



General Certificate of Education

Applied Art and Design
8511/8513/8516/8519

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - June series

- 8511 Advanced Subsidiary
- 8513 Advanced Subsidiary (Double Award)
- 8516 Advanced
- 8519 Advanced (Double Award)

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2006 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

Contents

All Units	5
Unit 1	6
Unit 2	6
Unit 3	6
Unit 4	7
Unit 5	7
Unit 6	8
Mark Ranges and Award of Grades	9

This page has been left intentionally blank

All Units

General

This was the first opportunity for centres to enter candidates for moderation of the Advanced Subsidiary awards. The approach of this new specification had been understood and the work produced was at an appropriate level. The requirements of units were understood and candidates were able to work through the design process using a range of briefs. The ‘applied’ nature of the course was evident in the work produced for all of the units and there was a strong vocational flavour to the outcomes. However, in some cases there was evidence that some aspects of the specification had not been fully understood and the requirements of the units were not always met.

Assessment

The accuracy of assessment varied between centres with a tendency towards leniency, especially at the top end of the mark range. Many centres adopted a holistic approach to the delivery of some of the units. This is acceptable, however, it is very important that units are assessed separately; against their specific Assessment Criteria and that the marks are recorded individually on the Candidate Record Form. This is especially important for moderation and clear labelling of the work related to each unit is essential for the moderator. Teachers at most centres had understood the Assessment Criteria and were able to award a mark for each Assessment Objective. Differentiation between mark bands was inaccurate in some cases. A common problem was where work was awarded a mark at the top end of a mark band when in fact it just met the criteria and should have been placed at the lower end of the band. Where centres used the marking grid with care, and understood the differences between mark bands, there was greater accuracy.

Differentiation between mark bands is seen in the progression in candidates’ ability to meet the Assessment Objectives. For example, in AO2(a) in AD01, *2D Visual Language*, differentiation occurs through a *basic* understanding (Mark Band 1), *moderate* understanding (Mark Band 2), *sound* understanding (Mark Band 3) through to a *well-developed* understanding (Mark Band 4). The bullet points in the Assessment Criteria indicate the requirements of the unit. This was the first occasion that teachers have assessed candidates’ work at AS standard and it was pleasing to see that most were able to recognise this level and how it sits between GCSE and A2.

Administration

The majority of centres had used the correct documentation and most candidates’ signatures were evident on the Candidate Record Form. On the reverse of the Candidate Record Form there is a space for teachers’ concluding comments but in many cases this was not completed. A short comment about the reasons for awarding marks and whether the candidate has worked independently is very helpful for the visiting moderator. This space can also be used for explaining any visits the candidate has undertaken or identifying any artists that the candidate has worked with. In most centres teachers had understood the required time scale for AD03 and AD05 and the deadline for the submission of marks was generally adhered to.

The method of presentation of portfolios varied from centre to centre with many having work available in individual folders and/or displayed on walls. It was sometimes difficult for moderators to read evaluations which were displayed on walls and these may be shown more effectively in sketchbooks or similar formats. One common problem encountered by visiting moderators was where some centres had combined units. Although this is acceptable, it was not always easy to attribute work to individual units. The majority of centres provided the required sample of work and had the work of other candidates available if required.

Unit 1 (AD01) Investigation of 2D visual language

There was evidence of some very good work with a range of mark-making techniques in evidence, including ICT. Sketchbook work was seen in many centres and there were some excellent examples of experimentation with media and appropriate comments. The main focus of this unit is that candidates work with a variety of skills and techniques in order to underpin work in other AS units and also as a basis for progression to A2. The ‘About this Unit’ section of the unit specification identifies the need to apply these skills and techniques, ‘... to vocational contexts such as advertising, exhibition design, electronic and computer generated design and printmaking ...’. This had clearly been done in some centres but there was also evidence that others viewed this as a Fine Art unit and had not thought about how the techniques could be applied in a vocational setting.

