



# **NQ Verification 2013–14**

## **Key Message Reports**

<b>Verification group name:</b>	Fashion and Textile Technology
<b>Levels</b>	N3 to N5
<b>Date published:</b>	July 2014

**This Report combines all Verification Key Messages for the academic session 2013-14.**



# NQ Verification 2013–14 Key Messages Round 1

01

## Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Fashion and Textile Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	January 2014

### National Courses/Units verified:

H24V 73/74/75      Fashion and Textile Technology: Textile Technologies

H24X 74      Fashion and Textile Technology: Item Development

02

## Section 2: Comments on assessment

### Assessment approaches

Centres have made good use of assessment records and candidates' observational checklists. A range of quality of feedback was given to candidates. Some feedback was very detailed, but some was too brief.

All centres sampled used the Unit-by-Unit approach, but many are considering using the combined or portfolio approaches for next session.

There was good evidence of internal verification and good record keeping. Some centres had a system of 'blind' internal verification, and sharing of judgements amongst the whole department. Some centres performed internal verification by co-teaching and team marking. Internal verification processes were effective and identified key assessment issues. Accurate records were kept in all cases, some very detailed.

## Assessment judgements

The assessment judgements sampled were generally in line with the Assessment Standards. Centres made very good use of the Unit assessment support packs and candidate observational checklists. The level of accuracy in decision making was generally good, with minimum competency generally being correctly identified.

Some centres were concerned that a fully-functional but inaccurately stitched item was not of a sufficient standard to merit a Unit pass, eg a pocket with secure backtacks and no gaps, but slightly crooked stitching. Minimum competence was discussed in the context of Units being judged on a pass/fail basis, and centres were reassured that the grading system for the Course assessment would allow for differentiation regarding level of accuracy and quality.

For the Textile Technologies Units, some candidates were working on items which were complex enough to meet the Assessment Standards for the level above that at which they had been entered. Advice was given regarding recognition of construction processes, and the level of entry for these candidates.

For the Item Development Unit, some centres were given advice about criteria for a clear design brief. These centres had not used the examples given in the Unit assessment support pack, and had not understood that the candidate evidence needs to show a clear link to a chosen fashion trend in order to fully meet Assessment Standard 1.2.

03

## Section 3: General comments

Most centres were using current versions of the documentation. The majority of centres showed excellent practice in record keeping and the quality of feedback given to candidates. Most provided very good evidence of internal verification.

Many textile items were made to a very high standard and most centres offered a good range of activities to promote personalisation and choice.

Some centres provided candidates with excellent additional support materials. Some had also used a number of detailed photographs in candidate workbooks.



# NQ Verification 2013–14

## Key Messages Round 2

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Fashion & Textile Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	March 2014

#### National Courses/Units verified:

H24V75 Fashion & Textile Technology: Textile Technologies

H24X74 Fashion & Textile Technology: Item Development

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Centres made good use of assessment records and candidates' observational checklists. Feedback to candidates ranged from instances that were very detailed to some that was thought to be too brief.

Some centres had not completed candidate assessment sheets as they were awaiting clarification/confirmation from verifiers.

All centres sampled used the Unit-by-Unit approach, but many were considering using the combined or portfolio approaches for next session.

There was good evidence of internal verification and good record keeping.

## **Assessment judgements**

Assessment judgements sampled were generally in line with Assessment Standards. Centres had made very good use of the Unit assessment support packs and candidate observational checklists. The level of accuracy in decision making was generally good, with borderline passes generally being correctly identified.

Centres were still concerned about what is 'minimum competence' of candidate's practical work.

03

## **Section 3: General comments**

Most centres were using current versions of documentation. The majority of centres showed excellent practice in record keeping and quality of feedback given to candidates. Most provided very good evidence of internal verification.

Many textile items were felt to be made to a very high standard, and most centres offered a good range of activities to offer personalisation and choice.

Some centres had provided candidates with excellent additional support materials, and some had used a number of detailed photographs in candidate workbooks.

# NQ Verification 2013–14

## Key Messages Round 3

01

### Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Fashion and Textile Technology
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting verification
Date published:	June 2014

#### National Courses/Units verified:

Fashion and Textile Technology (National 4) Added Value Unit

Fashion and Textile Technology (National 5) Course assessment

02

### Section 2: Comments on assessment

#### Assessment approaches

Centres have made good and consistent use of the assessment support documents and marking instructions. All centres had used the 2014 briefs and candidate workbook. Candidates had been offered all three briefs, which facilitated personalisation and choice. Most centres had also used the candidate guide, had kept very good observational records and provided a good range of photographic evidence. All centres had used the marking sheets provided in the assessment support pack.

#### Assessment judgements

Centres had used the marking instructions and applied them consistently. Some had filled-in highly detailed information on assessment judgements, others were briefer but still valid. Accurate records had been kept and there was good evidence of internal verification at most centres. The level of accuracy in decision-making was generally good. However, in the National 5 Course assessment, some centres had double-penalised candidates when allocating technique marks (2 c), and the standard of quality section (2 d). Centres were advised that if a candidate has completed a technique, they should be awarded

marks according to the Construction Techniques Marking Instructions. If they complete the technique to a poor standard, this should be reflected in the 'standard of quality' marks, and they should not be penalised in section 2 c. Some centres were also given advice over criteria for awarding marks for investigations, such as identifying sources of information, asking multiple questions and drawing progressive conclusions.

03

### **Section 3: General comments**

Several National 4 candidates were identified as having completed a fashion/textile item with enough construction processes, and to a high enough degree of competency, to be suitable for National 5. Centres had considered candidates' overall abilities regarding both sewing skills and supporting work, and most candidates had been entered at the right level to suit their strengths.

There was an excellent range of projects completed for each brief, with the Fancy Dress Item for a Teenager being the most popular. The verification team were very impressed by the quality and creativity of many of the items produced by candidates.

Some centres had issues with digital media: some files were lost from cameras and memory sticks. Centres are reminded that it is best practice to keep back-up copies and/or printouts of evidence.