

Senior Moderator Report - Central Moderation

Senior Moderator:

Peter Linton

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Lead Officer:

Roderic Gillespie

Qualification area

**Subject(s) and Level(s)
included in this report**

Graphic Communication – Standard Grade

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

The moderation team is made up of experienced moderators. This year there were no new moderators.

Procedures

Session 1:

Organising the room and conducting the standardisation meeting

Session 2:

Senior Moderator provides close support to individuals throughout

Session 3, 4 & 5:

Moderation and report writing

Session 6:

Printing and checking clerical work & organizing envelopes.

52 centres were targeted at moderation; slightly more centres were selected for moderation this year compared with last year. The folios from 2 centres had not arrived at SQA by the time the moderation event commenced.

The process of providing feedback to those centres who passed moderation but who were very close to the tolerance for the national standards was continued. Among the moderation team, it is felt that there is merit in providing advice to these centres.

It is reassuring to see centres moderated over consecutive years are taking the advice offered on-board. However, despite specific feedback on problem areas, a small number of centres continue to fail moderation or come very close to failing moderation.

Specific issues identified

Common assessment trends

Internal assessment was more accurate than in previous years with fewer centres (2) requiring re-assessment.

Arithmetic errors and errors in completing the Ex5 (flyleaf) were more varied than last year.

Examples include;

- no grade entered on the Ex5 flyleaf. Empty boxes were more common this year than in recent years
- incorrect selection of candidates when compiling the sample
- the use of half grades eg 1.5
- the use of grade 8 on the flyleaf
- flyleaf grades not corresponding with entries on the SGER00.

Feedback was provided to centres that made the above errors. This will be followed up at the next

moderation event; these centres will be selected again to ensure that there is no longer any ambiguity regarding the flyleaf.

Although some centres utilised the space for the teachers' comments, it is felt that in some centres there is still room for improvement. The moderation team welcome the teacher's comments on the Flyleaf. An explanation of the candidate's input or the extra support provided by the teacher facilitates the moderators when making a decision on the centres assessment procedures.

Recommendations to be considered for the future

The change of location (from Dalkeith to central Glasgow) was not well received by the moderation team. Travelling time was increased for most moderators (even those living closer to Glasgow) and parking is difficult and expensive. Otherwise, the venue was good and the support provided was, as usual, excellent. The Senior Moderator would like SQA to consider returning the event to Dalkeith next year.

The Senior Moderators request to have a printer in the moderation room was not met by SQA. To ensure quality and accuracy of moderation reports, it is suggested that a computer and printer (in good working order) are made available to the Senior Moderator during the moderation event. This would prevent the inconvenience of having to save reports to floppy disc which are then printed from printers elsewhere in the building. The current IT situation is likely to lead to errors when amendments are made and originals and copies have to be changed. The whole process is unnecessarily complex, time consuming and cumbersome.

Feedback to centres

The overall standard of work submitted for moderation was better than that of last year.

More centres have made progress in computer graphics and there is evidence that centres are better preparing candidates for the challenges they will face in the Higher and Intermediate 2 courses.

It is encouraging that more centres have adopted a strong creative approach to learning. The quality and depth of treatment of work from those centres whose candidates were involved in creating or designing their work (graphs and charts, layout, display etc) was far superior to that from schools where teacher led/controlled work is the norm. It is clear that this creative approach provides a better route to Intermediate 2 and Higher Grade.

A greater number of centres provided evidence of strong work across the entire folio. Previously it was more common for a centre to be strong in one area e.g. *manual rendering and display* but less confident in another e.g. *computer graphics*.

Specific comments on each topic

Topic (a) Graphs and Charts

The topic was generally well done and assessment was, in the main accurate. Better use is being made of graphs and charts across the folio (display, CAG for Display, Layout and Lettering etc). There is also more evidence that pictorial computer graphics and computer-generated illustrations are featuring in this topic. Teachers appear to be expanding into NQ territory by giving candidates experience in the kind of areas that they will require to be familiar with at Intermediate 2 and Higher levels.

For further information on this topic and topics **(d), (e) and (i) Layout and Lettering, Display and CAG for Display**, please refer to the SQA publication; **Standard Grade Graphic Communication Illustration and Presentation: Advice for Centres, issued February 2001.**

Topic (b) Use of Colour

Candidates from a number of centres are not providing a justification for their selection of colours. This is a crucial part of the assessment in this topic at all levels. Failure to do so can lead to failed moderation and re-assessment. Due to the frequency with which this justification is missed out, it is extremely difficult of moderators to provide feedback to all individual centres.

