![SQA logo]

NQ verification 2022–23 round 1 and 2

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Art and Design
Verification activity:	Visit
Date published:	June 2023

National Course components and/or National Units verified

Course/Unit code	Course/Unit level	Course/Unit title
H202 73	National 3	Art and Design: Expressive Activity
H204 73	National 3	Art and Design: Design Activity
H202 74	National 4	Art and Design: Expressive Activity
H204 74	National 4	Art and Design: Design Activity
J1YA 75	SCQF level 5	Art and Design: Expressive Activity
J1YC 75	SCQF level 5	Art and Design: Design Activity
J23A 75	SCQF level 5	Art and Design: Design Activity with a Scottish Context
J222 76	SCQF level 6	Art and Design: Expressive Activity
J223 76	SCQF level 6	Art and Design: Design Activity

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

Nearly all centres at all levels chose to follow the unit-by-unit approach, with one centre choosing to follow the portfolio approach.

Verifiers identified good practice through a variety of approaches. The opportunity for personal choice in terms of expressive and design themes clearly supported candidate engagement. The opportunity to explore personal themes within a wide variety of considered design briefs, which were clear and achievable with appropriate thematic context, provided candidate choice and appropriate levels of independence.

Verifiers noted that selecting artists and designers for outcome 1 who clearly influenced outcome 2 (in terms of approach, technique, style and/or working methods) provided support and cohesion for candidates. This approach allowed candidates to explore appropriate materials, media and techniques in relation to the chosen artists or designers, producing work that showed focus and quality.

A number of centres developed booklets and appropriate support materials to assist candidates when gathering and producing evidence for outcome 1. This was noted in both expressive and design units at all levels. Mind maps were increasingly used by centres to support candidates in identifying their expressive theme for outcome 2.

A number of centres presented work that exceeded the minimum amount of work required in terms of volume. Centres are reminded that there are minimum requirements for each assessment standard that will allow candidates to produce the appropriate evidence required.

There were minor issues with centre-generated assessment records, specifically, issues with the transfer of assessment standards; this led to a lack of clarity, information, and incorrect application of assessment judgements. Centres are advised to use the SQA candidate and class assessment record documents located in the unit assessment support packs.

There were issues with centre understanding of the requirements of the units. This was mainly linked to the unit modifications put in place for session 2022–23. Centres should fully engage with the documents, paying particular attention to the course specifications and unit assessment support packs, which will include the modifications to assessment that are remaining from session 2023–24 onwards.

Inconsistent use of candidate assessment records and record keeping was noted as a concern, when assessed candidate evidence did not tally up with judgements made against assessment standards. Anomalies were also noted on the Verification Sample Form, which did not reflect the assessment judgements made on the candidate assessment record. Centres must note that the visiting verifier requires a 'pass' or 'fail' record only for each candidate based on the most recent assessment of that candidate's evidence.

Robust assessment and internal verification procedures should stop these issues from occurring and impacting on verification outcomes.

Assessment judgements

Nearly all centres had assessment judgements in line with national standards and were deemed to be reliable and accepted. It was clear to verifiers that centres were making very good use of the judging evidence tables to support assessment decisions. Verifiers noted that written feedback by assessors and internal verifiers in relation to each assessment standard proved to be an excellent way to support the learning and teaching process and to clarify assessment decisions. Many centres used this process to give clear feedback to candidates and to provide information on next steps.

There were some issues with candidate assessment records where a 'fail' was noted on the Verification Sample Form, even though all of the assessment standards up to that point had

been passed by the assessor and internal verifier. Centres must note that although the unit was incomplete at this interim stage, the candidates should have been judged as a 'pass' on the Verification Sample Form to reflect this interim position based on the evidence from the most recent assessment.

'Pass' or 'fail' is required on the Verification Sample Form for each candidate; the use of 'complete' or 'incomplete' is not acceptable.

Section 3: general comments

Visiting verifiers noted a consistently clear organisation and layout of candidate evidence and paperwork. This was helpful to verifiers when viewing evidence and assessment judgements.

There was good practice in terms of differentiated resources, prompts and supporting documentation, which clearly supported candidates who had a wide range of abilities. These varied approaches allowed candidates to be successful in meeting the requirements and assessment standards.

Success was identified in both expressive and design units when candidates had opportunities to make personal decisions and choices. These opportunities lead to increased candidate engagement in researching and investigating designers, artists, design briefs and expressive themes.

A wide and varied range of materials, media and techniques were observed in expressive unit evidence for still life, portraiture and the natural environment. It is clear that candidates who had the opportunity to experiment with a range of media explored appropriate visual elements that suited their subject matter.

Dry media such as pencils, pen, chalk, and oil pastels, along with collage, were complemented by wet media such as acrylic, watercolour, printmaking, and pen and ink. Clay and ceramic work was noted along with digital media techniques and photography.

In design units, there were creative and exciting examples using various approaches, such as paper manipulation techniques, printmaking, digital media, modelling, and low relief techniques. Media varied from traditional design media, ceramics, and digital to a focus on low cost materials and recycling using corrugated card, paper, string, match sticks, and straws.

This personalisation and choice engaged and encouraged candidates throughout the unit. As candidates progressed with their unit work, they began to develop ownership and play to their strengths, developing confidence and refinement.

Verifiers noted thorough and robust approaches to internal verification, with both SQA and centre-devised candidate assessment records being used. It is good practice to have candidate assessment records which note assessment evidence with comments and feedback signed and dated by the assessor. This should be followed up with the evidence being checked, dated, and signed by the internal verifier. These approaches should be adopted by all centres as they provide excellent opportunities for quality assurance and to give feedback to candidates on their unit progress and next steps.

It was noted as good practice when centres planned to assess candidates at suitable strategic points throughout the school year in accordance with departmental, faculty or school policy.

There was collaboration between centres in terms of the verification of assessment standards. The professional dialogue was clear to see in terms of detailed records. This approach is particularly important to develop and maintain within single-person departments where the internal verifier is a non-subject specialist.

Most centres have an internal verification policy in place. Art and Design departments should consider developing a bespoke policy that meets the needs of their setting and candidates. Further information is available on [SQA's internal verification toolkit website](#).

Centres must be fully prepared for the requirements of a verification visit and have all the necessary documentation and assessment evidence as outlined in the visit plan. Verifiers are available to fully discuss the procedures and the requirements of the visit in advance of the agreed date. It is concerning to find a centre who has little, or no evidence assessed prior to a verification visit. Centres should make the verifier aware of any issues prior to a visit taking place to allow support to be provided.