



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Message Reports

Verification group name:	Art and Design
Levels	N3 – Advanced 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:	Art and Design
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H202 Art and Design: Expressive Activity (National 3, 4 and 5)

H204 Art and Design: Design Activity (National 3, 4 and 5)

or

H202 Art and Design: Expressive Activity (Higher and Advanced Higher – Studies or Enquiry)

H204 Art and Design: Design Activity (Higher and Advanced Higher – Studies or Enquiry)

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres chose to follow a Unit-by-Unit approach. Some centres chose to follow the Portfolio approach for Advanced Higher, this allowed candidates to work in a much looser and more experimental way. The evidence tended to be more naturally occurring when following this approach.

The vast majority of centres had a clear understanding of the purpose and requirements demanded by the Units. No centres chose to develop their own assessments or to significantly alter the UASPs and therefore the prior verification service was not required. In Art and Design, centres tend to continue to use the published UASPs as they can already choose their own context unlike other subjects where the task is specified.

Centres are clearly referring to the judging evidence tables in the UASPs and are working directly from these. Centres that have delivered National 3, National 4, National 5 and Higher previously were able to meet Unit requirements more quickly than previous years. Work also tended to be more focused and relevant.

Many centres used sketchbooks which demonstrated a highly effective integration of Outcomes 1 and 2. Some centres chose to record Outcome 1 in a PowerPoint presentation, this too was also successful.

Outcome 1

There was evidence of many centres encouraging candidates to investigate artists and designers without being restricted to a particular style or genre. This was in keeping with the question papers at National 5 and Higher and allowed candidates to develop a broad awareness of artists and designers. For Advanced Higher, candidates were also encouraged to investigate a wide variety of different artists and designers again without restricting them to any particular style or genre. For example an Advanced Higher candidate could be studying jewellery design but is looking at a sculptor for inspiration.

Many candidates were producing evidence beyond the minimum requirements and selecting artists and designers of personal interest to them and relevant to their practical work. The most effective examples had Outcomes 1 and 2 delivered almost concurrently and this allowed candidates to gather a more meaningful understanding of their artists and designers and also informed the candidate's practical work.

Some centres were delivering and completing Outcome 1 first and then relating their artists and designers to their practical folios. It was evident that departments had devised appropriate prompts and resources for Outcome 1 and this allowed candidates personalisation and choice. There are still centres producing over and above the minimum requirements for Outcome 1. This is not an issue as long as candidates have met the minimum requirements and the national standard for that particular level then work can be passed thus freeing-up more time for candidates.

The Advanced Higher Course now has two mandatory Units. Candidates will choose either to study Expressive Studies and Expressive Enquiry or Design Studies and Design Enquiry.

For the Advanced Higher Studies Unit for both Expressive and Design Outcome 1, candidates are required to provide a brief explanation of why a particular area of art or design has been chosen for study. Candidates will then select two artists or two designers whose work relates to their chosen theme/stimuli/concept. Candidates then analyse two examples of art/design works by their chosen artists/designers. They are required to produce an action plan, including a timeline for carrying out research and investigation into their selected artists'/designers' work and present valid judgements about their artists' or designers' work and the contexts which influenced it.

Centres should note that for part of Outcome 1 for the Advanced Higher Enquiry Unit for both Expressive and Design, candidates are required to relate their work to their knowledge of artists/designers.

A large number of centres chose to record this evidence in a sketchbook format.

There was clear evidence of personal engagement by the candidates in their individual themes and use of materials and techniques. Unit work for the Advanced Higher showed exciting examples and explored a huge range of media and techniques. Some centres chose to deliver the Advanced Higher Unit in a very 'art school' manner. Due to the nature of the Advanced Higher Course some candidate evidence met more than one Assessment Standard. The course itself is fluid and flexible in nature and perhaps not as linear in approach in comparison to other levels.

Areas of misunderstanding

Issues arose regarding the amount of work required for Outcome 1 in Higher and National 5. Some centres are still passing Units which had not looked at two pieces of work by the two artists and two pieces of work by two designers.

