



NQ Verification 2015–16 Key Messages Round 1

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Graphic Communication
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	March 2016

National Courses/Units verified:

H27V 75	National 5	2D Graphic Communication
H27W 75	National 5	3D and Pictorial Graphic Communication
H27V 76	Higher	2D Graphic Communication
H27W 76	Higher	3D and Pictorial Graphic Communication
H27V 27	Advanced Higher	Technical Graphics
H27W 77	Advanced Higher	Commercial and Visual Media Graphics

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

This is the first year the verification team has verified assessment judgements at all levels of the subject. Centres are becoming more comfortable in adapting and creating their own assessment material for National 5 and Higher, and the verification team encountered a wide range of approaches — most through a portfolio or centre-devised approach. These appeared to be tasks that were well pitched to the level of the candidates and enabled them to access a range of Assessment Standards.

It is beneficial for both internal and external verification if the assessor indicates on candidate material where they felt an Assessment Standard had been achieved or not.

Some centres are incorrectly assessing National 5 Assessment Standard 1.1, which requires sketching, with drawings. This Assessment Standard requires

candidates to complete sketches either manually, or using an electronic sketching method such as tablet and stylus or touch-screen device. Retrospective sketching (tracing) is not acceptable. Centres are advised to be vigilant for such evidence and to record it as not achieving the Assessment Standard.

Centres verified for Advanced Higher had used SQA Unit assessment support pack (UASP) material without any modifications. All candidates had completed more evidence than would be required to achieve Outcomes; often repeating the same skills or responses.

Some centres had chosen to make use of the UASP tasks to arrange visits or use different technologies to aid completion of the task. This was refreshing to see and candidates had made full use of this approach. It is possible for centres to adapt UASP tasks to take account of more local opportunities.

Assessment judgements

Assessment judgements for both National 5 and Higher appeared robust, with most centres' decisions Accepted.

There is evidence that centres are still overly assessing candidates, or demanding that evidence be achieved on specific pages to the exclusion of other items of evidence. Candidates can demonstrate a pass for an Assessment Standard in any aspect of their own work. The verification team identified several instances where candidates had generated sufficient evidence to warrant a pass for numerous Assessment Standards, but as the candidate had not completed them on a specific page, the candidate had not been awarded a pass. This leads to the candidate generating more assessment evidence to achieve Outcomes — many of which they would already have passed if the assessor had rewarded their evidence.

However, at Advanced Higher, many centres had been generous in their assessment judgements with regard to Assessment Standard 1.1 within the Technical Graphics Unit. Most candidates had only described the differences between graphical items. However, to achieve this standard, candidates must make accurate comments regarding specific audience requirements. The terminology of 'audiences' appears to be a challenge for candidates and centres are advised to focus more time to researching and learning the needs of audience and how they can be achieved graphically.

There was also some confusion between Assessment Standards 1.2 and 1.3 of both Units at Advanced Higher. It is important to identify the technologies and the techniques used to generate graphics for specific audiences. On a few samples, centres had incorrectly assessed candidates for Assessment Standard 1.3, which requires techniques, by describing the technologies.

Sample composition

Centres had chosen a broad range of Assessment Standards for verification, and the team saw several centres present material that covered much of the Course

content. It was also noted that centres are using a range of technologies and approaches to enable candidates to generate evidence. Drawing boards, pastels, spirit markers, photography and photo-editing, 2D and 3D CAD, and modern rendering software have all enabled candidates to create high quality evidence.

03

Section 3: General comments

Sample format

All centres presented candidate evidence and material in hard copy. Where candidates had created animations, almost all centres had presented a series of renders or snapshots to storyboard the evidence. Centres are reminded to ensure that all evidence continues to be in hard copy only.

Internal verification

Most centres were correctly entering candidates for the appropriate level.

The verification team noted that all centres had some form of internal verification and quality assurance procedure. There were many centres working with others in their authorities to sample and internally verify evidence and this is proving to be helpful in maintaining and applying national standards. Systems of internal verification have been developed by centres and are increasingly being seen as integral to the effective delivery of Units. There was evidence of dual assessment, cross-marking and sampling. Records to support assessment took a variety of forms including departmental minutes and quality assurance calendars with key dates.

Most centres use individual record-of-work booklets/sheets for candidates with a simple checklist outlining each element of the Outcomes. This is ticked off when each Assessment Standard is achieved. It is good practice to also indicate where the evidence can be found.