



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Design and Manufacture
Verification event/visiting information	Event and Visiting
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H22T 74	National 4	Design
H22V 74	National 4	Materials and Manufacturing
H22T 75	National 5	Design
H22V 75	National 5	Materials and Manufacturing
H22T 76	Higher	Design
H22V 76	Higher	Materials and Manufacturing

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

The majority of centres had used the combined approach and submitted partial evidence which had been generated from a wide range of activities.

Assessment judgements

All levels

Materials and Manufacturing Unit

This Unit was verified by visiting verifiers and almost all judgements were reliable. There were minor issues with the finish on some models and the assembly of others. Candidates at National 5 must produce models which allow them the opportunity to display their assembly and finishing skills: very simple models may not be appropriate.

Candidates at Higher must produce models or prototypes which allow them to demonstrate the practical skill required in this Unit. The development type models used in the Design Unit may not allow the candidates to demonstrate practical skill at an appropriate level.

Design Unit

The judgements made for Higher, Outcome 3, Product Evaluation were generally reliable and reports produced by candidates at all levels were appropriate to the time available and detail required.

The majority of judgements made by centres for the other Outcomes were reliable. However, a number of judgements raised issues at N4, N5 and Higher:

Producing a specification: Specifications should become more detailed/specific as candidates progress through the levels of the Course. Many candidates produced 'specifications' which were too vague/generic for N5 and Higher.

Research: Candidates should be aware of the purpose of the research, ie to produce a design specification which details the requirements of the proposal. Many candidates carried out inappropriate research which resulted in weak specifications (AS 1.4).

Idea generation: There was continued improvement in this area. However, it should be noted that techniques should be used to generate ideas which address the brief/specification, eg use of SAM to simply generate a range of shapes does not demonstrate appropriate use of an idea generation technique.

Exploring and refining: The weak specifications generated in AS1.4 made it difficult for a number of candidates to carry out the exploration and refinement required at this level.

Graphic and modelling techniques: Techniques must be applied effectively to explore and refine ideas. Simply producing a range of models and graphics will not satisfy the Assessment Standards; they must be used to develop the proposal.

03

Section 3: General comments

Centres are reminded of the following:

- ◆ Graphics and models must be appropriate to the level of the Course.
- ◆ Higher candidates are required to justify their selection of factors and research techniques (AS1.1/1.2/3.1).

Centres are advised not to generate evidence for Outcomes 1 and 3 with the same activity. Although the skills used by candidates are the same for both Outcomes they are used in a different context and attempting to do both with the

same task often leads to candidates being confused, ie they mix up an existing product with the analysis of a brief.

Centres are reminded of the importance of the specification. Candidates must be made aware that it is the focus of Outcome 1. Candidates must also have developed, or have been given, a detailed enough specification to allow them to carry out suitable development of a design proposal (Outcome 2).