Moderation Feedback – Central - 2005

Assessment Panel:	**Technical education**	
Qualification area		
Subject(s) and Level(s) included in this report	**Graphic Communication**	**Intermediate 2** **Higher** **Advanced Higher**

General comments on moderation activity

Advanced Higher

Overall the quality of evidence continues to improve. There were fewer outstanding pieces of work in the sample this year though. Unfortunately too many centres are not applying the assessment guidelines correctly. In most cases this is due to a lack of familiarity of the assessment guidelines issued. There are a few areas in the assessment guidelines that are being misinterpreted.

Advanced Higher – Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation
Even though there were less than last year, there were still some outstanding pieces of work produced and in some cases well beyond the requirements of the Course. Generally the final documents are of a high standard, but any weakness is in analysis or planning.

Analysis
This area continues to improve, but there are still areas of concern. Analysis of grid structure/type specification was particularly good with more centres following the format in the exemplar material.
A few centres though did not analyse the appropriate number of pages or two different publications. There are still centres that appear to have a lack of understanding of design principles and elements. As commented last year, the choice of material for analysis must be carefully chosen to offer candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the use of these design factors. This was not always the case this year.

Planning and Development
Thumbnails continue to be disappointing. There was not enough evidence of consideration of alternative ideas, ideas being developed or creative use of design elements and design principles. Annotation was lacking and very few candidates commented on grid structure. There were still a number of cases where the only thumbnails produced were miniature versions of the final document and therefore clearly retrospectively produced. Unfortunately, where the thumbnails were poor, this was not always reflected in the marks awarded. There was some excellent and well thought out thumbnails being produced by some centres.

There were some excellent ***visuals*** but too many are still not getting it right.

- There was evidence of visuals retrospectively traced from the final electronic version. This is disappointing as both thumbnails and visuals must be completed in full before the electronic version is started.
- Even though visuals should be full sized and manually produced, there were a number of scaled visuals and electronically produced versions.
- There were a number of candidates who did not produce the minimum number of visuals required.
- In some cases the visuals consisted of a basic layout indicating only basic text and graphic frames. There should be enough information to produce the electronic version from. Too often there was a lack of annotation on the visuals.

Implementation and Presentation
This was the strongest element as the majority of the final publications produced were excellent. The quality of printing and presentation of the final documents was very professional. There were a few though who did not do their document justice by printing on poor quality paper.

There were a number of centres that awarded marks for the electronic template but there was no evidence of it being produced.

The evaluations and modifications tended to be very poor with a few exceptions, but the marks awarded by centres did reflect this.

Candidate's lack of understanding of design elements and principles was evident as there was a lack of reference to these in the evaluation. Candidates who did not follow the appropriate planning process were unable to indicate and discuss any modifications made.

Advanced Higher - Computer-Aided 3D Modelling Presentation
Overall the models produced were complex and of a high standard. More candidates are using the full range of ***modelling techniques*** but maximum marks are often being awarded for very basic examples with no modifications.

Once again a large number of candidates did not fill in their Student Records adequately, making it hard for moderators to identify how marks were awarded for the various modelling techniques. In many cases they were not highlighting the examples of addition processes used and therefore losing marks.

There were a number of candidates not using five techniques from the list and others who were calling modifications/editing a modelling technique.

The quality of ***orthographic*** and ***pictorial*** work produced from models was better but is still mixed. Most candidates are achieving Unit standard, but many are failing to pick up the additional marks. Other points of note were:

- Too many candidates do not produce drawings with facets removed.
- General draughtmanship tends to be poor as appropriate line thickness are not being used, scaling of hidden and centre lines is poor and the selection of font style and size is often poor. A number of candidates using "Inventor" are using default settings and are not altering the settings to produce a better quality drawing/s.
- Some centres were awarding maximum marks for annotation where the candidate was using a default border and name box.
- There were a few centres that submitted rendered pictorial views. These do not fulfill the requirements of pictorial CAD drawings.
- There are very few examples of pictorial cutaways.
- There were some excellent scenes produced this year, but again many candidates did not clearly indicate details of how they applied materials and lights. Application of lights was the weakest part of this section.
- Some scenes were small bitmaps stretched to A4 or A3 size. These were pixilated and of a very poor quality and therefore not doing the candidate justice.

Higher

Overall the quality is improving with some excellent work. There are also an increasing number of centres using 3D modelling software, but some of the best work is still from centres using more traditional 2D CAD to a very high standard. Centres that are also presenting Advanced Higher are using their DTP experience to produce stunning DTP work at Higher.

