

**Moderation Feedback**

**Assessment Panel:**

**Technical Education**

**Qualification area**

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

**Graphic Communication  
Intermediate 2 – Higher – Advanced Higher**

## Central Moderation

### General comments on central moderation activity

The moderation team all acknowledged that although it was hard work, with long hours, it was the most efficient way of running the event. The team was split into an Advanced Higher team and an Intermediate 2/Higher team. This split allowed the Advanced Higher moderators to concentrate their effort on one level giving continuity to the event.

The team felt that it was essential to keep the structure of the event as it was, as the value of having other teachers to confirm and advise on difficult areas was invaluable.

It was reported also that the confidential notes used by the moderators as they progress through a centre's material were sent to not accepted centres. This should never have happened as these notes were only for the moderator or senior moderator in case of arbitration.

### Specific issues identified

#### Intermediate 2

The quality of work for this area was lower than that of last session, however, the centres awarded a higher mark allocation.

The component detail was not as well presented this year, (for example, the drawing of a battery is too simple). There was a clear indication that many centres had not guided the students with regard to degree of difficulty and the amount of information required on the component drawing. The correct use of line types was not evident in most drawings presented.

The degree of difficulty of the object selected was on many occasions too simple to allow the students to produce graphics worthy of full marks. It was noted that many students produced evidence from HSDU or commercially produced material. It was difficult to decide if the step by step process had been used. Centres were advised not to use such material for external assessment.

Several centres allowed the students to create 3D surface or 3D solid models. This allowed the student to produce rendered drawings with the click of a button. On many occasions the student did not fully understand the facility and the finished graphic lacked highlights, graduations due to the use of lights.

Note: - Centres using this method may not be covering the elements within the "Computer Graphics" unit and therefore would not be eligible for the course award.

The quality of DTP work varied from very poor to just above average. It was quite basic and lacked any creativity. There was a large increase in the number of centres producing calendars. In many cases these did not match the high marks allocated by the centre.

Several students followed a theme approach and produced work above that of some higher candidates. Centre work very similar - a class approach was adopted stifling creativity in certain areas of work. Student Records completed reasonably well although many not signed by the teacher and/or the student.

#### Higher

Similar to Intermediate 2, in that the quality of work was not as good as previous years. A number of centres

did not complete the external flyleaf form, marks totaled incorrectly and not signed by the student or teacher.

There was a large increase in the number of centres that allowed the pupils to **trace** CAD drawings and/or produced instrument drawn views and marked them under the freehand section of the external folio. From the evidence submitted it was clear that many students produced the DTP planning retrospectively. This may have been the cause of a lack of variety and experimentation of layouts which was not evident. In many cases annotated sketches and planning was insufficient to produce a document. Very few centres defined the type of text, font sizes, etc. An indication of the choice of font would be helpful.

The freehand sketching was poor and did not have the analytical tone expected at this level. Overall there was disappointment expressed by all moderators at the quality of work within the freehand sketching section. The use of instruments for the freehand sketching indicated that the information from SQA with regard to the definition of "freehand sketching" either did not reach the teacher or was not fully understood by the teacher and/or student.

Within the CAD area there was a mixture of poor and good graphic items. A number of centres had allocated full marks for the students' thematic however, neither the degree of difficulty nor the quality of the thematic ensured full marks. High quality work was rare. Technical detail was not attempted as well as last year. In many cases only one attempt had been made. The assessment guidelines clearly states a range, 2 or more, of higher quality.

As for Intermediate 2 several centres allowed the students to create 3D surface or 3D solid models. This allowed the student to produce rendered drawings with the click of a button. Centres using this method may not be covering the elements within the "Computer Graphics" unit and therefore may not be eligible for the course award. This issue requires urgent attention and clear guidelines given to centres and moderators to determine what is acceptable for Intermediate 2 and Higher.

Within some centres all students used one object. It was felt that this was against the ethos of the 'Thematic Presentation', student driven project.

The presentation of the CAD pictorial view was missing in many students' folios. Moderators had to use the rendered drawing to moderate the centre's mark. It would be easier for the teacher and the moderator if the outline pictorial drawing was within the folio. The promotional graphics lacked creativity with a very large increase in very badly produced calendars appearing. The DTP items varied in quality and technical quality. The number of centres not using relevant text was greatly reduced this year. Next session 2002 – 2003 only relevant text will be acceptable. It is clear that many centres are not teaching simple DTP design elements and principles e.g. font sizes, font types, balance colour.

