



External Assessment Report 2011

Subject	Graphic Communication
Level	Standard Grade

The statistics used in this report are pre-appeal.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published question papers and marking instructions for the Examination.

Comments on candidate performance

General comments

Understanding of accepted terms for British Standards (BS) building/architectural symbols remains inconsistent. Candidates must use the full BS term when answering questions. An update regarding this was sent to centres and it is apparent that some centres have adhered to this, resulting in greater use of the correct terms. However, there are still a number of centres where this updated information has not been implemented, resulting in candidates using incorrect symbol names. Centres are recommended to refer to this guidance, which is available from the Standard Grade Graphic Communication page of SQA's website.

The standard of draughtsmanship demonstrated across all levels, especially at Credit level, continues to require improvement. In particular, there continues to be no differentiation between outlines and construction lines in many candidates' work.

At General and Credit levels, there were a significant number of candidates who failed to complete all the questions. Once again, there continues to be evidence that a number of candidates are being presented at an inappropriate level, and centres are recommended to consider this carefully.

Many centres are using 3D CAD packages. Centres are reminded that the requirements of the CAD questions relate to 2D CAD only, as stated in the SQA Arrangements document for Standard Grade Graphic Communication. Centres should also be aware that when marking questions relating to software packages only the generic representation is acceptable, rather than specific software titles.

Areas in which candidates performed well

Credit

Question 1: Candidates performed well and demonstrated a clear understanding of this topic.

Question 4: Generally this area was well attempted and most candidates performed well.

Question 5 (b) and (c): Candidates proved to be knowledgeable in this area and performed well, achieving high results.

Question 6: This question proved to be a positive start to the drawing abilities element where many candidates performed very well, achieving high scores.

Question 7: Most candidates performed very well in this question. However there were a number of candidates who did not show any relevant or meaningful construction, displaying a lack of knowledge of this type of drawing.

Question 9: Many candidates performed well in this question. However, the standard of draughtsmanship proved to be poor which had a detrimental effect on performance.

General

Question 2: Overall, there was a good response to this question and many candidates achieved high scores.

Question 3: This was probably the best answered question in the General paper with many candidates attaining high scores.

Question 4 (b): This question was well attempted by most candidates.

Question 5: This question proved to be a very good choice for the first drawing abilities question where most candidates attempted the question and many achieved high scores.

Question 6: This question was well attempted. However, some candidates did not interpret the hidden detail correctly, positioned the middle shelf poorly and missed the end foot/base detail.

Question 7: Most candidates performed very well on this question achieving high scores.

Question 8 (a): There was a good response to this question with most achieving high scores.

Question 9 (b): A number of candidates achieved high scores for this part of the drawing.

Foundation

Questions 1, 2 and 3: As in previous years, the majority of candidates answered the KI section very well with many achieving high marks. The overall response to Question 1 proved to be particularly good with nearly all candidates achieving full marks.

Question 5: This question proved to be an excellent starting question for the drawing abilities element and challenged the candidates. Most attempted this question and only a few failed to perform well.

Question 7: This question was attempted very well by the majority of candidates. However, a number of those who did attempt it, increased the size.

Question 8: Many candidates performed very well in this question and achieved high scores.

Areas which candidates found demanding

Credit

Question 2: Many candidates did not attempt this question and generally the responses were not in line with the marking instructions. There appears to be a lack of understanding in a large majority of candidates with regards to the standards of dimensioning. The lack of understanding in this area is proving to be a recurring issue.

Question 3: A large number of candidates did not achieve full marks in this question. As in previous years, it appears many candidates had no knowledge of the hatching standards and thus opted for the incorrect section.

Question 5 (a): A number of candidates remain unclear what the marking expectations are for this question and as a result answered incorrectly. Centres should ensure that candidates refer to generic types of software as opposed to specific software titles.

Question 7: A number of candidates displayed little knowledge of constructing isometric circles and as a result achieved low scores in this question.

Question 8: Although a number of candidates performed very well in this question there was significant evidence many candidates lacked the knowledge related to this type of drawing to ensure accuracy. Again, appropriate construction methods and true lengths were not used well.

Question 10: Many candidates did not attempt part (b) of this question and about half of those who did attempt it performed poorly. Undoubtedly this question proved to be the most challenging in the paper, however there was evidence of excellent performance from some candidates.

General

Question 1: A number of candidates did not attempt all parts of this question and many of those who did attempt it performed poorly.

Question 4 (a): As in previous years, this question was poorly attempted by all candidates. It is clear that candidates are not referring to the correct BS symbol terms and are under-performing in this area.

Question 6: Some candidates did not interpret the hidden detail correctly, positioned the middle shelf poorly and missed the end foot/base detail.

Question 7: A number of candidates misinterpreted the front elevation detail and positioned it incorrectly on the oblique view. Some candidates did not half the sloping lines despite there being a note referring to this included in the question.

Question 8: Many candidates did not draw the true shape. However, of those who did, approximately half achieved full marks for this part of the drawing.

Question 9 (a): A number of candidates were unable to interpret the orientation and shape, consequently drawing the plan poorly.

Foundation

Question 4: A number of candidates performed poorly in this question and there appeared to be confusion with some of the line types.

Question 6: Many candidates did not perform well in this question. There was either a clear lack of knowledge of this drawing type (or confusion), where they started one face correctly but did not project the other face appropriately.

General

As mentioned earlier and in previous external assessment reports, the standard of draughtsmanship continues to be very poor across Foundation, General and Credit levels.

A large proportion of candidates do not distinguish between construction lines and outlines, and there is often little evidence of accurate measurement and transfer of measurements from a given view. This is a real concern, and there has been little sign of improvement over the past years. It is especially problematic for those candidates wishing to progress to Higher level where the penalties for not adhering to these standards are greater.

Knowledge and Interpretation (KI)

Areas of concern are:

- ◆ Knowledge of BS conventions. Teachers need to ensure that candidates only use the recognised BS terminology. SQA has published guidance indicating what is acceptable, and this is available from SQA's website.
- ◆ Applying dimensioning standards continues to be poorly attempted, and can be problematic for candidates wishing to progress to Higher level.
- ◆ Where appropriate, Credit candidates should give an explanation or description rather than providing single-word responses.

Drawing Abilities (DA)

Areas of concern are:

- ◆ Quality of draughtsmanship.
- ◆ Correct identification of hatching areas and correct use of hatching standards.
- ◆ Transferring of widths from plans to end elevations. This is fundamental but is very poorly attempted by a large number of candidates.

Statistical information: update on Courses

STANDARD GRADE

Number of resulted entries in 2010	8,506
------------------------------------	-------

Number of resulted entries in 2011	8,442
------------------------------------	-------

Statistical information: performance of candidates

Distribution of overall awards

Grade 1	16.3%
Grade 2	32.6%
Grade 3	27.7%
Grade 4	15.3%
Grade 5	5.5%
Grade 6	1.3%
Grade 7	0.1%
No award	1.2%

Grade boundaries for each assessable element in the subject included in the report

Assessable Element	Credit Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		General Max Mark	Grade Boundaries		Foundation Max Mark	Grade Boundaries	
		1	2		3	4		5	6
KI	40	28	22	35	17	13	30	19	15
DA	70	48	31	60	36	25	50	27	17