Centres should be aware that at National 4, National 5 and Higher, in the Expressive Activity and in the Design Activity, Outcome 1 requires the candidates to study a minimum of two artists and two designers respectively, and two works by each artist and designer.

At National 3, however, candidates are required to study a minimum of two works by only one artist and two designs by only one designer.

If selected for verification for Advanced Higher, centres should note that only one Unit for Advanced Higher will be verified this will be either the Studies **or** Enquiry. The individual centre can choose which Unit they put forward for verification.

Outcome 2

For Outcome 2, centres were allowing candidates to experiment with a wide variety of different materials and techniques. There were no issues for candidates using a minimum of two different medias/techniques within the evidence produced for Outcome 2. This allowed candidates to be experimental especially with regards to the development stage. Although centres are meeting the minimum requirements quicker, some centres are choosing to produce over and above the minimum requirements. This is not an issue as long as candidates have met the minimum requirements and the national standard for that particular level then work can be passed thus freeing-up more time for candidates. However, on a whole, there was an excessive amount of work produced for the Advanced Higher Units. Centres should refer back to the UASPs and take note of what the minimum requirements are.

Genres/themes

It was evident that in most centres candidates exercised personal choice in their selection of artists/designers and art/design works to address the requirements. This personalisation allowed the candidates to identify and study suitable art/design works which would inform and support their practical work. There was clear evidence of personal engagement by the candidates in their individual themes and use of materials and techniques. Common genres tended to be: still life, portrait, body adornment, fashion, architecture etc. The use of traditional media and digital photography were also used to explore composition.

Candidates have been encouraged to explore and vary the scale of their investigative and compositional work in the Expressive Units.

Areas of strength/examples of good practice

The use of well devised design briefs helped candidates engage thoroughly in the design process and personalisation and choice led to a higher quality work. The A3 sketchbook approach to the Unit work was well utilised by candidates allowing them to keep a clear record of their progress through the Unit and make connections between Outcome 1 and Outcome 2.

Assessment judgements

The majority of centres were correctly entering candidates for the appropriate level. On a whole, centres had an excellent understanding of the national standards across all levels. In this round all centres were either 'Accepted' or 'Accepted*' in comparison to previous years where a small number of centres were 'Not 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 a whole, centres are confident in the national standards, what the minimum requirements are, and in making assessment judgements.

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 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 and 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 element of the 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. Both of which were acceptable.

03

Section 3: General comments

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

- ◆ Round 1 runs for the full month of February 2016 (National 3 to Advanced Higher Units).
- ◆ For Round 1, centres were selected for either National 3 to 5 or H and AH. The sample was six at each level. Therefore if centres were selected for National 3 to 5 the sample size was 18. Centres presenting candidates at

both Higher and Advanced Higher needed to prepare a sample of evidence for 12 candidates, split evenly between the two levels.

- ◆ If a centre was presenting at one level and there were fewer than 12 candidates, then evidence for all candidates at that level should be provided.
- ◆ If a centre was presenting at two levels and there were fewer than six candidates at any level, evidence for all candidates at that level should be provided. Where possible, evidence for additional candidates should be provided at the other level to make up an overall sample of 12.
- ◆ If a centre was presenting at three levels and there were fewer than six candidates at one of the levels but at least 12 candidates overall, then no further candidate evidence is required.
- ◆ Although SQA chooses what levels a centre is verified for in Round 1, the centre chooses which candidates they put forward for verification.
- ◆ For Round 1, Units will be Design or Expressive but not mixed within any one level, eg 6 x N3 Expressive, 6 x N4 Design and 6 x N5 Design.
- ◆ For verification to take place all candidates must have been assessed, passed or failed, for at least one Assessment Standard.
- ◆ Work does not need to be mounted but neatly laid out for verification and preferably labelled with the Assessment Standard it has been assessed at.
- ◆ The verifier will look at all relevant paperwork — including the centre's internal verification policy, assessment sheets, UASPs and all available evidence.
- ◆ Evidence can be paper or electronic or a mixture of 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.
- ◆ The verifier will look at the assessment judgements made by the centre; do they meet the national standards and have they met the minimum standards and outcomes that are stated in the UASPs?
- ◆ All Units are assessed, passed or failed by centres and are subject to external verification.
- ◆ Centres will assess the candidates' work and will keep a record of this stating what 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.
- ◆ Centres should **not** send Units along with Course assessment work.
- ◆ All Unit evidence should be kept by the centre until the 31 July of each year.
- ◆ The verification process is fully supportive and centres found the process to be very helpful and beneficial.
- ◆ [Understanding Standards Internally Assessed Art and Design Unit exemplars](#) (click on Art and Design Event presentations)



