



Course Report 2014

| | |
|---------|-----------------------|
| Subject | Graphic Communication |
| Level | National 5 |

The statistics used in this report have been compiled before the completion of any Post Results Services.

This report provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers/lecturers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding. It would be helpful to read this report in conjunction with the published assessment and marking instructions for the examination.

Section 1: Comments on the Assessment

Component 1: Question paper

Overall the make-up of the question paper represented a good mix of questions covering the main elements contained in the National 5 Graphic Communication Course Assessment Specification. Areas included:

- ◆ Computer Aided Design/Draughting techniques
- ◆ Advantages and disadvantages of manual and electronic techniques
- ◆ Spatial awareness
- ◆ Drawing standards, protocols and conventions
- ◆ Use of colour, layout and presentation
- ◆ Graphic Communication as it impacts on our environment and society

This question paper represented a new approach to assessment for the subject, and many of the topics had not previously appeared at this level within Graphic Communication. Many of these topics were 'new ground' for the question paper element of Graphic Communication and as a result some questions did not perform as expected, namely the spatial awareness questions (Q6(i) i, ii, iii). These questions allowed candidates to achieve a substantial number of marks too easily for this level, and the grade boundary was adjusted to take account of this.

The manner in which some questions were phrased made them difficult to interpret, and a number of different understandings were possible. Where this occurred the marking instructions were modified to ensure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

Component 2: Assignment

The assignment is an Internally Assessed Course Component Assessment (IACCA) marked out of 60 marks, and represents 50% of the Course award.

A selection of three assignment tasks was provided by SQA. These comprised of two 'closed brief' scenarios and one 'open brief'. Either the centre or candidate could choose which task to complete. Each task used the same assessment criteria.

The verification team witnessed a wide range of approaches to the IACCA tasks; many of these were very positive and embraced the creative nature of the new Graphic Communication Course. Most candidates kept to within the 10 page limit for submissions and used a variety of manual and electronic responses to generate assessment evidence.

Some centres chose to supply their candidates with more information about the assignment task. This information was designed to support their candidates in the completion of the activity. However, it was noticed by the verification team that choosing a 'pro-forma' approach to the task had the effect of limiting their candidate's responses; marks tended to be generally lower.

Most centres chose the closed brief Aqua-J juice bottle or Buzz-It pen-drive tasks. The few centres that had chosen the more open 'Thirst4music' brief generally completed these to a high standard, although the products modelled were more complex than required.

Section 2: Comments on candidate performance

Component 1: Question paper

On the whole candidates appear to have been well prepared for this examination. Centres appear to have embraced the new approaches and content of this assessment component. The candidate performance demonstrated that centres are mostly covering the correct topic areas in preparation for the question paper.

Candidate performance was generally good in responding to questions on the use of colours, layout and presentation techniques. Candidates were, on the whole, able to identify modifications being applied to a promotional layout and identify the effect of such modifications.

Most candidates performed well in identifying drawing standards, protocols and conventions. However, when candidates were asked more demanding questions, such as justifying their decisions or interpreting drawings, performance was inconsistent.

Performance of candidates in responding to 3D CAD modelling questions was varied. Those candidates who chose to support their responses by using sketches generally performed better than those choosing to respond purely by written means. Many candidates did not use correct terminology to describe their modelling processes, and there was also evidence of inconsistent reference to correct dimensions — critical in the accurate modelling of any component or product.

Component 2: Assignment

The national average mark for the IACCA component was 47 from the 60 marks available. This statistical dataset has not been divided into the separate components of 'Research', 'Preliminary', 'Production', 'Promotion' and 'Evaluation' marks.

Perhaps the most pleasing aspect of verification was the strong creativity of many submissions. Centres who encouraged their candidates to engage in the design opportunities offered by the assignment tasks invariably produced responses that were complex, detailed and well presented. These candidates appear well placed to progress to the new Higher Course.

With the significant changes to the Graphic Communication Course, and the different methods of assessment, centres have clearly responded well. This is testimony to the hard work of assessors and candidates and sets a positive benchmark for the future of the subject.

Section 3: Areas in which candidates performed well

Component 1: Question paper

Question 2(b)(i), (ii), (iii): Most candidates demonstrated a very good understanding of colour theory and the associated effects.

Question 3(a) & (b): Most candidates were able to correctly identify both 3D CAD modelling techniques.

Question 6(b): The majority of candidates were able to identify the third angle projection symbol.

Question 7(a): Most candidates were able to interpret preliminary sketches and relate specific dimensions into a 3D CAD modelling scenario. This was also evident for most candidates when they responded to question 7 (b).

Question 8(a): The majority of candidates were able to identify the different stages of graphic activity (preliminary, production and promotional)

Component 2: Assignment

Whilst there is no formal statistical breakdown of the marks, it was agreed by the verification team that the production drawings component was completed well by most candidates. Where errors had been made, it was due to the set-up of the various software packages and the application of British Standards.

Most candidates had used 3D CAD to create their production drawings — only one centre in the sample had all their candidates use traditional, manual drawing board technology to create these drawings.

Section 4: Areas which candidates found demanding

Component 1: Question paper

Question 1(a): Most candidates had difficulty in identifying the appropriate graph type used to present change in data over a period of time

Question 2(e): Some candidates had difficulty in describing how ‘bleed’ had been used in the promotional layout.

Question 2(f): Some candidates had difficulty in identifying and describing how ‘reverse’ had been used in the promotional layout.

