

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 general management of the activity was well organized by the SQA Moderation Unit.
- The accommodation was on the small size to allow a holistic overview of the folios (which requires space to spread the folios out). However, every attempt was made to ensure that the moderation team was happy within the environment and a successful event.
- The additional notebooks (supplied by SQA and the moderators) ensured that there was no delay in the report writing.
- The administrative help given by Gillian Anderson-Mann was very welcome and added to the smooth running of the event.
- The general house keeping for the event was first class and appreciated by the moderators.
- The production of the reports proved to be awkward due to the fact that no printer was available on site. This gave the Qualifications Officer additional work that could have been avoided. The light box supplied by the moderation unit was a valuable tool and should be made available at future events.
- From the general discussion it was evident that central moderation was by far the best method to moderate the subject to deal with the diversity of software. Central moderation also facilitates interaction and discussion and a standardised approach being adopted by team.
- With regard to the time restriction in place, the moderators expressed concern that the team could not continue the event after 17.00hrs. The moderators hope that this issue can be resolved for the next central event to prevent valuable time being lost.

Specific issues identified

Advanced Higher: -

- Overall the quality of evidence presented was of a higher standard than 2002. More centres did meet the standard required for Advanced Higher by producing high quality Computer-Aided 3D modelling and Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation folios.
- The application of the assessment guidelines varied from centre to centre, it appears that several centres do not fully understand them and/or how to apply them.

Advanced Higher – Computer-Aided Graphic Presentation

Five centres submitted candidates' visuals that were traced from the finished hard copy, these had been awarded marks. This is not acceptable, as the visuals should be developed from the thumbnails, be full size and created before the pupil begins the electronic production of the Graphic Presentation. In such cases these marks were modified by moderators as marks should not be given for traced visuals.

Analysis

- In most cases the analysis had improved in comparison to last year, in particular the analysis of the grid structure/type specification was particularly good.
- In several centres only two pages had been analysed – this did not meet the assessment criteria.
- The choice of publication for analysis gave sufficient scope for a proper analysis. There were enough features for the student to comment on for the Design Elements/Design Principles.
- Centres were obviously using the correct rule to measure font sizes, bullet points, line width etc.

Planning and Development

- In general the work for this section had improved slightly from last year.
- Thumbnails had improved, but once again very little annotation was provided. Ideas were not developed and evidence demonstrating creative skills using the design elements and design principles was lacking.

- In most cases visuals were better developed than last year. There was an increase in the quality of manual representation of graphics, body text, headlines, colour backgrounds, etc. The traced visuals however were a disappointment.
- In several cases the visuals consisted of a basic layout indicating text and graphic frames.

Presentation

- In most cases the publications produced were excellent. The quality of printing and the overall ambience of the finished document was very professional.
- Most candidates chose the correct type of publication, which meant that there was sufficient scope for including the design elements and design principles expected at Advanced Higher.
- The evaluations and modifications varied from very poor, eg '*this is how I did it*', to some very detailed evaluations and modifications referring in the design elements and design principles.

Advanced Higher - Computer-Aided 3D Modelling Presentation

- Overall the folios presented were of a higher standard than the previous year. This may have been due to the reduction in the number of modelling features in the main model. The other two modelling features can be used in the model of the environment.
- Several 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 which led to a few 'Not Accepted' centres.
- Some candidates are not attaining full marks for the orthographic work produced from models, this may be due to them lacking the knowledge of the commands required to produce a facet free view.
- In some cases the Student Records did not clearly show how the candidate applied materials and lights to their presentation.
- Although there were numerous good examples of materials, lights and environments being well used, there were still some examples of inappropriate environments and those that were too simplistic eg placing the 3D model on top of a 2D clip art background.

Higher

- With regard to the flyleaves, a number of centres did not: complete the external flyleaf; correctly total the marks; or ensure that the candidate and teacher had both signed the document.
- The quality of work was better than last year with some innovative work taking place.
- There was an improvement in the incidence of **tracing** of CAD drawings and/or views produced using drawing instruments in the freehand section of the external folio.
- Overall there was disappointment at the quality of work within the freehand sketching section. Similar to last year the freehand sketching was poor and did not demonstrate the analytical tone expected at this level.
- Within the CAD area there was a mixture of very good/mainly good graphic items.
- Centres allowing the candidates to create 3D surface or 3D solid models for their Thematic Presentation should read the Assessment Guidelines very carefully and ensure that the appropriate facets, hidden line removal and a clear description is given for the application of materials and lights. Centres using this method should do an audit to ensure they are covering the elements within the "Computer Graphics" unit and are therefore eligible for the course award.
- The presentation of the outline CAD pictorial view was missing in a few candidates' folios. Centres are advised to have an outline view and a rendered view separated from any other graphic presentation to aid the moderation process.
- The quality and creativity demonstrated by candidates' promotional graphics increased compared to last year. Nearly all centres produced a poster incorporating their rendered graphic item. Greater skill of the use of "Illustration Packages" was demonstrated.
- The desktop publishing items varied greatly from excellent to very poor with regard to layout, presentation and technical quality of the document.

Intermediate 2

- The quality of work for this area was slightly higher than that of last session.
- The component detail was better presented this year. Only a few centres did not use objects with the correct degree of difficulty, fully dimensioned and containing a range of line types for full marks.
- It was noted that only one centre produced evidence from step-by-step/worksheets from HSDU/ commercially produced material.
- Centres allowing the candidates to create 3D surface or 3D solid models for their Thematic Presentation should refer to the Assessment Guidelines carefully and ensure that the appropriate facets, hidden line removal and a clear description is given for the application of materials and lights. Centres using this method should do an audit to ensure they are covering the elements within the "Computer Graphics" unit and therefore eligible for the course award.
- The quality of DTP work varied from poor to excellent.
- Similarly to last year, several candidates followed a theme approach and produced work above that of the standard required for higher.
- Two centres adopted a class approach. This may have stifled creativity in certain areas of work.
- Student Records completed reasonably well although many not signed by the teacher and/or the student.

Overall the quality of the folios appeared to be of a **higher standard** to that of 2002 and similar to 2001

Feedback to centres

- Centres will benefit from reading the Moderator's report relevant to the centre's presenting levels. If any doubt contact SQA to gain clarification.
- The overall evidence moderated 2002 – 2003 was of a higher standard than that of 2001 – 2002. Although the quality of work was higher a similar number of centres to that of 2002 did not apply the Assessment Guidelines within the tolerance acceptable to SQA.
- Evidence of freehand sketching produced by tracing CAD drawings was still evident from a small number of centres and four centres submitted drawings produced using instruments as freehand sketching evidence.
- Every effort was taken by the Moderators to provide full reports to Not Accepted centres. In the report of accepted centres Moderators included any useful ideas that they thought would help future presentations. This was not to be taken as a criticism but as an outside observation that the Moderator hoped would be welcomed by the centre.
- Centres should make every effort to ensure that candidates have the correct equipment and software before starting any new level of course. Simple tools such as a rule to measure the font size, rule thickness and bullet point size in the correct units aids the learning and teaching of the subject.