in others. Most centres had used the correct documentation for 2016–17 and had used the marking instructions accordingly. However a very small minority of centres had confused the method of marking according to the tariffs.