

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. This year there were no new 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 & organizing envelopes.

52 centres were targeted at moderation; slightly more centres were selected for moderation this year compared with last year. The folios from 2 centres had not 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.

It is reassuring to see centres moderated over consecutive years are taking the advice offered on-board. However, despite specific feedback on problem areas, a small number of centres continue to fail moderation or come very close to failing moderation.

Specific issues identified

Common assessment trends

Internal assessment was more accurate than in previous years with fewer centres (2) requiring re-assessment.

Arithmetic errors and errors in completing the Ex5 (flyleaf) were more varied than last year.

Examples include;

- no grade entered on the Ex5 flyleaf. Empty boxes were more common this year than in recent years
- incorrect selection of candidates when compiling the sample
- the use of half grades eg 1.5
- the use of grade 8 on the flyleaf

- flyleaf grades not corresponding with entries on the SGER00.

Feedback was provided to centres that made the above errors. 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 the flyleaf.

Although some centres utilised the space for the teachers' comments, it is felt that in some centres there is still room for improvement. The moderation team welcome the teacher's comments on the Flyleaf. An explanation of the candidate's input or the extra support provided by the teacher facilitates the moderators when making a decision on the centres assessment procedures.

Feedback to centres

The overall standard of work submitted for moderation was better than that of last year.

More centres have made progress in computer graphics and there is evidence that centres are better preparing candidates for the challenges they will face in the Higher and Intermediate 2 courses.

It is encouraging that more centres have adopted a strong creative approach to learning. The quality and depth of treatment of work from those centres whose candidates were involved in creating or designing their work (graphs and charts, layout, display etc) was far superior to that from schools where teacher led/controlled work is the norm. It is clear that this creative approach provides a better route to Intermediate 2 and Higher Grade.

A greater number of centres provided evidence of strong work across the entire folio. Previously it was more common for a centre to be strong in one area e.g. *manual rendering and display* but less confident in another e.g. *computer graphics*.

Specific comments on each topic

Topic (a) Graphs and Charts

The topic was generally well done and assessment was, in the main accurate. Better use is being made of graphs and charts across the folio (display, CAG for Display, Layout and Lettering etc). There is also more evidence that pictorial computer graphics and computer-generated illustrations are featuring in this topic. Teachers appear to be expanding into NQ territory by giving candidates experience in the kind of areas that they will require to be familiar with at Intermediate 2 and Higher levels.

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

Candidates from a number of centres are not providing a justification for their selection of colours. This is a crucial part of the assessment in this topic at all levels. Failure to do so can lead to failed moderation and re-assessment. Due to the frequency with which this justification is missed out, it is extremely difficult of moderators to provide feedback to all individual centres.

Topic (c) Shading, Toning and Rendering

There is evidence of very strong work in a small but growing number of centres. However, in some centres there is still an over dependence on the use of photocopy masters which are traced and then rendered or simply rendered onto the photocopy. This can create difficulty in finding evidence on which to base a grade for draughting.

The strongest work in this topic is found in centres where the candidates sketch or draw their own outlines.

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

Although it does occur, it is encouraging to see that there is less evidence of candidates copying exemplar materials. Centres are becoming more creative and more confident in combining

