Higher National and SVQ

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017
Clothing and Textiles (35)

F3HR 34   Fashion Design and Manufacture: Graded Unit 1
F295 35   Fashion Technology and Manufacture with Design: Graded Unit 2
F1RF 35   Textiles: Graded Unit 2
G9M3 22   SVQ Manufacturing Textile Products
GA0A 23   SVQ Kilt Making
GA09 22   SVQ Leather Production
GJ7J 23   SVQ Leather Production

Introduction

Three centres delivering Higher National units F3HR 34 Fashion Design and Manufacture: Graded Unit 1, F295 35 Fashion Technology and Manufacture with Design: Graded Unit 2 and F1RF 35 Textiles: Graded Unit 2 were externally verified. All centres met the full range of SQA Quality Assurance criteria, indicating a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the National Standards at the appropriate level of the award. There was a standardised approach to delivery, assessment and internal verification in all centres. There was evidence of improving standards.

Six centres delivering G9M3 22 SVQ Manufacturing Textile Products, GA0A 23 SVQ Kilt Making, and GA09 22 and GJ7J 23 SVQ Leather Production were externally verified. Almost all centres met the full range of SQA Quality Assurance criteria, indicating a clear and accurate understanding of the requirements of the National Standards at the appropriate level of the award. The standards were good or very good in almost all centres. There was evidence of deteriorating standards in a very few centres where there was a lack of understanding of the Quality Assurance criteria and requirements of the award. This was caused by failure to conduct internal verification and undertake relevant assessor continuing professional development

(CPD). There was a standardised approach to delivery, assessment and internal verification in almost all centres.

F0JK 04 Maintain Health and Safety at Work is a key unit across all levels of each award. It was evident from talking to candidates, assessors and verifiers in centres that all had a very good awareness of the importance of Health and Safety in the workplace – fault reporting, emergency evacuation procedures, manual handling, and isolation of faulty machinery.

Category 2: Resources

Criterion 2.1: Assessors and internal verifiers must be competent to assess and internally verify, in line with the requirements of the qualification.

(This criterion should be completed for regulated qualifications only.)

Almost all centres had appropriately qualified assessors to deliver the SVQ awards and almost all were receiving appropriate CPD in line with the requirements of the qualification. In a very few centres there was no evidence of formal assessor qualifications or CPD activity to ensure industrial currency in line with assessment strategy requirements. Appropriate professional and vocational CPD activities in almost all centres ensured that they maintained currency. Almost all centres had appropriately qualified verifiers to internally verify the award and very few centres had no evidence of internal verification taking place. Assessor and verifier qualifications and CPD records were available for centres who met this criterion. One assessor "work shadowed" colleagues to gain subject knowledge throughout the company.

Criterion 2.4: There must be evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments; equipment; and reference, learning and assessment materials.

Almost all centres had effective ongoing reviews of the assessment environment(s), assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials. Centres had fully-equipped workrooms, pre-delivery checklists, standardisation minutes, and internal verifier reports which detailed the review of the assessment environment. These centres were able to fully meet the criterion. In a very few there were no pre-delivery checklists, standardisation minutes or internal verifier reports and there was insufficient evidence to meet this criterion.

Category 3: Candidate support

Criterion 3.2: Candidates' development needs and prior achievements (where appropriate) must be matched against the requirements of the award.

All centres identified candidate prior achievements and development needs and matched them to the relevant qualification. There was a good awareness of the need to provide alternative

arrangements for candidates who required additional support due to factors such as language barriers, or written and/or oral communication difficulties. In college centres, candidates are referred to learning support as and when required.

Criterion 3.3: Candidates must have scheduled contact with their assessor to review their progress and to revise their assessment plans accordingly.

Almost all centres provided candidates with effective scheduled contact with their assessor and supplied evidence that assessment planning and progress review occurred. Signed and dated candidate tracking sheets, reports and logbook entries confirmed that candidates had regular scheduled contact with their assessor to review progress. Very few had no records to review candidate progress and revise assessment plans accordingly. Almost all centres recorded written evidence of clear, supportive and encouraging discussions. In almost all centres candidates used a logbook to record and reflect on their own assessment progress.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

Criterion 4.2: Internal assessment and verification procedures must be implemented to ensure standardisation of assessment.

