

Moderation Feedback - Central

Assessment Panel:

Technical Education

Qualification area

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

**Graphic Communication
Standard Grade**

Central Moderation

General comments on central moderation activity

The moderation team is made up of experienced Moderators.

Procedures

Session 1:

Organising the room and conducting the standardisation meeting.

Session 2:

Senior Moderator provides close support to individuals throughout.

Session 3, 4 & 5:

Moderation and report writing.

Session 6:

Printing and checking clerical work and organising envelopes.

Forty-one centres were moderated; fewer centres were selected for moderation this year compared with last year's 52. All folios had arrived at SQA by the time the moderation event commenced.

The process of providing feedback to those centres who passed moderation but who were very close to the tolerance for the national standards was continued. Among the moderation team, it is felt that there is merit in providing advice to these centres.

Specific issues identified

Common assessment trends

Internal assessment was on par with last year, only two centres required re-assessment.

The number of centres making arithmetic errors and errors in completing the Internal Assessment Flyleaf was lower than in previous years.

Examples or errors include:

- ◆ no overall grade entered on the form of the Internal Assessment flyleaf
- ◆ missing grades (empty boxes) on the back of the Internal Assessment Flyleaf
- ◆ incorrect selection of candidates when compiling the sample
- ◆ the use of incorrect grades (0, 8 and 10) on the flyleaf

Feedback was provided to centres making arithmetic errors and they will be asked to check the arithmetic on all folios held in centre. This will be followed up at the next moderation event; these centres will be selected again to ensure that there is no longer any ambiguity regarding completion of the Internal Assessment Flyleaf.

More centres utilised the space for the teachers' comments on the Internal Assessment Flyleaf. This space is useful if there is a need to clarify the candidate's input or the extra support provided by the teacher. Moderators will always look for content in this box when making a decision on the centres assessment procedures.

Feedback to centres

The overall standard of work submitted for moderation was on par with that of last year. A handful of centres produced work of outstanding quality.

The area of computer graphics (CAD and CAG) is moving forward and there is more evidence of 3D Computer Modelling. DTP software is also widely used and is contributing to the quality of display and layout found throughout the sample. There is again strong evidence that centres encouraging originality and creativity in layout and display achieve better results in those topics.

A worrying trend is the large size of a typical folio. Most centres follow the recommendations found in the arrangements document and produce two graphs and three manually rendered items etc. Some centres produce separate items for each topic and can produce a folio of 12 items or more. This is counter productive. It limits the time that can be spent on the other two elements (DA & KI) and limits the time that is spent on each individual item. Centres should consider reducing the number of items and use the time saved to improve quality across the folio.

There is also evidence that candidates in some centres are penalised if they do not complete the recommended number of items for any given topic. Centres are reminded that the grade awarded in any topic is the best grade achieved by the candidate within that topic. Therefore, if a candidate produces only one graph and this graph is assessed at say, grade 2, it is this grade 2 that should be recorded for assessment. Some centres have been awarding a lower grade because the candidate has fallen short of the recommended number of items.

Specific comments on each topic

Topic (a) Graphs and Charts

Treatment of this topic is improving. It is now unusual to find a graph with components missing and the depth of treatment of graphs that involve CAG is generally very good. The exception to this are centres where the subject matter of the graph is very simplistic (levels of pocket money or the different forms of transport to and from school). These graphs tend to be less challenging in content, layout and depth of treatment.

Centres are still not using Graphs and Charts to provide evidence for other topics; (Display, CAG for Display, Layout and Lettering etc). Using items to provide evidence in several topics across the folios is to be encouraged. Employing this strategy will cut down on the number of items being produced and give more time to improve the quality of items across the folio.

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

Topic (b) Use of Colour

There is more evidence that candidates are producing a written justification of their choice of colours. It is also pleasing to note that the inclusion of terms required at Credit level is more prevalent. Consequently, it was easier to reach agreement with the centre's internal assessment during moderation.

Topic (c) Shading, Toning and Rendering

More centres are producing evidence in two or more mediums. Coloured pencil and marker pen are the most common. Chalk pastel, airbrush and water based paints are less commonly used. Strong credit level work is found in a small number of centres. The quality and variety of work in those centres is clearly motivational — the manual illustrations are vibrant and without exception this quality continued throughout the rest of the folio. The standard across the majority of centres is largely confined to General and Foundation levels.

Internal assessment here is generally accurate but assessment inaccuracies did cause serious disagreement with a small number of centres during moderation.

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

There was more evidence of planning work for topic (e) Display. Rough layouts with annotation and simple colour swatches used in the design stages of Display items were found in the samples from more centres.

It is clear that some centres allow candidates to use step-by-step guides to carry them through topic (i) CAG for Display. It is acceptable to use step-by-step guides from resource packs such as 'RED SPOT' and 'Design works tutorials' for building skills and experience. But work generated in this way **must not be used to provide evidence for assessment in the portfolio**. Portfolio assessment material must be the candidate's own, original work.

Topic (f) Modelling

More centres provided photographic evidence as opposed to sending in the model itself. Again those centres that ‘open up’ the topic and encourage a creative approach invariably produce stronger work in this topic.

Modelling in some centres is teacher led; this is evident when all students produce the same model (eg a house or kitchen unit). This style of delivery does not challenge the most able candidates and the models they produce do not exemplify the full extent of their ability. Similarly, less able candidates do not perform as well in a teacher led exercise, some struggle to construct a presentable model.

Centres must refer to the EGRC prior to internal assessment. Credit level requires ‘*a detailed model of a complex item*’. This should also show surface details (graphics etc).

Topic (g) Computer-Aided Draughting

There were many examples of excellent CAD, both in orthographic and pictorial work. 3D computer models (and orthographic drawings generated from 3D models) are now being included in submissions. Depth of treatment is also improving and features such as; sections, exploded views a variety of line types; hidden detail; dimensioning; textual information and the projection of complex forms are now relatively common. Advanced in technology and the emphasis on preparing the most able pupils for Higher have made a significant impact on the quality and breadth of work submitted for moderation.

Internal assessment here is generally very accurate.

Topic (h) CAD using a Library

There is more evidence that candidates are including a Key or legend but centres must also indicate exactly what the candidate’s input has been. Please state whether icons have been created by the candidate and saved to the library. The teacher’s comments box on the internal assessment flyleaf is provided for this purpose. Centres who did not provide this information had their assessment for this topic downgraded.

Depth of treatment cannot be gauged without information on candidates’ input.

Topic (j) Draughtsmanship

Internal assessments were generally accurate but centres need to bear in mind that while this topic is assessed across the folio, any assessment should reflect the candidate’s best example of, or best performance in, this topic.

Again a small number of centres included orthographic or pictorial, pencil line drawings (drawing board work) as evidence in this topic. Centres are reminded that formal drawing skills are assessed in the course examination. Technical drawings do not provide useful evidence in the portfolio; they should not be used in the internal assessment of illustration and presentation and will not be considered during moderation.