



Internal Assessment Report: Graphic Communication

Assessment Panel: Technical Education

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.

Standard Grade

SG Graphic Communication

Element/Coursework moderated

Illustration and Presentation Portfolio

Feedback to centres

General comments

Nine centres were selected and all were submitted and verified. The team found a broad spectrum of work including strong Credit level submissions and a few examples at Foundation level. The centres sampled often had obvious strengths and, in most, the work across topics was of a consistent quality and depth of treatment. In a few centres there were clear inconsistencies between the quality of computer-generated and manual items; computer-generated being significantly stronger in those centres.

Assessment was more accurate this year: there were no re-assessments or arithmetical errors in the calculation of grades; and in all but one case the internal assessment flyleaf was completed correctly. Feedback was appropriate and provided to all centres.

Again the creative process was evident in many topics and the best graphic design work at Credit level was strong. While this augurs well for progression to the Higher Course there was also evidence that less able candidates are being encouraged to create interesting graphic layouts and progression through Intermediate 2, and this is clearly an option for many of these candidates.

All General level folios were complete (no items missing) and the quality of work was appropriate to the level. Foundation level folios again contained items of a General level standard but were, without exception, incomplete. It is clear that the determining factors in Foundation level assessments are the costly gaps in the folio.

The space for the teachers' comments on the internal assessment flyleaf was again more widely used. Teachers took the opportunity to clarify the candidate's input and where extra support was provided by the teacher. This feature can help explain assessment anomalies and always makes verification more straightforward. The additional knowledge can only contribute to accuracy and fairness during verification.

Advice on good practice and areas for further development

There were more folios with around 10 discrete items as opposed to 20 discrete items. This is to be encouraged. It gives candidates more time to improve the quality of work in the folio and to devote to the other two Course elements in preparation for the Course exam. A few centres padded folios with manual drawings produced on the drawing board; possibly in the hope that it would improve the draughting grade (Topic (j)). Centres are reminded that this type of work is assessed in the Course Question Papers. It will not be considered at verification and should not be included in the portfolio.

Specific comments on each topic

Topic (a) Graphs and Charts

Graphs often lacked a written comment to clarify their purpose. The graphs produced for a Standard Grade portfolio are generally 'stand alone' graphs and (at the upper grades) should include a brief note to explain the purpose of the graph. There were more computer-generated graphs than manually-produced graphs and, in centres where both are included in the portfolio, the CAG graphs nearly always carried the best grade. There was strong evidence of a thematic approach and there was a wider range of themes and subjects than in previous years.

For further information on this topic and topics (d), (e) and (i) Layout and Lettering, Display and CAG for Display, please refer to *Standard Grade Graphic Communication Illustration and Presentation: Advice for Centres*, issued February 2001. This is now available on SQA's website.

Topic (b) Use of Colour; and Topic (c) Shading, Toning and Rendering

Encouragingly, the inclusion of written notes to justify the selection of colours is becoming the norm rather than the exception. Centres are reminded that assessment is based on two features: manual application of colour; and notes to justify the selection of colours. This written justification is required at all levels.

Manual work featured less in folios, perhaps in favour of CAG/CAD. Centres are reminded of the need to develop manual illustration skills and that the portfolio is the ideal opportunity to integrate illustration with creative layout skills and colour theory.

Pencil and pastel were the most popular illustration media. There was very little marker pen rendering and often the items rendered were simplistic and did not challenge our most able candidates. It is apparent that many centres aim for a comfortable, General level degree of difficulty when differentiated work may set individual candidates more appropriate challenges.

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

Assessment here often failed to take account of items produced for related topics. For example, a good CAG for Display item should be used as evidence in all three topics; this was often not the case. Centres are becoming more adept at combining an illustration with a backdrop and text in a creative display. This augurs well for those progressing to Higher or Intermediate 2 Courses.

Encouragingly, the standard of creative layout and display continues to improve.

Topic (f) Modelling

There was more evidence of the model being submitted in the flat, surface development state. Centres are reminded that modelling should include cutting, assembly and fixing. The addition of surface detail was more evident at all levels, much of this detail is computer generated.

Centres are reminded that assessment here is based on: quality of build; complexity of construction; and the inclusion of surface detail.

Topic (g) Computer-Aided Draughting

3D computer modelling is now an accepted method of generating orthographic and pictorial drawings in the Standard Grade Course. SQA's website provides guidance on content and assessment. This topic provides opportunities to prepare our candidates for progression to Intermediate and Higher Courses. There was some strong work in evidence, generated on 2D and 3D software. Occasionally folios assessed at General and even Foundation level, included a Credit level CAD item.

Features such as: dimensioning; hidden detail; the use of centre lines; and adding annotation were evident — but were often not completed to British Standards or to a depth of treatment compatible with Credit level work. Centres are reminded that smooth edges/facets should be removed prior to printing.

Again, there was almost no evidence of Foundation level work in this topic. All candidates produced either two related views or a pictorial line drawing; the starting point for assessment in each case is grade 4.

Topic (h) CAD using a Library

There is already evidence of the use of 3D modelling software in this topic. This is perfectly acceptable and the same assessment criteria apply to both 2D and 3D software; there is guidance on SQA's website.

Again, there is not enough evidence to confirm the level the candidate is working at. Centres are reminded that they must specify the candidate's input and state whether:

- ◆ icons have been created by the candidate and saved to the library (Credit level), or
- ◆ existing icons have been manipulated (scaled, rotated etc) (General level), or
- ◆ candidates have used a CAD library (Foundation level)

The teacher's comments box on the internal assessment flyleaf is provided for this purpose. Centres that do not provide this information risk having their assessment for this topic downgraded.

Topic (j) Draughtsmanship

Some centres are averaging the draughting skills from items across the folio when assessing this topic.

The instruction is to 'look across the folio' for the draughting grade. This does not mean we take an average grade based on work produced in the other nine topics. Centres should identify the candidate's best example of draughting and award the grade accordingly. This 'best grade' can be based on manually-produced work, modelling or CAD drawings. In most folios the best places to look for the draughting grade are CAD drawings — Topic (g), and Modelling — Topic (f).