



NQ Verification 2016–17

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Graphic Communication
Verification event/visiting information	Visiting
Date published:	June 2017

National Courses verified:

X735 75 National 5 IACCA*
X735 76 Higher IACCA
X735 77 Advanced Higher Project

*Internally-assessed component of course assessment

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

At Advanced Higher, it was noted that some centres were still allowing their candidates to take on too wide a brief and thus limiting the chances of their candidates achieving high quality work. The candidates then produced 'a quantity of' rather than 'quality' work.

Centres are encouraged to engage with the candidates at the outset of the Advanced Higher projects to ensure that realistic briefs are being set.

At National 5 and Higher level it was apparent that centres are now far more comfortable with all assignments and the standard of work expected within these.

At National 5 the most popular assignments remain the USB and AquaJ tasks, while at Higher there was evidence of staff within centres giving candidates a free choice between all three available assignments.

At Advanced Higher the most popular option was for candidates to choose a commercial and visual media graphics (CVMG) approach over the technical

media graphics approach to their project, with a very few centres opting for a combined approach.

Centres that opt for the combined approach must guard against students producing quantity over quality across the whole assignment, not just at the graphic solution stage, and to bear in mind that only the best work in either technical graphics or CVMG can be assessed in any one area of the project, not both added together.

Most candidates kept to the 10-page limit for National 5 and Higher, and the 20-page limit for Advanced Higher.

Assessment judgements

In almost all centres verified, the assessment judgements at National 5 were found to be very much in line with the national standard and verifiers identified many centres where candidates were producing high quality work across the whole assignment and not just in CAD work. In the very few centres where generous marking was identified it tended to be across the analysis, preliminary and desktop publishing (DTP) sections of the assignment.

At Higher level, most centres' assessment judgements were found to be in line with the national standard and it was particularly pleasing to see several centres where candidates were producing high quality work across the entire assignment. A very small number of centres are still permitting/marketing retrospective planning work such as tracing of CAD drawings etc. Centres are reminded that retrospective planning and tracing is **not permitted** at any level for any course assignment/project, and must not be awarded any marks.

Some candidates at Higher did not produce three different CAD modelling techniques and centres are reminded that not all three techniques are required in the model — some can appear in the scene. Some candidates, while producing the three techniques, did not do so at a level appropriate to Higher. Centres are reminded that technical detail should be relevant to the task in hand as some candidates had produced inappropriate sections (some stepped, possibly just because they could) and were then awarded marks simply for creating the views.

Higher candidates are required to create a 3D scene as part of the promotional activity. In a few cases the quality of illustration was below what should have been achieved. Materials and textures (bump-maps) were often in an incorrect orientation or scale, making the scenes unrealistic and ineffectual.

Some candidates were not planning and then producing multi-page layouts for the Higher promotional item. Centres are reminded that at Higher level, candidates must produce multi-page DTP layouts for the assignment. This can be in form of table talkers, split-wall or banner displays as well as double-sided and three-fold leaflets.

At Advanced Higher level, centres were much more reliable than previous years with their assessment judgements, however a few centres continue to mark too generously across the whole project and not just in one particular area.

Analysis of the graphic brief and initial research

Candidates generally completed this area well, identifying the target audience and their graphic requirements.

In some cases 'imaginary' clients were quoted. While it is accepted that not all centres are in a position to find real clients for their candidates, we would advise that the class teacher take on this role to make the project more relevant, particularly with feedback, dialogue and presentations.

Producing a graphic specification

Some of the specifications created by candidates were lists of tasks that the candidate will complete. A valid specification should detail the particular graphics that will be created for the audience and any specific features required.

Project planning

For many candidates the project planning made no reference to intermediate target setting. The candidate must demonstrate key targets, show how they will help achieve the requirements of the target specification and specify the resources that would be required at each stage.

Candidates who achieved high marks in this section typically included sub-tasks within their project planning.

Graphic planning and production

Carrying out and using ongoing research

This was handled far better by candidates this year, with some opting to display this in a separate section rather than having it occur naturally throughout the project.

