



National Qualifications 2007

Senior Verifier Report

Subject: Graphic Communication Standard Grade

Assessment Panel: Technical Education

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification which has taken place within National Qualifications in this subject.

STANDARD GRADE

ELEMENT / COURSEWORK VERIFIED

ILLUSTRATION AND PRESENTATION PORT-FOLIO

FEEDBACK TO CENTRES

General comments:

Verification covered the full spectrum of work from strong **Credit Level** to lower **Foundation Level**. There was generally consistency of quality (across all 10 topics) within folios at Credit and General Levels. The centres sampled often have obvious strengths but, in general, the work across topics was more evenly tackled in terms of depth of treatment and quality.

Creative work was more in evidence this year. Topics (a) 2D & 3D Graphs & Charts; (d) Layout & Lettering; (e) display and (i) CAG for Display and Topic (f) Modelling, provide candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate creative (graphic design) skills.

Work at Credit Level was strong creatively; in a few centres the design work was excellent.

Candidates working at General Level often showed an enthusiasm for the creative process. At General Level the assessment was again consistent across the folio.

At Foundation Level candidates again produced work at both Foundation and General Levels. There was more evidence of costly gaps (that attract grade 7) in the sample. Often work at this Level is incomplete.

The space for the teachers' comments on the Internal Assessment Flyleaf was more frequently used. Teachers took the opportunity to clarify the candidate's input or the extra support provided by the teacher. This feature always makes verification more straightforward and the additional knowledge can only contribute to accuracy and fairness during verification.

It was pleasing to note that one or two centres who previously had real difficulty meeting our assessment standards, submitted folios that had been accurately assessed in the centre. The centres were commended for this in our feedback. It should also be noted that the quality of work in those folios was significantly improved and the thoroughness with which their candidates completed the written parts of the IP element (use of colour and CAD Library Legend) was excellent. This too was noted in our feedback to centres.

Advice on good practice and areas for further development:

Centres appear more comfortable in applying the **'best grade principle'** when assessing individual topics. The exception is in **Topic (j) Draughtsmanship**. The EGRC instruction is to base the grade in this topic on work across the folio. Centres are reminded that this does not mean they should take an average of the grades where draughting is a feature. They should identify the candidate's best example of draughting and award the grade accordingly.

The average size of the folio was smaller than last year. Centres were advised that reducing the size of the folio (number of items) will leave more time to improve the quality of fewer items or to spend reinforcing

skills and knowledge in the other two elements. In general this has been taken on board and folios of around 10 were the norm. Some centres padded folios with coursework that was clearly inferior in quality to the main items in the folio. This is to be discouraged.

Specific comments on each topic

Topic (a) Graphs and Charts

This was often the best example of Layout and Display in a folio. It is encouraging to see that some centres recognize this and use these items for assessment across the folio. However, some centres still grade topics **(d), (e) and (i) Layout and Lettering, Display and CAG for Display** severely when the graph would (and should) provide a better grade.

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.**

Clarity and completeness in graphs and charts is still an issue. Graphs assessed at General and Credit Levels should be complete; title and quantities are essential and the purpose of the graph should be clear. Centres are reminded that, at Credit Level, graphs should have both clarity and visual impact.

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

The two part assessment of this topic is still an issue for some centres. Assessment is based on two features; manual application of colour and notes to justify the selection of colours. This written justification is required at all Levels. While several centres did an excellent job in providing a written justification, others did not produce written justification at all. Centres are reminded that the written justification builds knowledge that may be tested in the exam paper. The IP folio provides an opportunity to develop this knowledge and integrate it with practical project work. In short it provides a practical relevance to the theory we teach routinely.

Topic (c) Shading, Toning and Rendering

There were one or two examples of excellent Marker pen work but in general coloured pencil is the strongest medium in the folio. However, marker pens were used more frequently this year. This medium is so important in CDT in general; Standard Grade, Intermediate 2 and Higher Graphic Communication courses all make use of it while Product Design courses also employ this medium. Centres are encouraged to introduce it if they have not already done so.

The quality of Shading, Toning and Rendering at Credit Level was fair and occasionally excellent. At Foundation and General Levels it was present and often neatly done but lacked tonal scale and texture.

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

These topics were tackled more effectively this year. Sophisticated Graphic Design skills and knowledge was evident in one or two centres. In others it was tackled enthusiastically. The important change is that progress is being made and candidates are becoming adept at using; line, colour, balance, unity and dominance to create effective graphic displays.

Topic (f) Modelling

The creative approach was also evident in this topic. Candidates are being encouraged to design their own models and the benefits are evident in both the originality and the quality of their work. This creative approach was the norm rather than the exception this year.

Centres are reminded that assessment here is based on quality of build, complexity of construction and the inclusion of surface detail. Centres should bear this in mind prior to starting the modelling project. Credit Level requires '*a detailed model of a complex item*' (EGRC). This should also show surface details (graphics, text etc).

Topic (g) Computer-Aided Draughting

Again we find that this topic is continuing to develop as teachers and candidates gain experience with new hardware and software. There is generally more depth to the CAD work and, while it is not a requirement, centres are submitting work that includes sectional and exploded views. Preparation for Intermediate and Higher courses is possibly the motivation here. The complexity of items drawn has also increased.

While this is a pleasing development, candidates still let themselves down by omitting features such as; centre lines, hidden detail, dimensions and textual information. Projection errors are also more common than in previous years; centres should note that 3rd angle projection is the required projection format for all orthographic work.

In orthographic CAD work, dimensioning is required at all levels. When dimensions are added it is important to ensure they are configured to British Standards. Common errors include; inclusion of too many decimal places, the millimetre abbreviation attached to the dimension, dimensions breaking a line and incorrect use of diameter and radius dimensioning.

Topic (h) CAD using a Library

In most cases, centres submitted CAD library drawings that cover the building area; mainly floor plans. These can be complex or simple to suit the ability of the candidate and the degree to which the CAD library is used is also appropriate to the candidates' ability.

Centres are reminded that they must specify the candidate's input. Please state whether; icons have been created by the candidate and saved to the library or existing icons have been manipulated (scaled, rotated etc). The teacher's comments box on the internal assessment flyleaf is provided for this purpose. Centres that do not provide this information risk having their assessment for this topic downgraded.

The use of the Flyleaf by teachers was more evident this year. It often cleared up potential verification issues and helped enormously in confirming grades.

Topic (j) Draughtsmanship

Centres appear more comfortable in applying the '**best grade principle**' when assessing individual topics. The exception is in **Topic (j) Draughtsmanship**. The EGRC instruction is to base the grade in this topic on work across the folio. Centres are reminded that this does not mean they should take an average of the grades where draughting is a feature. They should identify the candidate's best example of draughting and award the grade accordingly. This '**best grade**' can be based on manually produced work, modelling or CAD drawings.