



**National Certificates, Higher National Qualifications and Scottish Vocational Qualifications**

**Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018**

**Clothing and Textiles**

## Introduction

### National Certificate Units

FP21 11	Fashion: an Introduction
FP5A 12	Fashion Illustration: Basic Principles
FP5N 12	Develop and Manufacture: Skirt
E88J 10	Hand Sewing Skills
D0RX 11	Introduction to Sewing Machine Skills

### Higher National Units

F18X 33	Garment Construction Techniques: an Introduction
H31D 34	Fashion: Textile Technology
F18W 34	Fashion: Commercial Design
F18E 34	Production Processes in the Clothing Industry: An Introduction
F18M 34	Textile Techniques: an Introduction
F193 34	Printed Textiles: an Introduction
F26W 34	Fashion Illustration: an Introduction
F18C 34	Fashion Forecasting: Research and Development
F1P8 35	Complex Pattern Development and Customisation
FIF4 35	Designing and Producing Fashion Garments: Advanced
F1F2 35	Concept Garment Design: Advanced
F18B 35	Surface Decoration for Textiles: Advanced
F192 35	Printed Textiles: Advanced

### Higher National Graded Units

F2EJ 34	Fashion: Design and Production with Retail: Graded Unit 1
F2EK 35	Fashion: Design and Production with Retail: Graded Unit 2
HD7L 35	Costume for Stage and Screen: Graded Unit 2
F1RF 35	Textiles: Graded Unit 2

### SVQs

G9M2 21	SVQ Manufacturing Textile Products
GA0A 23	SVQ Kilt Making
GL2H 22	SVQ Leather Production

Two centres delivering five **National Certificate Units** 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, and evidence of improving standards in most centres from previous external verification. The level of skills demonstrated was a true reflection of the national standards in the award and credited candidates with the appropriate National Certificate Units.

Four centres delivering 13 **Higher National Units** were externally verified. An integrated approach to assessment was used in almost all centres giving learners the opportunity to explore a 'brief' in greater depth, integrating skills and knowledge from a wider range of units. Assessment evidence 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 in centres previously verified. The level of skills demonstrated was a true reflection of the national standards in all awards and credited candidates with the appropriate Higher National Units.

Four centres delivering four **Higher National Graded Units** 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 consistent marking of assessed evidence in more than a few centres delivering the same award and evidence of improving standards from previous external verification. The level of skills demonstrated was a true reflection of the national standards in all awards and credited candidates with the appropriate Higher National Graded Units.

Five centres delivering a range of **SVQs** 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. One centre was non-compliant. There was a standardised approach to delivery, assessment and internal verification in all centres and evidence of the high standards of candidate and centre evidence from previous external verification being maintained. The level of skills demonstrated was a true reflection of the national standards and credited candidates with the appropriate SVQ Units in their various vocational areas.

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 machinery if working on 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.**

Almost all centres had appropriately qualified assessors and internal verifiers to deliver the SVQs and were undertaking appropriate CPD. In a few centres additional internal verifiers are required. In a few centres, some internal verifiers had not completed their Internal Verifier qualification within the expected timescale. Evidence of formal assessor qualifications and CPD activity was available to ensure industrial currency in line with the assessment strategy requirements. Appropriate professional and vocational continuing professional development activities ensured that centre staff maintained currency.

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

All centres had effective ongoing reviews of the assessment environment(s) assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials for award delivery. Centres had fully equipped workrooms, pre-delivery checklists, standardisation minutes, and internal verifier reports, which reported the review of the assessment environment. Improvements could be made in more than a few centres such as securely logging and filing records of meetings and reviews. Good practice identified included minutes of monthly sampling meetings that provided a detailed record of learning, assessment decisions and trainee-assessor decisions.

## **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, written and/or oral communication difficulties. In college centres, candidates accessed learning support as and when required. Good practice was evidenced in motivating learners to build on skills developed in a previous study trip.

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

All centres provided effective scheduled contact with their assessor and 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. Almost all centres had written recorded evidence of clear, supportive and encouraging discussions. In most centres candidates used a logbook to record and reflect on their own assessment progress. Very detailed written mentoring feedback to learners and a reflective personal statement summarising skills learned and how to overcome difficulties were noted as good practice in some centres.

## **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 all centres in line with SQA requirements. In most there was interim and end-of-unit internal verification. Interim verification would further support learner assessment decisions in some centres. Regular recorded meetings with the assessor to discuss assessment decisions, candidate progress and reviews ensured that standardisation was effective. In some centres an internal curriculum group approved all assessment instruments before they were used. A few centres used SQA's prior verification service. Higher National award centres used hard copy and electronic format on their VLEs giving candidates and staff online access. Standardisation minutes in all centres confirmed that verifiers and assessors had regular discussions regarding candidate evidence. All centres provided evidence of clear marking schedules, constructive feedback and support in all candidate feedback on assessment decisions. In a few centres double-marking of all learner evidence at the various stages of the graded unit was highlighted as good practice. It was recommended in a few centres that learners are encouraged to be more 'self-aware' of acceptable garment production standards before presenting their work for assessment.

### **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. A relevant design brief 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. Some centres used SQA 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 all centres, signed induction checklists, expert witness testimony, photographic evidence, assessment checklists, classroom observations of the project development, feedback in mentoring sessions, assessor question checklist with the candidate response, and internal verification minutes all authenticated candidate evidence generated under SQA's required conditions.

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

All centres recorded accurate and consistent assessment judgements against the assessment strategy and SQA requirements. Portfolios of candidate evidence, signed and dated candidate logbooks, tracking sheets and clear marking guidelines to aid standardisation, and internal verifier reports ensured the integrity of the SQA qualification. Workplace standardisation events to minimise disruption to the employer and increase assessor participation was noted as good

practice. In a few centres, the frequency of standardisation meetings had decreased and could affect candidate certification.

**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. All centres had retained a variety of checklists, reports, minute 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.**

All centres disseminated external verification and development reports to relevant staff from qualification verifiers and implemented the feedback given. All centres discussed and recorded the report at team meetings and if there were 'actions' these would be completed within an agreed timescale.

## **Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers**

The following good practice was reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ use of SQA prior verification of assessment services
- ◆ clear and detailed mentoring evidence between assessor and candidate
- ◆ monthly sampling meeting
- ◆ motivating learners to build on skills previously developed
- ◆ very detailed written mentoring feedback
- ◆ reflective personal statement summarising what was learned and how to overcome difficulties
- ◆ double-marking learner evidence at the various stages of the graded unit
- ◆ workplace standardisation events to minimise disruption to the employer and increase assessor participation

## **Specific areas for development**

The following areas for development were reported during session 2017–18:

- ◆ increase the number of appropriate internal verifiers
- ◆ complete training timeously
- ◆ securely log and file centre records
- ◆ conduct interim review and standardisation meetings
- ◆ encourage learners to be more 'self-aware' of acceptable garment production standards before presenting work for assessment
- ◆ increase the frequency of standardisation meetings to minimise 'risk' to candidate certification