



Higher National and Graded units

Qualification Verification Summary Report 2019

Drama and Theatre Arts

Verification group 16

Introduction

This report relates to the findings of external verification activity within the Verification Group 16, Drama and Theatre Arts. The units verified are listed below.

Overall, all criteria were successfully met. However, there continue to be some issues in relation to the robustness and implementation of internal verification and in the use of non-valid instruments of assessment. Centres are strongly advised to make use of SQA's prior verification service when devising alternative assessments.

Centres are reminded to ensure candidates are choosing appropriately challenging performance pieces in graded units at SCQF levels 7 and 8.

DG4T 34	Acting and Performance: Graded Unit 1
DG4V 35	Acting and Performance: Graded Unit 2
DP9P 34	Musical Theatre: Graded Unit 1:
DP9R 35	Musical Theatre: Graded Unit 2
F3NN 34	Technical Theatre: Graded Unit 1
DG3M 34	Acting for Camera
DG3R 34	Acting for Radio
DG3Y 35	Directing a Text
DG48 35	Production 2: Applying Skills in Performance
DP8R 34	Musical Theatre Repertoire
DP8T 34	Performance 1 Developing Skills for Musical Theatre
DP8Y 35	Singing Skills for Musical Theatre 2
H1KW 34	Voice 1: Developing Skills
H1KX 35	Voice 2: Applying Skills in Performance
H1KY 34	Vocal Techniques for Musical Theatre 1
H4SJ 34	Acting 1 Developing Skills

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, and referencing, learning and assessment materials. Master folders were in place for all units. Documented minutes contained evidence of ongoing reviews (and actions therein) along with student surveys.

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 and where 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 indicating that the internal verification process was being implemented effectively for pre-delivery and ongoing verification. A few centres demonstrated a requirement to have a more rigorous implementation of their internal verification procedures.

Most centres demonstrated effective use of feedback from the internal verifier to assessor but more than a few provided little or no feedback which diminishes the opportunity for deeper learning and quality enhancement.

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/instruments of assessment, ensuring validity, reliability, equitability and fairness. Almost all centres had evidence of a pre-delivery internal verification process being implemented to ensure the suitability of the assessment methods/instruments. The pre-delivery internal verification process was also applied where SQA assessment exemplars were in use.

Some centres had issues with non-valid instruments of assessment. In these cases the instruments of assessment had not been sent to SQA for prior verification.

Very few centres were still using lapsed descriptors and assessment exemplars for graded units, and almost all centres were employing the new guidelines regarding the 50% capping rule. Where centres had not been employing the new rules regarding capping, there was no effect on candidate results. Centres are reminded that the most current SQA unit descriptors and assessment exemplars must be used.

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 ensuring it was the candidate's own work generated under SQA's required conditions. All centres employed a signed disclaimer by the candidate relating to plagiarism. 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 judgments of candidates' work against SQA's requirements. Some centres continue to provide little or no assessor commentary on how assessment judgements have been made. Candidates' evidence had to be re-marked where invalid 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.

Almost all centres demonstrated effective dissemination of feedback from qualification verifiers. This was evidenced through minutes of standardisation/team/course committee meetings. Very few centres lacked documented evidence of qualification verifier's reports being disseminated to assessors and/or verifiers.

Areas of good practice reported by qualification verifiers

The following good practice was reported during session 2018–19:

- ◆ Some centres produced evidence of very detailed and constructive feedback for candidates from the assessor on the mentoring checklists in graded units. This provided the candidates with the opportunity to engage in deeper learning.

Specific areas for development

There was no specific area for development reported during session 2018–19.