Overall the quality of the folios appeared to be of a lower standard to that of 2001.

### **Advanced Higher - Computer-Aided 3D Modelling Presentation**

The overall view of student folios presented for Advanced Higher was poor. It was evident that it would appear from the evidence produced by the students, and the allocation of high marks allocated by a large number of centres, that the award could be perceived as an easy Advanced Higher to gain. It was clear that many teachers did not have a benchmark from which to work from. Several centres submitted the 3D surface modelling exercise, the scooter, as their project or additional to their project. The scooter has no quality statement, it was given as an example of how to include all necessary surface techniques into one project to pass the unit checklist.

Many students choose a poor choice of model. This meant that students did not have enough scope to apply five modelling techniques.

Students were continually mixing up surface and solid modelling techniques. E.g. surface of revolution and solid of revolution.

Students were unsure of what constituted a 'Flat surface of regular or irregular shape.' E.g. a region in some software packages.

To gain five modelling techniques, students were submitting extra pieces of work that were not part of the theme. E.g. the scooter.

Many students did not fill in their student records adequately, making it hard for moderators identifying how marks were awarded for the various modelling techniques.

A few schools did however meet the challenge of Advanced Higher and produced high quality Computer-Aided 3D modelling and Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation folios.

There is a difficulty in getting five modelling features into a project. **Consideration should be given to reducing this three or four modelling features thus stopping an artificial 4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> element being introduced.**

### **Computer-Aided 3D Modelling Presentation**

From the evidence submitted a large number of teachers require to be instructed on the software being used. The students are not producing the best orthographic work possible from their created model due to the lack of knowledge of commands such as solprof, soldraw, solview and similar commands in other packages.

Drawings were not generated from the 3D model. In some cases students drew the orthographic views from scratch in 2D.

- Many students produced related views in 3D viewports but did not convert them into true 2D. Due to this, students were not able to produce 'clean' drawings. E.g. hidden line removal, no facets etc.
- There was little evidence of hidden line removal in drawings.
- Poor additional views – sections, stepped sections, exploded views, etc.
- Poor annotation – views not named, poor dimensioning, borders and title boxes not professional in appearance, etc.
- In some cases dimensions had been added to Bitmaps, not to actual drawings.

Poor choice of text styles throughout presentation. For example: font, point size, colour.

### **3D Modelling - Visualisation**

Although there were numerous good examples of good use of materials, lights and environments, there were still some examples of inappropriate environments and those that were too simple.

One or two candidates mixed up rendering with materials and shading with line colour

### **Advanced Higher - Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation**

With respect to the thumbnail freehand sketches, several centres did not comply with the guidelines set by SQA with regard to freehand. This should be reviewed within the Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation and

consideration given to a “sketch” being used.

#### Analysis

- In most cases the analysis was fair to good. The analysis of the grid structure/type specification being particularly good.
- In some cases the choice of publication for analysis did not give enough scope for proper analysis. There were not enough features for the student to comment on for the Design Elements/Design Principles analysis.

#### Planning and Development

- In general the work for this section was poor.
- Thumbnails were quite large in size with very little annotation. They were invariably drawn with the aid of a straight edge and not drawn freehand. Ideas were not developed throughout the thumbnails.
- In most cases visuals were very poor. Although most showed examples of good representation of layout there was little in the way of manual representation of graphics, body text, headlines, colour backgrounds, etc.
- In most cases the visuals consisted of a basic layout indicating text and graphic frames with little annotation.

#### Presentation

- In most cases the publications produced were very good.
- A few students chose the wrong type of publication to do, which meant that there was not enough scope for including the design elements and design principles expected at Advanced Higher. The valuations were usually well done.

## **Feedback to Centres**

It is essential that centres are given sufficient feedback specific to their own school. Every effort was taken by the moderator to provide a full report to not accepted centres. If this is to continue or be increased in any way additional moderators and more IT equipment will be required .

It is essential that centres study the Advanced Higher, Computer Aided 3D Modelling guidance on assessment. Particular reference should be given to 3D Modelling Techniques. These are the guidelines used by the moderators and centres not assessing to these guidelines will find the moderator not agreeing to the marks allocated by the centre. This may lead to the centre not being accepted and called in for moderation the following year.

It is important for the Lead Officer to arrange for politically correct extracts to be taken from the Senior Moderator's Report and issued to centres.