Higher National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2017
Make-up Artistry

Introduction

HN Make-up Artistry

D92Y 34   Make-up Artistry: Applied Hairdressing 1
DP30 34   Make-up Artistry: Basic Make-up Skin Care and Eye Treatments
DP31 34   Make-up Artistry: Fashion and Photographic Make-up
F0JG 35   Make-up Artistry: Special Effects

One centre was subject to HN unit verification.

All assessment evidence seen fully met SQA unit assessment requirements. All evidence was well set out and well presented, evidence was in hard copy, and digital images were all of a good standard. Areas of good practice included use of design sheets, PowerPoint presentations, and consultation sheets. Digital evidence was of a good standard.

The following areas of good practice were identified:

D92Y 34 Make-up Artistry Applied Hairdressing 1

♦ Excellent student feedback

♦ Consultation sheets with assessor comments

♦ PowerPoint presentation of evidence supporting sustainability

♦ Assessor feedback was included within the slide supporting oral feedback in all units

DP30 34 Make-up Artistry: Basic Make–up Skin Care and Eye Treatments

♦ Design sheets

♦ Consultation sheets in PowerPoint presentations ensuring all evidence is presented in digital format

DP31 34 Make-up Artistry: Fashion and Photographic Make-up

♦ PowerPoint presentations supporting sustainability and presenting evidence in same digital format

F0JG 35 Make-up Artistry: Special Effects

♦ Presented with high-quality digital evidence

♦ Evidence was very detailed and demonstrated skills development and process very well

♦ Evidence presented was of a good quality and showed significant strengths

DP9T 34 Graded Unit 1 Fashion Make-up HNC

Six centres were verified for HNC Graded Unit 1 Fashion Make-up. Evidence over all centres was of a good standard. In almost all of the centres, marking schemes were being used well. Advice was given to one centre using a previous marking checklist, which had been revised, and this was explained to centre staff. All centres were reported as having significant strengths.

Both HNC and HND are currently being revised.

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.)

N/A for the HN awards.
This was not a requirement for the units which were verified, but almost all centres provided qualification and CPD folders which showed evidence that required CPD is being carried out, ensuring currency of training in the specialist subject area.

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

All centres provided evidence showing that effective processes are in place to review assessment environments. Staff meet regularly in all centres to discuss all aspects of courses, and specifically unit requirements. All centres also carry out annual course reviews which identify action and resource requirements, taking account of candidate feedback.

All centres have good make-up studios where teaching areas are designed to reflect industry needs, and give an excellent environment for learning and teaching. Yearly reviews are carried out, and in some centres learners are involved in the reviews to ensure any concerns they have are identified and actions put in place where required.

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 learners had personal learning plans (PLPs) or development plans at induction stage, and any identified needs were recorded and support put in place. Most centres have a dedicated learner support department where all learners receive any help which is required. In all centres if any need is identified support is put in place. This is recorded and all staff have access to the record of identified needs and support in place. All learners are encouraged at interview to request support if required.

Almost all centres have visits from make-up artists from industry; this gives excellent opportunities to understand what is required within the make-up industry. Most assessors have good links with the make-up industry, which offers learners opportunities for work placements and employment. In all centres candidates' prior achievements are identified at recruitment interview stage, taking any APL into consideration. Candidates interviewed also confirmed this to be college procedure. Most learners who started the HNC Course this session progressed via NQ Make-up Artistry, Beauty or Hairdressing courses.

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

In all centres learners have regular meetings with assessors and most have a specific guidance session each week. Progress is monitored with agreed amendments made as required to meet individual candidate needs to support achievement.

Within the sample chosen there was an international learner who has English as a second language, who was well supported throughout the course.

As a requirement of the graded unit, mentor meetings take place with each learner, following the submission of each stage (planning, developing, and evaluation) of the graded unit. In all centres records of mentoring meetings were available, and all showed supportive feedback to learners.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

In almost all centres a robust assessment and internal verification policy and procedure is in place and is fully implemented. In almost all centres pre-delivery, and on-going standardisation meetings took place. All required documentation was available and fully meets SQA requirements.

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

All centres were using SQA developed assessment support packs (ASPs) for the units seen, and also for the graded unit. Assessment evidence showed that the ASP assessment evidence was being used effectively.

For the graded unit most learners had produced evidence in electronic format. Some of the portfolios seen in the graded unit also had video links. In most centres there was also a diary where learners had shown their journey throughout the unit. While not assessment material, this was an excellent tool when completing the evaluation stage of the unit. In almost all centres the standards used in marking guidelines for the graded unit of the portfolios to determine A, B and C grades were being used effectively. The graded unit has an SQA-developed marking guide which assessors had used to give excellent feedback and justification for grades given. All evidence seen was valid; all required evidence was in place and was assessed to the required standard; reliable marking guidelines showed evidence was consistently assessed throughout; all assessment instruments were practicable; all learners had constructive feedback and learners have a clear understanding of unit needs; all evidence seen had been marked to the requirements of the unit specification, internal verification was carried out and supported this; all learners had regular meetings, and reviews and feedback showed that all learners felt they were treated in a fair manner. In almost all centres planning and development show a good understanding of unit needs. In some centres when evaluation was carried out to obtain part of

the assessment evidence, some learners reflected more on the evaluation of the day of the photo shoot and less on overall evaluation; this was discussed with the centres and it was agreed that this could be reviewed for future delivery.

