



Higher National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2018

Drama and Theatre Arts

Introduction

This report relates to the findings of external verification activity within the verification group — Drama and Theatre Arts (16). Specific units verified are listed below. Overall, the criteria were successfully met. However, there were some issues in relation to the robustness and implementation of internal verification and, in addition, the use of invalid instruments of assessment. Centres are advised to make use of SQA's prior verification service.

DG4T 34	Acting and Performance: Graded Unit 1
DG4V 35	Acting and Performance: Graded Unit 2
DP9R 35	Musical Theatre: Graded Unit 2
F3NN 34	Technical Theatre: Graded Unit 1
FA09 35	Technical Theatre and Production Arts: Graded Unit 2
DG3M 34	Acting for Camera
DG47 34	Production 1: Developing Skills
DG48 35	Production 2: Applying Skills in Performance
DG4A 34	Shakespeare in Practice
DP8V 35	Performance 2: Applying Skills for Musical Theatre
DP92 34	Theatrical Makeup
F387 34	Audio Visual Technologies for Performance
FA03 35	Stage Lighting and Technology
FA07 35	Technical Theatre and Production Arts: Work Placement
H1KV 35	Acting 2: Applying Skills in Performance
H1KW 34	Voice 1: Developing Skills
H1KY 34	Vocal Techniques for Musical Theatre 1
H4SJ 34	Acting 1: Developing Skills
H4TP 34	Professional Development for Actors
H90E 35	Vocal Techniques for Musical Theatre 2
D658 12	Preparation for Audition
F5KY 12	Drama: Acting Skills
F5L0 12	Acting through Song
F5L1 12	Drama: Movement Skills
F5LB 12	Drama: Theatre Skills in Performance
F5LF 12	Drama: Voice Skills
F5LG 12	Writing Dramatic Text: An Introduction
F691 12	Theatre History: An Introduction to Theory and Practice

Category 2: Resources

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 evidence of initial and ongoing reviews of assessment environments, equipment, reference learning, and assessment materials. Master folders were in place for all units.

Documented minutes contained evidence of ongoing reviews (and actions therein) along with candidate surveys. It was highlighted at one centre that there was no dedicated theatre space for assessment purposes.

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 matched candidates' development needs and prior achievements through interview and audition processes. Development needs were identified at an early stage and ongoing development needs were identified throughout practical and written exercises. Within graded units, candidates' ongoing development needs are identified by all centres through inherent mentoring sessions.

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

All centres offered candidates regular one to one meetings with their assessor to review their progress and revise their assessment plans accordingly. Spontaneous feedback was also given on an ongoing basis due to the large amount of practical activity involved in the awards. For graded units, feedback was incorporated through mentoring sessions. Candidate feedback from all centres confirmed that supportive and developmental feedback was given when required.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

Documented evidence was available in most centres to prove that the internal verification process was being implemented effectively for pre-delivery and ongoing verification. More than a few centres demonstrated a need to have a more rigorous implementation of their internal verification procedures.

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

Almost all centres demonstrated the effective selection and use of assessment methods and/or instruments of assessment ensuring validity, reliability, equitability, and fairness. Almost all centres had evidence of a pre-delivery internal verification process being implemented which ensured the suitability of the assessment method and/or instruments. The pre-delivery internal verification process was also applied where SQA assessment exemplars were in use. More than a few centres had issues with invalid instruments of assessment. In these cases, the instruments of assessment had not been sent to SQA for prior verification.

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

All centres had processes and procedures in place to ensure that it was the candidate's own work generated under SQA required conditions. All centres employed a signed disclaimer by the candidate relating to plagiarism. In addition, some centres used 'Turnitin' for candidates' written work.

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

Most centres made accurate and consistent judgements of candidates' work against SQA requirements. More than a few centres demonstrated a tendency to provide little or no assessor commentary on how assessment judgements had been made. Candidate evidence had to be re-marked where non valid instruments of assessment had been initially used.

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

All centres retained evidence in line with SQA requirements. All centres provided the requested candidate evidence and this was password protected where appropriate.

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

Most centres demonstrated effective dissemination of feedback from qualification verifiers. This was evidenced through minutes of standardisation/team/course committee meetings. More than a few centres lacked documented evidence of qualification verifier's reports being disseminated to assessors/verifiers.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

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

- ◆ Innovative use of project-based learning which enhanced collaboration and engagement and reduced the assessment burden for candidates.
- ◆ Use of a traffic light system to highlight candidate progress.
- ◆ Highly detailed developmental feedback using commentaries and highlighters.

Specific areas for development

The following area for development was reported during session 2017–18:

No specific areas for development were identified.