Using preliminary graphic techniques to communicate ideas

In most cases the preliminary graphic techniques were valid for creating a graphic solution; however, in a few centres the quality demonstrated by candidates was poor and showed far more limited skill than would be expected at Advanced Higher for the mark awarded, especially within technical graphics projects.

Producing a range of graphic ideas or concepts

Some candidates did not demonstrate a range of possible graphic solutions to satisfy the needs of their chosen target audience(s) and did not show any development of their idea — linked to ongoing research — that would allow the

creation of a valid graphical solution or solutions. Some of this could be linked to candidates attempting too wide a brief or taking on too many tasks.

Many candidates chose to demonstrate their use of techniques and technologies in this area to good effect, eg FEA, 3D prints, mock ups, physical models.

Producing a graphic solution

It was pleasing to see an increase in the standard and quality of graphics in both technical graphics and commercial and visual media graphics. There was clear evidence of top quality graphics from some centres and candidates.

However, there was also evidence of some centres marking far too generously in this area for work which was not of the quality expected at Advanced Higher.

Centres are reminded that for a combined approach they must assess the strongest element of the graphic solution: technical graphics or commercial and visual media graphics. It cannot be an aggregate of the two marks.

Generally, the technical graphic solutions lacked significant details in terms of dimensions, scale, tolerances, and view types, required for the target audience.

Architectural type projects typically lacked detail sufficient for construction or further work. This can be linked back to candidates trying to take on too much work, ie drawings for a whole building being worked on, which in most cases, for a candidate at this stage of their education may be too daunting.

Commercial and visual media graphics solutions have improved from previous years, however a few lacked significant details in terms of screen resolution, paper size, file types, colour palettes, bleed, crop or registration information. The target audience would require this information to produce this graphic type.

Planning a client presentation

Typically, the planning for the presentation did not reference how the graphic solution was suitable for the target audience and was then a presentation of the candidate's journey through the project which would only have been suitable for the assessor rather than the audience initially identified. Resources required often listed only hardware and ignored any software and/or file types etc.

Producing a client presentation

Some candidates gaining high marks here had used other methods apart from PowerPoint, eg Prezi, physical representations, videos, film etc to demonstrate and talk to solutions.

Some presentations did not address the needs of the target audience. A client presentation should address the specific requirements of that client and how the candidate has generated a solution.

Evaluating the solution and the process

This area had improved from previous years with most candidates providing a thorough evaluation of the project.

Many candidates made effective use of the 'record of progress' entries or effective references to notes, comments or annotations from project design work, mostly in the form of a diary complete with copies of letters, e-mails etc.

03 Section 3: General comments

Centre staff are reminded to download and use the most up to date versions of the assessment materials and subject documentation. There was some evidence of centres using out of date assessment materials.

While almost all centres had provided evidence of, and had engaged in, internal verification processes there were still instances of centres being found to be 'not accepted' at verification due to arithmetic errors in their sample of candidates. Centres are reminded to closely verify not only their judgements but also the arithmetic totals at all levels.

There was evidence from some centres of high quality internal verification, complete with notes on the dialogue between assessor and internal verifier, with clear recording of the outcome of the internal verification process.

Centres should be mindful of the assessment conditions set out in the course assessment specification of the assignment (National 5 and Higher), and the project (Advanced Higher):

The assignment/project will be carried out under open-book conditions, but supervised to ensure that the work is the learner's own.

The assignment/project is designed to discriminate between learners, and therefore would be expected to provide a wide range of marks. Stronger learners should be able to complete the assignment successfully with minimal support and guidance. Weaker learners may not be able to complete all aspects of the assignment within a reasonable time, or may require significant assistance, and so would achieve a lower total mark.

Once the assignment has been completed and assessed, it should not be returned to the learner for further work to improve their mark.

A final point to note is that while the assessor may give learners support and guidance, where any significant amount of support is provided this must be reflected in the marks awarded. The learner may be provided with feedback to help them achieve the next stage of the assessment, however they are not allowed to be re-assessed on stages already completed.