Question 4: Some candidates had difficulty in identifying the British Standard symbols. Many candidates used inappropriate terms to describe 'Sawn Timber' — only this specific term is accepted.

Question 6(c): Most candidates had difficulty in describing the purpose of the third angle projection symbol. Although the majority of candidates could identify the symbol, very few could describe its purpose correctly.

Question 6(f) (ii): Most candidates had difficulty in identifying the pictorial view shown in View 2.

Question 7(b): Some candidates had difficulty in describing correct modelling techniques to achieve **Step 2** and **Step 3**. Some candidates did not make reference to the dimensions given in the preliminary sketches. Some candidates failed to read the question properly and only provided a response that described how to achieve **Step 3**.

Question 7(c): Some candidates had difficulty in using the correct terminology in describing how to 3D CAD model the doorplate. Some candidates made reference to program specific terms and not those supplied in the National 5 Graphic Communication Course Assessment Specification.

Component 2: Assignment

Candidates found the research and analysis component particularly challenging. This is perhaps due to the new nature of this approach to graphic communication.

Many candidates also found preliminary graphics challenging — many had traced production drawings and therefore were awarded no marks — and it is evident that centres should focus on this aspect more within the learning and teaching.

It was clear that some centres are not yet comfortable with the promotional graphics element — especially when it comes to creative use of DTP layouts and design elements and principles.

Section 5: Advice to centres for preparation of future candidates

Component 1: Question paper

In undertaking examination preparation for next diet, centres should encourage candidates to support their responses with sketches where appropriate. Although not a requirement, it was identified from this 2014–15 diet that some candidates may struggle to fully articulate some of their responses through written means only. This was particularly evident in 3D CAD modelling questions. Although pencil may be used to construct a sketch, any final sketch to support a response should be in blue or black ink.

Candidates should ensure that when using additional space at the rear of the question paper to continue their response it is clearly indicated.

Ensure that candidates are using the correct terms as detailed in the National 5 Graphic Communication Course Assessment Specification. This has particular importance when responding to 3D CAD modelling questions and drawing standards, conventions and protocol type questions.

Centres should ensure that graphs and charts are covered in suitable depth so that candidates can distinguish which types of graph or chart are suited to specific sets of data. Evidence from this examination shows that many candidates have limited knowledge of graphs and charts and were unable justify their decisions.

Component 2: Assignment

Section 1: Research & Analysis

The verification team witnessed a wide range of approaches to the research and analysis component. Where this section had been completed well, candidates had completed some research that confirmed all aspects of the assignment brief.

Several centres generously marked candidates who only researched the graphic design aspect of the task. Many candidates who completed the Aqua-J task had purely focused on the graphic design, colour scheme and target market at the expense of other aspects, such as production drawings. Centres should encourage candidates to consider all aspects of the assignment that will require research and analysis.

Section 2: Preliminary Graphics

Some candidates produced retrospective planning. Work that is traced or is retrospective does not attract any marks. Several centres failed to identify these issues and, consequently, candidates had their marks reduced during verification.

Several centres were generous in their assessment of candidates with regards creating sufficient evidence to generate production drawings. Centres should consider whether the evidence is clear and detailed enough to enable the creation of a 3D CAD model or manual drawings.

Where preliminary promotional layouts have been completed well, candidates made clear reference to design elements and principles and the DTP features and techniques they were intending to use. There should be a clear indication which promotional layout will be developed into the final item.

Section 3: Production Graphics

Production graphics were generously marked by centres. Centres are reminded that BS8888 is the standard to be applied to these drawings; candidates should be able to change any settings within their CAD application to reflect these standards. There should be sufficient views and dimensions that could enable the product to be re-drawn via 3D CAD, if necessary.

Technical detail must be clear and relevant to the task. Where sectional, enlargements or exploded views are created; they must provided additional information or enhance the clarity of the drawings. Several centres had given marks for simply creating a view.

Centres should ensure candidates have a firm knowledge of British Standards, along with an understanding of the relevance of particular technical graphics to a specific situation.

Section 4: Promotional Graphics

Many centres incorrectly assessed candidates for producing a promotional item in relation to a brief. Both the Aqua-J and the Buzz-It tasks have specific promotional activities that a candidate must choose from. A candidate who does not respond to the brief cannot be awarded any marks for this activity. However, subsequent marks for illustration and the use of layout techniques may be assessed from the candidate's strongest work. This is particularly useful if a candidate has created more promotional work than was required by the brief.

Section 5: Evaluation

The evaluation component was generally assessed well by most centres; most candidates had focused on the DTP component. Centres are reminded that candidates can evaluate any aspect of their work. A high-marking evaluation should make reference to the brief and how the graphics they have produced meet the requirements of the brief.

Statistical information: update on Courses

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Number of resulted entries in 2013 | 0 |
|------------------------------------|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Number of resulted entries in 2014 | 6129 |
|------------------------------------|------|

Statistical information: Performance of candidates

Distribution of Course awards including grade boundaries

| Distribution of Course awards | % | Cum. % | Number of candidates | Lowest mark |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------------|
| Maximum Mark 120 | | | | |
| A | 37.3% | 37.3% | 2284 | 89 |
| B | 27.1% | 64.4% | 1661 | 78 |
| C | 19.0% | 83.4% | 1166 | 68 |
| D | 5.9% | 89.3% | 364 | 63 |
| No award | 10.7% | - | 654 | - |