



# NQ verification 2023–24 round 1

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Drama
Verification activity:	Event
Date published:	June 2024

### 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

Centres continue to demonstrate a range of approaches to assessment. Some of these approaches are appropriately designed to capture the skills required to meet the assessment standards. Overall, candidates are being offered a range of creative opportunities to respond, explore and develop drama skills and production skills.

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 or skills for each assessment standard and differentiated resources to aid and support candidates at this level.

Centres have also developed digital approaches to assessment. These approaches clearly support candidates to demonstrate their developing skills. Opportunities for assessor feedback were clearly visible. Where this was not the case, the centre presented candidates with an approach to assessment 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 is challenging for the candidate and would include skills, knowledge and understanding not required for National 3 level.

There was minimal evidence of candidates being offered the opportunity to explore production skills at National 3. The approaches to assessment clearly supported candidates to meet the requirements of the assessment standards at this level. Approaches to assessment were well laid out, role-specific and differentiated with the necessary prompts and structure to enable candidates to meet the requirements of the Production Skills (National 3) unit.

For the Drama Skills (National 4) unit, approaches to assessment included evidence relating to all the unit's assessment standards. 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 centres who failed to offer appropriate stimuli for assessment standard 1.1 and did not capture candidates' application of practical skills effectively for assessment standards 1.3 and 2.2. We advised those centres to make closer reference to the judging evidence table of the related unit assessment support (UAS) pack to support candidates' reflection on their strengths and areas for improvement for assessment standards 1.4 and 2.4.

For some centres there was evidence of the approach to assessment not fully supporting candidates to meet an assessment standard in its entirety; and not allowing the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate their skills in enough depth.

In contrast, there was evidence of over-assessing at National 4 level, with candidates being presented with multiple tasks for one assessment standard or candidates being presented with approaches to assessment for Drama Skills (National 5).

For the Production Skills (National 4) unit, the approaches to assessment 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. Also, as identified in previous event verification, some centres failed to design approaches to assessment to clearly capture the candidates 'using or applying' production skills.

Some centre assessors over assess at both National 3 and National 4 level and put greater demand on candidates than is necessary. The majority of submitted evidence still does have appropriate labelling of assessment standards on candidate responses.

### **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 that are in line with national standards.

For some centres, there is evidence of reliable, consistent and valid judgements being applied to candidate evidence; this was 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 UAS 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 the assessment judgement across all candidates in a cohort. All assessment judgements must be evidence based. Assessors can apply their judgements using a combination of candidate generated responses and assessor commentary. If assessor judgements rely heavily or solely on assessor commentary, these need to be specific to the assessment standard and skill being assessed, and in enough detail to capture the candidate's application of skills.

Some centres submitted complicated and complex systems relating to their assessment judgements, often grading candidates and applying marks to assessments. While this may support internal tracking and monitoring, it is not valid for unit verification. We remind centres that unit assessment is assessed as a pass or fail.

### **Section 3: general comments**

Centres submitted evidence that captured candidates' meeting the requirements of some or most assessment standards.

Some centres labelled candidate evidence appropriately by indicating the related assessment standard on it. **Centres must label candidate evidence appropriately by indicating the related assessment standard on it.**

SQA offer 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, the evidence must be labelled with the assessment standard or standards to which it relates. Only evidence for the individual candidate should be uploaded under their name. It is not appropriate for centres to create a file for multiple candidates and upload this file multiple times.

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

### **Key messages**

- ◆ National 4 Added Value Unit is not verified during round 1 event verification, as this is included in round 2 visiting verification.
- ◆ Centres must clearly identify the UAS pack they are using to assess the unit. Centres are often stating their unit assessment is 'centre devised' when the evidence shows it is clearly related to an existing UAS pack. If a centre wishes to develop their own unit assessments that differ significantly from SQA UAS packs, they should submit these to SQA prior verification service to ensure they are valid, reliable, and equitable.
- ◆ Centres must submit the corresponding approaches to assessment to that indicated on the candidate sample form, candidate responses and candidate assessment records.

Submitting incorrect approaches to assessment will result in a not accepted verification outcome, as is not possible to verify the associated approaches or judgements made.

