



NQ verification 2022–23 round 1

Qualification verification summary report

Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Drama
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	June 2023

National Course components and/or National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H231 73	National 3	Drama Skills
H232 73	National 3	Drama: Production Skills
H231 74	National 4	Drama Skills
H232 74	National 4	Drama: Production Skills

Section 2: comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

There continues to be some understanding of the application of national standards for National 3 and National 4 Drama, with candidates being offered a range of creative opportunities to develop the required skills to meet the demands of unit assessment.

Centres delivering the Drama Skills (National 3) unit provided some approaches to assessment that were designed and structured to provide the necessary support for candidates at this level. Approaches included step-by-step support relating to the required skill(s) for each assessment standard and differentiated resources to support candidates at this level.

Some centres have also developed digital approaches to assessment. These approaches clearly supported candidates to demonstrate their developing skills with opportunities for assessor feedback to be clearly visible.

A few centres had presented candidates with an approach that was not specifically designed for National 3 level. For example, presenting a National 3 candidate with an assessment

approach for National 4 level. These approaches often lack structure and signposting. This would be challenging for the candidate and would include skills, knowledge and understanding not required for National 3 level.

There was some evidence of candidates being offered the opportunity to explore production skills at National 3. However, from the evidence submitted for verification, the approaches did not support candidates to meet the requirements of the assessment standards at this level. Approaches to assessment were for National 4 and National 5 level and were clearly beyond what is required for National 3.

For Drama Skills (National 4) unit, approaches included evidence relating to all assessment standards and in some cases these approaches had been integrated to capture the required skills for more than one assessment standard in a single assessment. This range of evidence provided the opportunity to quality assure contrasting approaches to assessment including a diverse range of stimuli offered to support candidates' creative responses. There were, however, centres who did not offer the range of stimuli required for assessment standard 1.1, did not capture candidates' application of practical skills effectively for assessment standards 1.3 and 2.2, and were advised to make closer reference to the judging evidence table of the related unit assessment support pack to support candidates to reflect on their strengths and areas for improvement for assessment standards 1.4 and 2.4.

For the Drama: Production Skills (National 4) unit, the submitted approaches to assessment did provide evidence of some understanding of the skills, knowledge and understanding and standards necessary to meet the requirements of the unit. Some of the approaches lacked support and structure in the tasks offered to candidates and did not signpost in enough detail the specifics of the chosen production roles. Therefore, candidate responses lacked appropriate terminology and insight into their production concept for this level. Additionally, some centres failed to design approaches to assessment to clearly capture the candidates 'using/applying' production skills.

There was evidence submitted for verification to demonstrate the combined approach for both Drama Skills (National 4) and Drama: Production Skills (National 4) units. One centre developed their approaches using SQA's unit assessment support package 3: combined approach. These assessments related directly to the judging evidence table within the pack and supported candidates meeting the requirements of the assessment standards. Additionally, another centre used a centre-devised assessment to assess the unit(s).

It is also clear that some centre assessors are over assessing at both National 3 and National 4 level and putting greater demand on candidates than is necessary. Some assessors failed to label the assessments with the related assessment standard as required.

Assessment judgements

Unit verification requires the centre to make clear assessment judgements to accompany candidates' evidence, allowing the verifier to reach an informed decision that the centre is making reliable, consistent and valid assessment judgements which are in line with the national standard.

For some centres, there is evidence of reliable, consistent and valid judgements being applied to candidate evidence. In cases where the approach to assessment was specifically

designed to meet the requirements of an assessment standard, at the appropriate level, the centre assessor was able to judge the candidate evidence confidently and correctly by referring to the judging evidence table in the SQA unit assessment support pack. Where an assessment judgement was identified as being lenient or severe, this was, in most cases, due to the approach to assessment not supporting candidates in meeting the requirements of an assessment standard at the appropriate level or inconsistency of approach across all candidates in a cohort.

Section 3: general comments

Overall, centres submitted evidence which showed candidates meeting the requirements of most assessment standards.

In most cases, the evidence submitted was attributable to the assessment standard to which it related. Centres are reminded to label candidate evidence appropriately by indicating the related assessment standard on it.

SQA offers the opportunity for centres to submit digital evidence for verification. If centres have opted to submit candidate evidence using this platform and scan original evidence, there is an expectation that the evidence will be labelled with the assessment standard(s) to which it relates. Additionally, only evidence for the individual candidate should be uploaded under their name. It would not be appropriate for centres to create a file for multiple candidates and upload this multiple times.

If photographs are submitted as evidence, the candidate must be clearly visible and identifiable with some indication of the activity being explored.

There was some evidence of centres engaging with and applying internal quality assurance processes. A few centres are using local authority-level documentation, filtering this for use within their own centre and applying this in their subject-specific faculty or department.

Most centres are producing evidence of cross-marking and internally verifying approaches to assessment and judgements. However, there are ongoing inconsistencies in some centre's application of internal verification processes. This is evident where the approaches to assessment do not support candidates meeting the requirements of specific assessment standards at a specific level. This results in assessment judgements that are not reliable or valid.

There was evidence of some centres using the [Internal Verification Toolkit](#) on SQA's website to support their internal quality assurance processes.