The Assessment Criteria bullet point, ‘how others apply 2D media and techniques’ (AO1), was not always well observed. The emphasis on, ‘*applying* knowledge and understanding of others’ practice’ (AO1), needs to be given greater importance as in some cases there was evidence of cutting and pasting with a lack of analysis and understanding. Some teachers were too generous when awarding marks for work that was not developed through the application of knowledge and understanding.

Evaluation tended to be weak. The Assessment Criteria require that candidates include, ‘comments that explain the use of 2D visual language and how this could be improved’ (AO3). Many candidates wrote descriptive comments which lacked analysis, and did not focus on improvements.

Unit 2 (AD02) Investigation of 3D visual language

The work produced for this unit was generally less successful than that produced for AD01. The range and breadth of 3D experience was somewhat narrow and in many cases only just fulfilled the requirements of the Assessment Criteria. Annotation varied from simple descriptions of techniques and/or media to an in-depth analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of different 3D media. Many centres had combined this unit with AD01, and in some cases with AD04, which is acceptable but it should be remembered that the Assessment Criteria for both units must be covered. One of the main differences between this unit and AD01 is that candidates need to consider 3D work through art, craft and design. Many centres adopted an art focus, ignoring 3D craft and 3D design. A further requirement is that the work produced should be ‘vocationally considered’. Some 3D work was purely Fine Art based and this could be rectified by seeing the work as a commissioned piece within the art market. Some of the stronger work for this unit was by candidates who either worked with a practising crafts person or visited a craft workshop and individual work developed from this experience. Candidates’ evaluations were sometimes over-marked where there was little analysis to credit.

Unit 3 (AD03) Working to a brief

Many candidates produced a creative response to their chosen brief. Brief 1, the five flags; Brief 2, the sculpture and Brief 4, the scarves, sarongs and neckties; were the most popular with fewer responses to Brief 3, the paintings and Brief 5, the holdall. Candidates were required to work from a choice of set briefs; carrying out research, paying particular attention to the constraints set by the brief and the requirements of the client; develop alternative ideas and produce a design proposal and evaluation in the supervised five hour period. The Candidate Guidance asked for the equivalent of not less than two, and not more than four, A1 sheets (or a sketchbook or other suitable form) of research and developmental work and most candidates worked to this requirement.

The requirements of the unit were generally understood and candidates were able to work through the design process from initial ideas and research to the design proposal. The vocational aspects of the outcomes were clear and candidates worked within the time constraints effectively. The accuracy of assessment varied between centres with an overall tendency towards leniency. One area to note is the specific requirements of each individual brief. Some candidates had not fulfilled the brief's requirements so could not be awarded higher marks in AO3. Research into the theme, whilst generally good, was sometimes not used to develop ideas and appeared as a stand-alone activity. Research should be linked to the chosen brief, be focused rather than generalised and be vocationally relevant. It would also be beneficial to include research that is contemporary and to which candidates can relate. The planning, organising and carrying out of research (bullet 1, AO1) was satisfactory, using insights (bullet 2, AO1), was, in many cases, not seen. Evaluation was usually descriptive and candidates should be encouraged to write comments that are addressed to the client rather than to themselves.

The tasks set out in the Candidate Guidance, whilst not always used in their entirety, were nevertheless noted and used by many of the candidates. Many teachers commented on the usefulness of the tasks and understood that, if completed, candidates would cover the Assessment Objectives. It would benefit candidates if they were guided through the tasks, and the Assessment Objectives, prior to starting work on their chosen brief. The five hours of supervised time was generally handled well with most candidates completing the necessary work. Centres that had organised the test time to include time for the evaluation, which has to be written within the five hours of supervised time, fared better.

Some exceptional evaluations were seen where candidates had discussed the requirements of the brief and explained, using visual language, how they had or had not addressed it, how their design proposal was fit for purpose and how improvements could be made. However, the majority of candidates wrote descriptive evaluations of the process and development of their designs, which could be seen in their work. Evaluative comments can be made formatively in the preparatory work through annotation but the summative evaluation written in the five hours of supervised time is important and candidates should be given guidance as to how to go about this.

