

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

**Graphic Communication
Intermediate 2, Higher and Advanced
Higher**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

- ◆ The event was well organised and managed by the SQA Moderation Unit.
- ◆ The venue was superior to that of previous years. The specific accommodation was a little small, but was very comfortable and therefore provided a good working environment. Additional tables were provided to give each Moderator more space to lay out the contents of the folios.
- ◆ The administrative help and notes taken by SQA Qualifications Staff were invaluable.
- ◆ The general house keeping for the event was first class and appreciated by the Moderators
- ◆ In future it would help if each Moderator had their own disc to store their reports on. The report writing was time consuming. It would have been better if hard copies could have been produced immediately.
- ◆ Once again having a light box supplied by the Moderation Unit was put to excellent use.
- ◆ From the general discussion it was evident that central moderation was by far the best method to moderate the subject to deal with the increased diversity of software being used by centres. This method helps to ensure that a consistent approach is being adopted by each of the moderating team.
- ◆ The increasing number of new 3D modelling packages being used makes the moderation of CAD at Higher and the 3D modelling presentation at Advanced Higher more difficult.

Specific issues identified

Advanced Higher

Overall the quality of evidence continues to improve. More centres did meet the standard required. Contributing factors were:

- ◆ The development visits organised this year, as they were a major success. Each Moderator involved in a visit noted that there was a significant improvement in the understanding of standards and the quality of candidate material submitted for moderation. These visits to ensure that these centres had a successful moderation.
- ◆ The exemplification of standards seminars and the resulting material put on the website.
- ◆ An increase in the allowable tolerance this year.

There is still a concern though that some centres are not applying the assessment guidelines correctly. It is unclear whether this is due to poor interpretation or a lack of familiarity of the assessment guidelines issued.

Advanced Higher — Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation

There were some outstanding pieces of work produced and in some cases well beyond the requirements of the course.

Analysis

This area continues to improve. Analysis of grid structure/type specification was particularly good with many centres following the format in the exemplar material.

Some centres though did not analyse the appropriate number of pages.

Design Elements/Design Principles are analysed to a very high standard in a few centres but too many demonstrate a lack of understanding. In addition the choice of material for analysis did not offer candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the use of these design factors.

Planning and Development

After a slight improvement last year, it was expected to continue this year, but did not happen. There were some excellent thumbnails being produced but this was the minority. There was not enough evidence of ideas being developed, consideration of alternative ideas or creative use of design elements and design principles. Annotation was lacking and very few candidates commented on grid structure.

There were even a number of cases where the only thumbnails produced were miniature versions of the final document and therefore clearly retrospectively produced.

The exemplar material obviously helped to raise the standard of visuals. There was a link that good quality thumbnails tended to result in similar good quality visuals.

There were a number of concerns regarding a number of visuals produced:

- ◆ 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 visuals for every page in their document
- ◆ In some cases the visuals consisted of a basic layout indicating only basic text and graphic frames.

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 was one candidate who had selected totally inappropriate subject matter for schools.

The evaluations and modifications tended to be very poor with a few exceptions. Main failings were a lack of reference to design elements and design principles. It was also evident that if the proper design process had not been used (adequate thumbnails and visuals and a development of a manual document to a final electronic version) then there was a reduced scope for discussion of any modifications.

Advanced Higher — Computer-Aided 3D Modelling Presentation

Overall the models produced were complex and of a high standard. There was a marked improvement on the use of the full range of modelling techniques.

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.

Where candidates did not do well, the poor model selection was the major factor. In some cases because the model was too simple or too complex, ie when the model was a scene.

There was an improvement in the quality of orthographic and pictorial work produced from models, but a number of candidates are not achieving any of the additional marks for 2(b)i — step section or 3(b)ii — pictorial cutaway or exploded view. Other points of note were:

- ◆ A number of centres do not produce drawings with facets removed.
- ◆ General draughtsmanship 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.
- ◆ Annotation continues to be of a very poor standard.
- ◆ There were some excellent scenes produced this year. It was disappointing though, that many candidates, in their student records did not clearly indicate details of how they applied materials and lights.
- ◆ Centres are now using a wider range of modelling packages. In some cases it was unclear if these packages could fulfill all the requirements of section 1.
- ◆ Some candidates had used downloaded material from the internet, ie lego objects for Prodesktop. This is not permitted as candidates must create their own model.

