



NQ Verification 2016–17

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Design and Manufacture
Verification event/visiting information	National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher — Visiting National 4 — Event
Date published:	June 2017

National Courses/Units verified:

C719 77	Advanced Higher	Project (Course Assessment Task)
C719 76	Higher	Assignment (Course Assessment Task)
C719 75	National 5	Assignment (Course Assessment Task)
H22W 74	National 4	Assignment (Added Value Unit)

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

All centres used tasks provided by SQA.

National 5

One centre used the old marking instructions. Updated course assessment tasks were issued in September 2015. Centres should check that they are using the most up to date documents before candidates start the task.

National 4

One centre used the old marking instructions. Updated course assessment tasks were issued in August 2016. Centres should check that they are using the most up to date documents before candidates start the task.

Assessment judgements

A large majority of centres made assessment judgements which were in line with the national standard.

National 4

Verification was carried out at a central event.

Centres should note that there is no 'range' in the bands, eg for 'exploring and refining ideas' only 0, 3, 6 or 9 marks may be awarded.

National 5

Verification was carried out by visiting verifiers. The majority of centres made reliable judgements. However, a significant number of centres were lenient in their judgements.

Design Skills

Section 1: Marks awarded for ideas were generally in line with the national standard.

Section 2: Marks awarded by a number of centres for development were very lenient. A number of candidates had been awarded marks in the top bands when there was very limited evidence of exploration, knowledge of materials and manufacturing, application of knowledge of design issues or ongoing review of ideas. For exploration, simply changing shapes and rounding corners will not allow candidates to access marks in the top band. Simplistic exploration leaves the candidates with little opportunity to apply any knowledge. Many candidates were incorrectly awarded marks in the top bands even although their design proposal showed almost no change and contained no more detail than their original idea.

Section 3: Marks awarded for communication were generally in line with the national standard.

Section 4: Marks awarded for evaluation of the design proposal were generally in line with the national standard. It should be noted that marks are awarded to the design proposal, not to initial ideas or ongoing development. Candidates may base their evidence on the proposal within their folio, the finished practical model or both. Many candidates made no reference to the specification and simply described what they had done. To gain marks in the top band the evaluation must be based on valid evidence, eg comparison against specification, testing or opinion of others.

Practical skills

Marks awarded for all sections of practical skills were generally in line with national standards. However, a few centres were lenient in their judgements.

It should be noted that in these sections, the candidates are assessed on their practical skills and that the proposal developed in Sections 1–4 (design skills) must allow them to demonstrate these skills. Assessors should remind candidates of this before they undertake the design task and during the development stages.

Section 5: Marks awarded for measuring and marking out were generally in line with the national standard. However, a few centres awarded marks when there was very little evidence of measuring or marking out; eg candidates had been supplied with all parts cut to size and had simply assembled the parts or the project was very simple and did not allow the candidate to demonstrate the assessable skills.

Section 6: Marks awarded for using hand and machine tools were generally in line with the national standard. However, a few centres awarded marks when there was limited demonstration of skills. This was often the result of a very simple project which did not allow candidates to demonstrate the assessable skills. The level of assistance given by teacher or technician must also be taken into account, eg marks should not be awarded if material has been cut on the band saw by the teacher.

Section 7: Marks awarded for assembly of components were generally in line with the national standard. However, a few centres awarded marks when there was limited level of skill demonstrated/required in the assembly of the components. This was often the result of a very simple project which did not allow them to demonstrate the assessable skills.

Section 8: Marks awarded for finishing were generally in line with national standard. A few centres were severe with their judgements, deducting marks for very minor blemishes on other very well finished complex projects.

Higher

Verification was carried out by visiting verifiers. The majority of centres made reliable judgements. However, a number of centres were lenient in their judgements. The major issue was that a number of candidates carried out very little exploration or refinement, simply making very minor changes to one of their initial ideas. This impacted on marks for Sections 2–6.

The Design Information Record (DIR) should be completed by candidates before they undertake the task. The information on the DIR can be used to generate a specification that provides much of the direction for the exploration and refinement of the proposal.

The following points should be noted:

Section 1: Marks awarded for generating ideas were generally in line with the national standard. A few centres were lenient in their judgements, awarding marks in the top band when there was very little evidence to support this at Higher level. As indicated in the marking instructions, marks are awarded for the range, creativity and diversity of ideas not the quality.

Section 2: Marks awarded by a significant number of centres for exploring and refining ideas were lenient. Marks were often awarded even although the design proposal was virtually the same as an initial idea. Marks were often awarded for

superficial development, eg where there was a lot of repetition or lack of detail of component parts.

Section 3: Marks awarded for applying graphic techniques were generally in line with the national standard. A few centres were severe with their judgements, deducting marks for minor flaws in a graphic even although the body of work demonstrated very good application of graphic skills.

Section 4: Marks awarded for applying modelling techniques were generally in line with the national standard. A few centres were very lenient in their judgements, simply awarding marks for models that had been produced but had not been used to develop the proposal. Marks are not awarded for the quality or presence of models, but for how the candidate has applied them to develop their solution.

Section 5: Marks awarded by a number of centres for applying materials and processes were lenient. Marks were often awarded even although the design proposal was virtually the same as an initial idea. Marks were often awarded for listing details of materials or processes. Marks are awarded for the use of the knowledge in developing the proposal.

Section 6: Marks awarded by a significant number of centres for applying knowledge and understanding of design issues were lenient. Marks were often awarded even although the design proposal was virtually the same as an initial idea. Marks were often awarded for listing details of design issues. Marks are awarded for the use of the knowledge in developing the proposal.

Advanced Higher

Verification was carried out by visiting verifiers. All centres made reliable judgements.

03

Section 3: General comments

There was clear evidence of internal verification procedures in most centres. However, the following points should be noted:

- ◆ Checking of arithmetic should be part of the internal verification process
- ◆ The mark agreed by the internal assessor and internal verifier **for each** section should be clearly indicated. The agreed mark should be arrived at through discussion and reference to the band descriptors. The mark should not be an average or the highest so that the candidate 'gets the benefit of the doubt'. The final mark agreed between the assessor and internal verifier must be clear.

Some centres had used other centres for internal verification. Although this is sound approach, assessment judgements must always be benchmarked against the SQA exemplars using the detailed marking instructions.