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Art & Design
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H204 National 4 Added value unit

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The added value unit has two outcomes: Outcome 1 Expressive; and Outcome 2 Design. The majority of centres had 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 and therefore the prior verification service was not required. In Art and Design, centres continued to use the published unit assessment support packs because they can choose their own context unlike other subjects where the task is specified.

Centres are clearly referring to the judging evidence tables in the unit assessment support packs and are working directly from these. Centres that have delivered the National 4 added value unit previously were able to meet unit requirements more quickly than in previous years. Work also tended to be more focused and relevant. In many cases, those centres delivering this unit for the second time encouraged candidates to produce highly detailed development work which exceeded requirements. 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 minimum 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.

Outcomes 1 and 2

For both Expressive and Design final art/design work demonstrated a wide range of themes, choices of media and techniques. In the majority of cases, candidates were easily exceeding the minimum standard for National 4. Clearly they had built on the experience gained within the National 4 Expressive and Design units. It was noted that in a number of centres the quantity of evidence produced exceeded minimum requirements at National 4.

The main reason for this was that centres considered some candidates to have the ability to produce artwork that would meet the standard for National 5 but that they were not likely to be able to pass the question paper element. In a number of such cases, candidates were achieving passes in one or both units at National 5 but were being presented for the National 4 added value unit in order to gain a National 4 course award.

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. Although centres were meeting the minimum requirements more quickly, some centres are choosing to produce over and above the minimum requirements. This is not an issue as long as candidates meet the minimum requirements and the national standard for National 4, then work can be marked as a pass.

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. These often demonstrated individuality in content and a number of centres commented that candidates were more engaged with their work as a result of personalisation and choice. 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.

Assessment judgements

The majority of centres were correctly entering candidates for the appropriate level. On a whole centres had an excellent understanding of the national standards across all levels. In this round all centres were either 'accepted' or

‘accepted*’ in comparison to previous years where a small number of centres were ‘not 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 minimum requirements are, and making assessment judgements.

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. Candidates were encouraged to reflect and evaluate on their final art and design works and they identified clearly areas that were successful and areas that were less successful rather than using purely descriptive language. Candidates were encouraged to use higher order thinking skills.

A large number of centres/candidates made good use of ICT/Photoshop within outcome 2 for Design; this engaged learners.

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 when each assessment standard was achieved. Some centres had developed their own assessment sheets, while some used the SQA assessment/record sheets. Other centres chose to use digital diaries to record pupil progress, all of which were acceptable. Student logs were also used to highlight next steps and learning targets for improvement.

03

Section 3: General comments

The aims of verification are to ensure standards are maintained, to 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 runs from March 2016 until May 2016.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ The National 4 added value unit is one unit with two outcomes: Expressive and Design.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ The verifier will look at all relevant paperwork — including the internal verification policy, assessment sheets, unit assessment support packs 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 unit assessment support packs.
- ◆ The verifier will look at the assessment judgements made by the centre — whether they meet the national standards and the minimum standards and outcomes that are stated in unit assessment support packs.
- ◆ 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 should assess a candidate's work and keep a record of this with which 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 only look at unit work and not course assessment work.
- ◆ Centres should **not** send units along with course assessment work for external marking.
- ◆ All unit evidence should be kept by the centre until 31 July each year.
- ◆ The verification process is fully supportive and centres found the process to be very helpful and beneficial.
- ◆ The Understanding Standards link for internally assessed Art and Design unit exemplars is: <http://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/45707.html>. (Click on: Art and Design event presentations.)