



NQ Verification 2017–18

Key Messages Round 2

01

Section 1: Verification group information

Verification group name:	Graphic Communication
Verification event/visiting information	Event
Date published:	June 2018

National Courses/Units verified:

Course	Level	Unit
C735	74	AVU
C735	76	IACCA
C735	77	IACCA

02

Section 2: Comments on assessment

Assessment approaches

At National 4, all centres who were verified used the SQA Added Value Unit (AVU) materials (either the Buzz-IT pendrive or the fruit drink promotion briefs).

Centres should be aware of the AVU re-assessment threshold: candidates are required to achieve six out of the eight learning outcomes to attain a pass at National 4 level.

At Higher, there was evidence of staff within centres giving candidates a free choice of assignment brief — the reception desk being the most popular.

At Advanced Higher, it was noted that some centres are allowing their candidates to take on too wide a brief, thus limiting the chances of their candidates submitting high-quality work. Candidates then produced a 'quantity rather than quality of work'.

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

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, with a very few centres opting for a combined approach.

Centres that opt for the combined approach should note 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 Higher, and the 20-page limit for Advanced Higher.

Assessment judgements

At Higher level, most centres assessment judgements were found to be in line with the national standard. High-quality work was usually found at the CAD production drawing stage; however, some centres were found to be too lenient when awarding marks.

Some centres permitted — and marked — retrospective planning work, such as tracing of CAD drawings. 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.

In many centres, the candidates' preliminary work — for example, the use of line, shape, form, and proportion; and the communication of design features through the use of light, shade, tone, and texture — was found to be disappointing and well below the standard expected for work at Higher level.

Some candidates at Higher did not produce three different CAD modelling techniques. Centres are reminded that not all three techniques are required in the model — some can appear in the scene. Some candidates, who did produce the three techniques, did not do so at a level appropriate to Higher.

A few centres were permitting candidates to model simple block models, which meant they did not attain the standard of CAD modelling required for Higher.

Centres are reminded that technical detail should be relevant to the task. Some candidates had produced inappropriate sections; some stepped — possibly just because they could, or perhaps they thought that they should — and were then awarded marks simply for creating the views.

To gain full marks for production drawings, candidates must include a full assembly and a separate sub assembly.

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 presented in an

incorrect orientation or scale, making the scenes unrealistic and ineffectual, and in some cases the applied lighting was poorly attempted.

At Advanced Higher level, centres' assessment judgements were far more reliable than in previous years; however, some 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

In some cases, imaginary clients were quoted. If centres cannot 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 for the candidate to complete. A valid specification should detail the particular graphics that will be created for the audience, and any specific features required.

Some candidates are still struggling to identify the graphic requirements and the correct formats to meet the needs of the target audience.

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.

In some cases, the project plans were not adhered to; the evidence logged the project itself or the record of progress.

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 in comparison to previous years, with some candidates 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.

The detail required within these preliminary techniques was poor for both technical graphics and CVMG assignments.

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 explained by 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 e.g. FEA, 3D prints, mock ups, physical models. Some centres are using animation here to good effect.

Producing a graphic solution

It was pleasing to see an increase in the standard and quality of graphics in both technical graphics and CVMG. There was clear evidence of high-quality graphics from some centres and candidates.

However, there was also evidence of a few 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 CVMG. 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 sufficient detail for construction or further work. This can be linked back to candidates trying to take on too much work; i.e. drawings for a whole building being worked on, which, in most cases, may be too daunting for a candidate at this stage of their education.

CVMG 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, it was a presentation of the candidate's journey through the project which is only suitable for the assessor, rather than the audience initially identified. Resources required often listed hardware only and ignored any software and/or file types.

The centres whose candidates did well here included full details of presentation content in relation to the audience requirements, provided an effective structure and layout, and then went on to detail all media or resources required.

Producing a client presentation

Some candidates gaining high marks here had used other methods apart from PowerPoint — for example, Prezzi, physical representations, videos, and film — to demonstrate and talk about solutions.

Some presentations did not address the needs of the target audience. A client presentation should address the specific requirements of the 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 and emails.

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.

Whilst almost all centres had provided evidence of, and had engaged in, internal verification processes, there were still many instances of centres having 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. Evidence of a dialogue between assessor and internal verifier aided the verification process.

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

- ◆ *The assignment/project will be carried out under open book conditions, but should be supervised to ensure that the work is the learners' 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, whilst the assessor may give learners support and guidance, where any significant amount of support is provided, this should be reflected in the marks awarded. The learner may be provided with feedback to help them achieve the next stage of the assessment, but they are not allowed to be re-assessed on stages already completed.