National Qualifications

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2022

Creative Industries

Verification group number: 400

Introduction

This report relates to external verification activity within the Creative Industries Verification Group (400).

The small team of external verifiers focused on the Foundation Apprenticeship and especially the units of its component National Progression Award. In most cases there was evidence of good practice. This was most evident where there was good communication and co-ordination amongst schools, training centres and employers.

All but one of the visits were virtual, and there was less interaction with candidates than would have taken place under normal circumstances. Centres were often praised for their creative responses to the challenges caused the by the COVID pandemic and their use of communication technology to maintain good contact with learners.

In all but two of the visits High Confidence was identified in the maintenance of SQA standards in relation to resources, candidate support and internal assessment and verification. In two visits there was only Broad Confidence in the maintenance of standards in Internal Assessment and Verification. Through the course of the year steps were taken to address where the responsibility lay between the partners involved: the schools, the council and training provider.

During the session, 17 verification visits took place, and the following units and group awards were verified:

Workplace units

H6PH 04   Use Digital and Social Media in Marketing Campaigns
H6PG 04   Communicating Using Digital Marketing/Sales Channels

NQ Units

H6NX 04   Work effectively with others in the Creative Industries
HE0E 46   Creative Industries: Understanding a Creative Brief
H6MV 75   Creative Industries: An Introduction – Scotland
F5D1 12   Media: Understanding the creative process
HH7T 46   Storytelling for the Creative Industries

Group Awards

GM69 46   Foundation Apprenticeship in Creative and Digital Media SCQF level 6
GM16 46   NPA in Creative and Digital Media: Technologies, Processes and Practice SCQF level 6

There was no external verification of mainstream Higher National qualifications.

There was quality assurance activity as part of the Higher National Next Generation pilot programme. This is beyond the scope of this report.

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.

In the one centre where Workplace units were verified, staff were qualified and competent in the occupational area and working towards the assessment and verification wards in an appropriate timescale.

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

In all cases there was evidence of ongoing review of the assessment environment(s) assessment procedures, equipment, learning resources and assessment materials at centres.

Specific mention was made of when candidates had access to creative production facilities, and good practice was further identified where centre staff contributed to the development to of the FA within a Skills Development Scotland Forum. The benefits of an effective partnership of a college and its external partners was also noted.

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 against the requirements of the award, and many instances of good practice were recorded in EV reports. These covered a range of activities, including the development of assessment programmes designed for individual learners.

Colleges, schools and training providers were often recognised for the partnership work done in recruitment of candidates, ensuring that candidates understood the qualifications and were suitably qualified to begin them.

Induction often took place before courses commenced. In some cases, student video testimonials helped inform candidates and shape their expectations. There were many references to the recognition of, and informed response to, specific learner needs.

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

All centres ensured that there was scheduled contact with candidates throughout the life of the qualification.

This was another area where many examples of good practice were noted.

There were two broad themes. Firstly, the support and mentoring provided by tutors with expertise in the vocational areas and experience of working with students in the limited time available in physical learning settings. And secondly, how information communication technologies were used to enhance and support the learning process.

Category 4: Internal assessment and verification

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

In most centres assessors and internal verifiers apply their centre's assessment and verification processes. There was clear evidence of effective internal assessment and verification taking place, and evidence that processes were mostly recorded appropriately, often using shared folders and electronic portals.

In some centres it was unclear where the responsibility for internal verification lay in a partnership between centre, local authority and training provider, and consequently the external verifier noted an amber response in this criterion and requested further evidence of the implementation of effective procedures.

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

All centres demonstrated the effective selection and use of methods and instruments of assessment. Assessors drew on a range of SQA sources, specifically unit specifications and assessment support packs. Internal verification ensured that assessment was valid, equitable and fair.

There were some instances of good practice which included the use of ICT, integrated and holistic assessment practice, the development of meta skills and the value of industry relevance.

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 evidence on which assessment judgement is made belongs solely to the candidate. Candidates were often required to sign disclaimers and codes of practice to authenticate their electronic

submissions. Assessors worked directly with their candidates and were able to verify through questioning and witnessing in class activity.

There were many instances of good practice which focused on the provision of real briefs from third party clients. This, together with the practical nature of the project work, encouraged the candidates to take ownership of their projects and appreciate where learned theory informed professional practice.

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

All centres made accurate and consistent assessment judgements. Care was taken to ensure that the correct criteria for assessment were being implemented, and that internal verification procedures identified and resolved issues during the delivery of the qualifications.

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

All centres were retaining candidate evidence effectively. Evidence was available as required for internal and external verification. Centres were all retaining evidence for at least the period defined for the qualification.

In discussion with some centres, external verifiers advised that that the over-enthusiastic retention of candidate evidence might contravene General Data Protection Regulations.

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

The results of qualification verification were made known to staff in all centres. Different methods were implemented, depending on the size and complexity of the centre and its partners.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2021–22:

♦ Alignment of project work with industry practice.
♦ Industry placements.
♦ Use of live briefs from real clients.
♦ Candidates able to produce work in a number of creative media.
♦ Development of meta skills.
♦ Encouragement of candidate self-reflection.
♦ Support for candidates with mental health needs.
♦ Open and honest discussion in environment candidates understand as safe.
♦ Use of video testimonials.

- Use of ICT to co-ordinate and better understand candidates' work.
- Various approaches designed to encourage candidates to take responsibility for their own progress.

Specific areas for development

The following areas for development were reported during session 2021–22:

Overall, some centres were encouraged to ensure that they made better records of their internal verification procedures.

4.2 In some centres it was unclear where the responsibility for internal verification lay in a partnership between centre, local authority and training provider.

4.4 Consider the use of online authenticity checker.

4.6 Development of matrices of assessment identifying where candidate work refers to outcomes across different units and assessors.

4.7 Some centres were advised to respect GDPR in relation to the retention of candidate evidence.