There are still problems with the external flyleafs, as too many centres did not complete them properly or at all.

Some centres appear to be awarding marks for completing a section and not for the quality of the candidates work.

Manual

- The quality of manual work appeared to drop again with fewer sketching of high quality.
- **Tracing** of CAD drawings and views produced using drawing instruments/straight edges in the freehand section is still a major problem. It is clearly stated in the "Guidance on Assessment" that this cannot be done but it still appears. The greater concern is that the candidates are receiving no penalty in the marking.
- There continues to be a lack of analytical sketching to show technical detail.
- Numerous candidates did not have an adequate amount of dimensions to enable them to produce CAD drawings from. In some cases the sketches had only a few dimensions.
- There was some excellent ***DTP planning (thumbnails),*** but there are still centres that do not consider various layouts or annotate the thumbnails. The best material tends to come from centres that are also presenting the Advanced Higher.
- There was a significant improvement in the quality and detail of the ***visuals*** this year. Some visuals were of a standard above what is required. If there was any general criticism it would be that there was a lack of annotation. Unfortunately there are a number of centres that appear to be unclear of what a visual should be like.
- A few centres produced planning for the additional promotional graphic instead of the DTP item.

CAD

Generally the CAD work was again of a very good standard with a more appropriate choice of theme (item).

- As with Advanced Higher general draughtmanship, annotation and application of British Standards Conventions tends to be poor.
- Most centres appear to have grasped the idea of technical detail. Marking of this section has also improved.
- A number of centres using 3D modelling failed to remove facets in the pictorial views. This is clearly stated in the "Guidance on Assessment" document but is being missed. In addition a few also did not produce line drawings, but submitted rendered views instead. To achieve the marks for pictorial CAD they must be line drawings with facets and hidden detail removed, most of these centres were awarding up to maximum marks.

Presentation

- Again those using 3D modelling packages produced very high quality realistically rendered objects either within the package or by using a dedicated rendering package. It was difficult to identify what materials and lights had been applied when candidates did not fill in the student record properly.
- The standard of rendering using a paint package was poorer again this year. There was a lack of appropriate tonal change or highlights. In addition the imported CAD drawing was still visible as outlines. Leaving outlines on rendered pictorial views was also common with centres using Inventor.
- The DTP items were mostly excellent.
- Marking of the DTP items was much improved but there were still a few centres that were awarding maximum marks for very basic items with no columns. There were also a few centres not giving full credit for some excellent work.
- The quality of paper used by some centres did not help to enhance the DTP items. There was a significantly higher standard by those who did use photo quality paper.
- The additional promotional graphic was better this year. There are still too many centres not putting as much effort into this item and this is reflected in the quality. These centres also tended to mark generously.

Intermediate 2

Most of the folios moderated were of a good standard with no non-accepted centres. Marking was also very good.

- There appeared to be still confusion over the difference between a detailed orthographic and a component orthographic. The main weakness was in this component drawing or lack of one.
- Those who did not do well in the component orthographic had made a poor choice of item to draw i.e. the item lacked complexity and therefore the opportunity to include enough dimensions or line types.
- As with other levels, draughtmanship and use of BS conventions was poor.
- As with Higher a number of centres are now using 3D modelling packages to create their CAD and rendered drawings.
- The quality of DTP work was good but there were a few candidates who used "wizards".
- Student Records completed reasonably well. Better than at other levels.

Specific issues identified

Areas of difficulty

- Centres that do not ensure that the flyleafs and student records are completed properly do not help the moderation process.

Feedback to centres

Centres should read and apply the "Guidance on Assessment "documents. These are fine-tuned each year and therefore may contain changes from the previous year. A few centres used the incorrect documents this year. It is therefore extremely important that the teachers are familiar with the new documents when they arrive in school in the autumn.

Important points to be aware of are:

- At Higher it needs to be reinforced that instruments, straight edges, tracing or other drawing aids cannot be used to assist in the manual freehand sketching. It is disappointing that these practices still continue.
- Manual sketching and DTP planning at Higher and planning & development at Advanced Higher must not be done retrospectively.
- Draughtmanship, annotation and correct application of BS conventions need to be improved in CAD work across all 3 levels.
- All CAD drawings (orthographic and pictorial) must be line drawings and not rendered.
- Candidates must take more care over the completion of the flyleaf at each level. Even though there are no marks awarded for this it gives the candidate the opportunity to clarify how parts of a drawing /document were produced. This aids the moderation process and helps to ensure that the candidate receives maximum credit for their work.

Centres should make use of the exemplar material on the SQA website.