The instrument of assessment is a practical assignment, as identified in the unit specification. The mark allocation for the planning and developing stages had been reviewed, but in one centre staff had not been aware of this, and therefore outdated mark percentages were being applied for these stages. The external verifier confirmed the current percentages which should be applied: planning 30%, developing 50%, evaluation 20%.

In one centre learners had been guided to produce three images: photographic, fashion, day/evening. The constraints this placed on learners were discussed.

In one centre a learner had achieved 100% in the marking process, and the college had added this to the sample. It was agreed that this portfolio was of an excellent standard and was worthy of the 100% mark given.

Criterion 4.4: Assessment evidence must be the candidate's own work, generated under SQA's required conditions.
In a few centres learners were provided with a centre handbook with guidance and authenticity statements for them to view and sign.

In a number of centres a malpractice policy is in place which gives guidance on what constitutes malpractice. Most centres have a plagiarism contract which learners sign for each project.

In all centres practical performance evidence has assessor observation checklists, and assessors observe performance evidence using assessor observation checklists, thus ensuring authenticity.

A few centres use Turnitin as a tool to ensure validity of written assessment evidence.

Criterion 4.6: Evidence of candidates' work must be accurately and consistently judged by assessors against SQA's requirements.
In all centres evidence available showed that a consistent approach is in place in the assessment of learners' portfolios. Feedback to learners in reviews, and effective use of marking guidelines show that all assessed evidence has been accurately and consistently assessed in line with SQA requirements. Records of assessed work and internal verification records support this. Assessors use SQA developed instruments of assessment which have been internally moderated in the pre-delivery process, or prior verified where centres are using centre-developed assessment instruments.

In all centres records of standardisation meetings and internal verification records ensure standard practice across the sector and ensure consistent, reliable assessment decisions are being made.

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

In all centres requirements for assessment evidence retention are in place, and centres hold evidence folders in a safe environment. Learners' evidence is kept for the external verification visit, according to the SQA processes. Almost all centres retain evidence for a longer period, in line with centre policies and procedures.

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

All centres have processes in place to ensure that all staff are informed after qualification verification reports are received. Meetings take place and all information from reports is disseminated to staff. Evidence available from most centres would suggest that any recommendations are implemented before the next academic session.

In a few centres SQA reports are disseminated to staff at monthly team meetings to discuss findings and set actions, and share good practice across campuses.

In almost all centres reports are also stored on a shared drive, to which all staff have access.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

♦ Clear and concise internal verification planning ensures standardisation across campuses and teams.
♦ Monthly cross-campus meetings ensure standardisation of delivery and assessments are a priority.
♦ Electronic format of all portfolios seen were of a high standard.
♦ Dedicated learning support ensures that any needs are identified and relevant help put in place.
♦ Links within the make-up industry give learners good opportunities to broaden experience within the industry and answer employment needs.
♦ Question and answer sessions at beginning of unit show all learners have a clear understanding of the graded unit requirements.
♦ Evidence of a very high standard of recording process, detailed assessment schedules and delivery planning.
♦ Extensive use of e-folio templates for candidate referencing.
♦ Excellent internal verification electronic system, which highlights all units for verification, capturing all relevant activity across the college; this is particularly helpful for new assessors and on new delivery.
♦ In-depth narrative was provided to exemplify/justify considerations relating to additional mark allocation above the minimum for each stage.
♦ Learning and Teaching Summary Form was excellent, showing Core Skills and how they were implemented in practical classes.
♦ Use of blog to encourage learner engagement with lecturing staff.
♦ Candidate participation in extracurricular activities which enhance their programme of study.

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2016–17:

♦ Ensure that all learners understand the need for overall evaluation of the whole unit, not just the running order of the day of the photo shoot.
♦ Carry out internal verification sampling at different submission stages.
♦ Carry out pre-delivery internal verification to ensure the percentage mark allocation for each stage of the graded unit is up to date.
♦ Review unit specification to ensure learners have clear guidance on graded unit requirements.
♦ Ensure current marking percentages are applied when making assessment decisions for all stages of the graded unit.
♦ Acknowledge SQA on 'house styled' documentation for copyright purposes.

- Consider depth of content against minimum criteria and broad level-related descriptions for a project when adding and justifying additional marks.
- Exemplify with the use of narrative justification for marks allocated.
- Consider digital style boards.
- Form links with a centre that has been delivering the award to share good practice.
- When double marking, put in place a mechanism to capture feedback following sampling and discussions between assessor and internal verifier.
- If a discrepancy is identified in an SQA assessment exemplar, the unit specification is the document that should be followed; note any discrepancy in internal verification documentation and seek clarification from SQA as required.
- Remove mark allocation for interpretation of the brief from PowerPoint used to induct learners to the unit.
- Use current checklist (marking guidelines) as contained in the assessment exemplar pack when making assessment decisions.