Higher

Overall the quality was similar to last year with some excellent work. There are still problems with the flyleaves, as too many of centres did not complete the external flyleaf, correctly total the marks; or ensure that the candidate and teacher had both signed the document.

Manual

- ◆ The quality of manual work could have been better.
- ◆ It was disappointing to still see evidence of **tracing** of CAD drawings and/or views produced using drawing instruments/straight edges in the freehand section.
- ◆ There continues to be a lack of analytical pictorial sketching to show technical detail.
- ◆ Numerous candidates did not have an adequate amount of dimensions to enable them to produce CAD drawings from.
- ◆ There was some excellent DTP planning (thumbnails), but there are still centres that do not consider various layouts or annotate the thumbnails.
- ◆ Numerous centres did not produce any visuals and many who did failed to do them full size.

CAD

Generally the CAD work was of a very good standard, but the choice of item should be considered carefully. There were an increased number of centres using 3D modelling packages to produce their CAD work.

- ◆ As with Advanced Higher general draughtsmanship tends to be poor as appropriate line thickness are not being used, scaling of hidden and centre lines is poor, dimensions are poorly applied and the selection of font style and size is often poor.
- ◆ CAD drawings should conform to British Standards and should contain a projection symbol, name box etc.
- ◆ Some drawings lacked clarity due to inappropriate scales being used.
- ◆ Most centres appear to have grasped the idea of technical detail. In some cases centres did not give the candidates full credit for very good examples.
- ◆ A number of centres using 3D modelling failed to remove facets in the pictorial views. 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.

Presentation

- ◆ Those using 3D modelling packages produced very high quality realistically rendered objects. It would appear that it is easier to achieve maximum marks for rendering if a 3D package is used. 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 this year. There was a lack of appropriate tonal change or highlights. In addition the imported CAD drawing was still visible.
- ◆ The desktop publishing items varied greatly from excellent to very poor with regard to layout, presentation and technical quality of the document. Design principles and elements are not being considered.
- ◆ The quality of paper used for hard copies does not help to enhance the DTP items.
- ◆ Many candidates did not produce an additional promotional graphic item.
- ◆ The additional promotional graphic tended to lack creativity. Many candidates just rehased the DTP leaflet.
- ◆ Some centres are being restricted by the use of poor quality software packages.

Intermediate 2

Most of the folios moderated were of a good standard and in some cases were very close to Higher standard.

- ◆ There appeared to be a number of centres that were confused over the difference between a detailed orthographic and a component orthographic.
- ◆ Those who did not do well in the component orthographic had made a poor choice of item to draw, ie the item lacked complexity and therefore the opportunity to include enough dimensions or line types.
- ◆ As with other levels, draughtsmanship and use of BS conventions was poor.
- ◆ It was noted that only one centre produced evidence from step-by-step/worksheets from HSDU/Commercially produced material.
- ◆ 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 varied from poor to excellent.
- ◆ Similar to last year, several candidates followed a thematic approach and produced work above that of the standard required for Intermediate 2. Much of the best quality work was from centres following this approach.
- ◆ One centre adopted a class approach. Even though the work was of a good standard, it was too similar. There was also a lack of individuality and creativity by this method. It should also be made clear that step by step instructions were not used in this approach.
- ◆ Student Records completed reasonably well although many not signed by the teacher and/or the student.

Feedback to centres

Centres should be aware that the “Guidance on Assessment” documents are fine-tuned each year and therefore may contain changes from the previous year. It is therefore extremely important that the teachers are familiar with the new document when it arrives in school in the autumn.

Even though the general quality this year had a similar range as last year, it was positive to have less non-accepted centres.

Important points to be aware of are:

- ◆ Draughtsmanship and correct application of BS conventions needs to be improved in CAD work across all three levels.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ 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 and Development at Advanced Higher must not be done retrospectively.

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

It is also important that centres should send in any suggestions that they may have to improve the internal folios across each level.