### **Internal verification**

- ◆ There is some evidence of centres engaging with and applying internal quality assurance processes.
- ◆ Few centres are adjusting local authority level documentation to use in their own subject-specific faculty or department.
- ◆ Most centres are producing evidence of cross-marking and internally verifying approaches to assessment and judgements.
- ◆ There are on-going inconsistencies in some centres' 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, and this has not been identified during internal verification. This means that centres are applying assessment judgements that are not reliable or valid.



# NQ verification 2023–24 round 2

## Qualification verification summary report

### Section 1: verification group information

Verification group name:	Drama
Verification activity:	Visit
Date published:	June 2024

### National Units verified

Unit code	Unit level	Unit title
H233 74	National 4	Drama Performance: Added Value Unit

### Section 2: comments on assessment

Centres continue to be well prepared for the verification visit, with candidate evidence available and well organised. There is generally a clear understanding of the application of national standards for this unit and candidates are given a range of opportunities to perform well. Visiting verification continues to be a very positive experience and suggests that centres are approaching the Added Value assessment with greater confidence. The majority of candidates presented for assessment had chosen acting as their preferred skill.

#### Assessment approaches

Where centres have both National 4 and National 5 candidates working alongside each other for the performance, this arrangement generally has a positive impact on the quality of National 4 responses. It is encouraging to note there are less instances where centres have presented National 4 candidates with a sole textual extract from which to develop their performance. Most candidates are being presented with a range of creative starting points for their performances, resulting in candidates meeting the requirements for assessment standard 1.1.

For assessment standard 1.2, centres are presenting candidates with a range of approaches to assessment. It is clear that the approaches to assessment that have been specifically designed and developed to meet the requirements of this assessment, continue to be most

successful in generating appropriate or necessary evidence for the range of production roles available.

For assessment standard 1.3, evidence continues to be predominantly recorded material. Most centres provide digital evidence for this assessment standard of good quality with candidates clearly identifiable in the footage. In many cases, this evidence had been accompanied with assessor comments or checklists giving further insight into candidates' application of skills.

For assessment standard 1.4, 'Reflecting on their work and that of others', centres should ensure that the requirements of this assessment standard are fully met. Candidates should be supported in their responses while reflecting on their strengths and areas for improvement. In addition, they should be given the opportunity to reflect on the contribution of two others within the production team. Centres are best supported in approaching this assessment by referring directly to the unit assessment support pack judging evidence table.

### **Assessment judgements**

Visiting 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 national standards.

For most 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, the centre assessor was able to confidently and correctly judge the candidate evidence by referring to SQA's unit assessment support pack. Centre assessors are reminded that all assessment judgements must be consistent across all candidates in the sample.

### **Section 3: general comments**

In general, centre staff have a clear understanding of the standards for the Drama Performance (National 4): Added Value Unit.

Overall, centres were well prepared for the visit and keen to ensure they had sufficient evidence for all assessment standards being verified.

Positive feedback continues to be received about this model of visiting verification, allowing one-to-one dialogue between the visiting verifier and internal assessors. Centre staff showed a keenness to engage in professional dialogue and took the opportunity to have their questions or concerns discussed.

### **Key messages**

For assessment standard 1.1, there is an expectation that candidates respond to a range of stimuli and not, as in some cases a single stimulus.

Candidate performances must be sustained for the required 10 minutes.

Centres should be aware of the need to adapt the approach to assessment where candidates develop a script extract. This could be by extending the extract, and/or inserting devised material. There should be awareness of the extract being appropriate for National 4 level and all production roles.

There continues to be a need for centres to support candidates further in generating evidence of their awareness of form and structure. Additionally, the design of rehearsal logs should include appropriate signposting for the range of production skills.

It is essential that centres refer directly to the judging evidence table in SQA's unit assessment support pack for clarity in developing appropriate approaches to assessment.

Centres must label candidate evidence appropriately by indicating the related assessment standard on it.

### **Internal verification**

There was some evidence of centres engaging with and applying effective internal quality assurance processes. Some centres are using local authority level documentation, filtering this for use within their own centre and further applying this within their subject-specific faculty or department. Where centres had a rigorous system in place, this impacted positively on both development of approaches to assessment and the consistency of assessment judgements.

Centres should use SQA's [Internal Verification Toolkit](#) available on SQA's website to support their internal quality assurance processes.