

## Principal Assessor Report 2005

**Assessment Panel:**

**Technical Education**

**Qualification area**

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

**Intermediate 2 – Graphic Communication**

## Statistical information: update

Number of resulted entries in 2004	1,137
------------------------------------	-------

Number of resulted entries in 2005	1,227
------------------------------------	-------

### General comments re resulted entry numbers

There was a substantial increase in the uptake in the number of candidates being presented in S4 this year with a corresponding decrease in numbers being presented in S5. The numbers being presented in S6 and in Further Education remain approximately the same.

## Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of awards including grade boundaries

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
Maximum Mark- 100	-	-	-	-
A	39.3	39.3	482	72
B	24.6	63.9	302	61
C	18.0	81.9	221	51
D	5.1	87.0	62	46
No award	13.0	100.0	160	-

### General commentary on passmarks and grade boundaries

- While SQA aims to set examinations and create mark schemes which will allow a competent candidate to score a minimum 50% of the available marks (notional passmark) and a very well-prepared, very competent candidate to score at least 70%, it is almost impossible to get the standard absolutely on target every year, in every subject and level
- Each year we therefore hold a passmark meeting for each subject at each level where we bring together all the information available (statistical and judgmental). The Principal Assessor and SQA Qualifications Manager meet with the relevant SQA Business Manager and Statistician to discuss the evidence and make decisions. The meetings are chaired by members of the senior management team at SQA
- We adjust the passmark downwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly more demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- We adjust the passmark upwards if there is evidence that we have set a slightly less demanding exam than usual, allowing the pass rate to be unaffected by this circumstance
- Where the standard appears to be very similar to previous years, we maintain similar grade boundaries
- An exam paper at a particular level in a subject in one year tends to have a marginally different set of grade boundaries from exam papers in that subject at that level in other years. This is because the particular questions are different. This is also the case for exams set in centres. And just because SQA has altered a boundary in a particular year in say Higher Chemistry does not mean that centres should necessarily alter boundaries in their prelim exam in Higher Chemistry. The two are not that closely related as they do not contain identical questions
- Our main aim is to be fair to candidates across all subjects and all levels and maintain standards across the years, even as arrangements evolve and change.

### Comments on any significant changes in distribution of awards/grade boundaries

The grade boundaries were slightly lower than last year to reflect a slightly more demanding exam.

There was an overall rise in the number of candidates gaining an award this year. This would appear to indicate that; in general, candidates are continuing to be better prepared for the exam than in previous years. There was a rise in the number of candidates obtaining A and B passes. At the lower end there were fewer candidates achieving a no award but as with previous years there are still many candidates performing badly.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

It was noted by the majority of the markers that the overall quality of the responses to the drawing questions was better this year with candidates making a good attempt at all the questions. The poorest response, as in previous years, came from the knowledge and understanding questions. Candidates failed to read the questions correctly or misinterpreted what was being asked of them. It is clear that schools are concentrating on the drawing abilities part of the course and neglecting the knowledge and understanding.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well**

Q2 (DTP) was reasonably well done, but there were a number of candidates who did not know that the header and footer should be inside the margins  
Q4 ( BSI symbols) was particularly well done with most candidates achieving full marks  
Q7 (oblique view). Most candidates made a good attempt at this question although small number did not read the question properly and drew it using half size oblique lines. This was taken care of at the markers meeting.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

Q1 was badly attempted with few candidates gaining full marks. Candidates still do not know how to dimension a drawing properly.

Q3 (CAD terms) was, as in previous years, poorly tackled. Many candidates described what had been done to the CAD drawing and did not state what CAD command had been used at each stage of the drawing.

Q5 (cylinder). This question was poorly attempted. A high percentage of the candidates did not use or know how to use basic construction techniques in order to draw the curve on the elevation or to construct the development. The half cylinder confused many of the candidates.

Q6 (sectional views). There are still a number of candidates who have difficulty with assemblies and sectional views. Either no hatching was shown, incorrect BS convention or the components were just copied and not assembled.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

#### **General feedback**

- There continues to be a large number of high quality candidates.
- Pupils are still not reading the question paper correctly and answering what is being asked of them.
- There is a general lack of knowledge concerning the use of CAD terms.
- Pupils lack the basic knowledge of BS conventions. E.G. dimensioning, hatching, etc...
- Some pupils lack the basics in constructing geometric shapes. E.g. Cylinders
- Candidates are still under performing when attempting sectional views and assemblies.