Topic (c) Shading, Toning and Rendering

There is evidence of very strong work in a small but growing number of centres. However, in some centres there is still an over dependence on the use of photocopy masters which are traced and then rendered or simply rendered onto the photocopy. This can create difficulty in finding evidence on which to base a grade for draughting.

The strongest work in this topic is found in centres where the candidates sketch or draw their own outlines.

Topics (d), (e) and (i) Layout and Lettering, Display and CAG for Display

Although it does occur, it is encouraging to see that there is less evidence of candidates copying exemplar materials. Centres are becoming more creative and more confident in combining illustrations, text and backdrops to create layouts and displays with visual impact and clarity. Candidates' own, original displays and layouts dominated the sample this year.

Again it is pleasing to note that centres are using Graphs and Charts for assessment in these topics. Time is saved, the quantity of work is reduced and the quality throughout the portfolio is generally improved.

Topic (f) Modelling

It is pleasing to see that more centres are adopting a creative approach to this topic. A creative approach allows candidates the freedom to design their own models and is by far the most successful. Candidates taught in this way demonstrates better build quality, they invariably produce more complex and appropriate.

Modelling in some classes is teacher led; this is evident where all students produce the same model (e.g. a house or kitchen unit). This style of delivery does not challenge the most able candidates and the models they produce do not exemplify the full extent of their ability. Similarly less able candidates do not perform as well in teacher led exercise, some struggle to construct a presentable model.

Topic (g) Computer-Aided Draughting

Assessment in this topic is generally very accurate. Compared with previous years centres are producing more work at the standard required for Credit Level. This would suggest an increased understanding of standards. There is more evidence of quality orthographic drawings that include: a variety of line types; hidden detail; dimensioning; textual information and the projection of complex forms.

Pictorial CAD work has also progressed. Centres are producing work that would fit neatly into the Intermediate 2 course and prepare candidates for Higher Graphic Communication. Pictorial illustrations are also becoming commonplace. The CAD line drawing is more readily evaluated if the centre provides the CAD line drawing of the CAG illustration. If all centres provided this information it would facilitate moderation decisions.

Topic (h) CAD using a Library

Floor plans and plan views of marinas, racing circuits and housing developments etc are common and more demanding of the upper level candidates. There is an increase in the complexity and quality of work.

A small number of centres submitted work that was produced using an illustration programme, without the use of a library. Centres are reminded that candidates at all levels **must** use a **CAD Library** in order to be successful in this area.

Centres are again reminded that CAD library items must come with a key, legend or a short note to indicate the candidate's input. This knowledge is crucial to assessment in this topic. Centres who did not provide this information but who awarded marks for it frequently had their assessment downgraded.

Topic (j) Draughtsmanship

In some cases, over-dependence on photocopies or tracings to aid manual work made it difficult to justify the grades awarded (see note on shading and toning). Often the orthographic CAD drawing was the only evidence of the candidates' own, original, draughting. A creative approach, which integrated drawing, sketching and illustration, provided good evidence at upper grades. The teacher/worksheet led approach did not.

Centres are reminded that while assessment is based on draughtsmanship across the portfolio, the grade awarded should not be less than the grade awarded for items that rely heavily on draughtsmanship; including Topic (g) Computer-Aided Draughting.

A small number of centres included orthographic or pictorial, pencil line drawings (drawing board work) as evidence in this topic. Centres are reminded that formal drawing skills are assessed in the course examination. Technical drawings do not provide useful evidence in the portfolio; they should not be used in the internal assessment of illustration and presentation and will not be considered during moderation.

Central Moderation Statistics

Moderation activity

Total number of moderators in the team:	8
Total number of centres moderated:	52
Total number of centres accepted:	43
Total number of centres not accepted:	9

Comments on moderator performance

The moderation team is experienced and efficient. The Standardisation meeting runs very smoothly and the Senior Moderator provides support throughout and to each moderator individually on the first day, to ensure that the national standards are being applied consistently across the team.

Each member carried out his duties effectively. The team is very supportive of one another and will discuss issues and standards throughout the event.