Robust internal Quality Assurance policies and procedures on assessment and verification were documented and implemented by almost all centres, in line with SQA requirements. In centres which met this criterion, verification was robust. There was interim and end of unit internal verification. Regular recorded meetings with the assessor to discuss assessment decisions and to review candidate progress ensured that standardisation was effective. In Higher National qualifications, all assessment instruments were approved by the internal curriculum group before use, and some centres used the SQA prior verification service. Higher National award centres used hard copy and electronic format on the VLE giving candidates and staff online access. Standardisation minutes in almost all centres confirmed that verifiers and assessors had regular discussion regarding candidate evidence. Clear marking schedules, constructive feedback and support was provided in most cases. In a few there was no evidence of the centre's assessment and verification procedures being applied, as there were no standardisation meetings or applicable internal verification records. Where this occurred the criterion was not met.

Criterion 4.3: Assessment instruments and methods and their selection and use must be valid, reliable, practicable, equitable and fair.

All centres used the most appropriate assessment instrument. Relevant design briefs and practical product evidence, with annotated photographs of the process, was the most appropriate assessment instrument in many centres. In others, observation checklists, written responses, reflective log, annotated diagrams and photographs were more appropriate. All

ensured a valid, equitable and fair assessment. A few centres also used a timed practical exam to test the students' skills and knowledge. Some centres used SQA's prior verification of assessment materials service to ensure that assessment instruments were appropriate.

Criterion 4.4: Assessment evidence must be the candidate's own work, generated under SQA's required conditions.

In almost all centres signed induction checklists, expert witness testimony, photographic evidence, assessment checklists, classroom observations of the project development, feedback in mentoring sessions, assessor question checklists with the candidates' responses and internal verification minutes all authenticated candidate evidence which had been generated under appropriate assessment conditions. In one centre a lack of recorded evidence meant it was not possible to authenticate candidate work and the centre was unable to meet the criterion.

Criterion 4.6: Evidence of candidates' work must be accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA's requirements.

Almost all centres recorded accurate and consistent assessment judgements against the assessment strategy and SQA requirements. The integrity of the qualification was ensured by use of portfolios of candidate evidence, signed and dated candidate logbooks, tracking sheets and clear marking guidelines to aid standardisation, and internal verifier reports. Lack of recorded evidence in a few instances did not ensure the integrity of the qualification.

Criterion 4.7: Candidate evidence must be retained in line with SQA requirements.

All centres retained candidate assessment evidence in line with SQA requirements for the purposes of internal and external verification. Almost all centres had retained a variety of checklists, reports, minutes of meetings, photographic evidence, portfolios, and product evidence.

Criterion 4.9: Feedback from qualification verifiers must be disseminated to staff and used to inform assessment practice.

Almost all centres disseminated External Verification and Development reports to relevant staff and implemented the feedback given. Almost all centres discussed and recorded the report at team meetings, and if there were any 'actions' these would be actioned within an agreed timescale. In a few centres, failure to disseminate the information and implement development points did not inform assessment practice, and previous recommendations discussed were not implemented and the centre was unable to meet the criterion.

Areas of good practice report by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2016–17:

♦ Assessor 'work shadowing' colleagues to gain subject knowledge
♦ Centre with multiple sites standardising assessment decisions by exchanging candidate logbooks
♦ Use of SQA prior verification of assessment service
♦ Standardisation log which tracked the impact of changes
♦ Clear and detailed mentoring evidence between assessor and candidate

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2016–17:

♦ In SVQs ensure appropriate Assessor and Internal Verifier qualifications
♦ CPD to ensure compliance with the SVQ Assessment Strategy and SQA Quality Assurance criteria
♦ Contact SQA if unsure of the Quality Assurance criteria
♦ Centres which are unsure of the assessment standards are encouraged to benchmark with other centres
♦ Conduct regular review and standardisation meetings
♦ Produce a schedule with specific mentoring dates