Unit 4 (AD04) Historical and contemporary references

Some candidates showed a sound knowledge of art, craft and design in vocational contexts, which enabled them to analyse and evaluate a variety of sources. Others were less certain and did not source useful material. The quality of visual evidence was a significant element in presenting contextual references and candidates who had thought about this aspect performed well. Some centres covered AO1 in a rather limited way. The Assessment Criteria require contemporary and historical applications in art, craft and design in vocational contexts and it was clear that in some cases the research had concentrated on art sources. To fulfil the criteria effectively, a wider range of sources must be used.

Some candidates did not provide, 'an example of one 2D and one 3D piece of work', and only one area was completed. It was interesting to note that some centres combined units AD01, AD02 and AD04, using the 2D and 3D requirement of AD04 as final vocational briefs in AD01 and AD02. This worked very well in some cases but it is important that moderators are able to 'unpick' the work into the separate units for assessment. A unit check-list or an index of work would be suitable ways of achieving this.

Unit 5 (AD05) Professional practice, communication and meaning

Interesting work was produced for this unit although there were some cases where the details of each of the briefs had not been taken into account and therefore some candidates did not produce all of the required evidence. The flow chart had been followed in detail by some candidates enabling them to work through the requirements of the unit. Many centres had prepared candidates to analyse images and it was

pleasing to see some understanding of and comment on the set images. Many candidates were able to differentiate between structure, meaning and content when de-constructing the images and personal comment and analysis were also evident. Stronger answers were sensitive and insightful with visual interpretations of the set images. The criteria for AO1 Mark Bands 2, 3 and 4, required candidates to compare and contrast images and there was very little evidence of this.

There was evidence that candidates used ICT to produce some of the work required for the brief. This was sometimes assessed inaccurately, taking far too much account of the ‘professionalism’ of the final hard copy without assessing the candidate’s input and interaction with the software.

Progression routes, part of AO3, were in many cases, quite loosely referred to, often comprising a description of a professional’s job. In some cases candidates did not complete this section and therefore could not achieve the higher marks for AO3.

Unit 6 (AD06) Option Unit Alternatives A - F

These are optional units and it was often the case that this was the best work that candidates produced. Candidates often shone when they followed their specialist area. ADA6: Drawing, painting or sculpture, and printmaking, requires a finished drawing, a painting or sculpture, and two limited edition prints. The more successful work linked this series of work together with one theme, each piece of work linking with the next. Some candidates however did not complete one or more of the requirements and the mark awarded reflected this.

The Graphic design option, ADC6, was generally completed well with some excellent ICT work both in the development of ideas and in the finished pieces. The Assessment Criteria require both traditional and computer techniques and sometimes one aspect was missing.

ADD6: Art in the community, was popular with many centres taking in-house mural projects as their theme. Group work was sometimes evident in this unit and whilst this was acceptable, the individual candidate’s contribution must be recorded. Notes and comments on the process and on the final product are required but these were not always seen.

The Textile art and fashion option, ADE6, was also popular with many candidates producing a finished textile or fashion item. Making was not always of a high standard but initial ideas and development showed some creative and imaginative responses. One requirement that should be focused on is the production of the illustrated report about either a contemporary textile artist or a fashion designer. Some excellent examples were seen but some candidates had simply downloaded information and visuals which were then presented as a report. To achieve high marks in AO1, candidates need to, ‘carry out a wide range of research using a variety of sources’ and show, ‘sophisticated illustrated supporting evidence’. The summary, used to justify the design solution for the client, was often short or simply a re-iteration of the brief’s requirements, with no justification.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
AD01	60	60	35.1	11.5
AD02	60	60	32.7	11.7
AD03	60	60	31.4	13.0
AD04	60	60	33.8	12.2
AD05	60	60	33.7	11.8
ADA6	60	60	38.2	11.9
ADB6	60	60	38.6	12.8
ADC6	60	60	33.7	10.9
ADD6	60	60	31.1	11.5
ADE6	60	60	33.1	12.9
ADF6	60	0	37.0	0.0

In Applied GCE examinations, scaled marks are the same as raw marks.

AD01 (438 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	40	34	28	22
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

AD02 (419 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	44	37	31	25	19
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

AD03 (371 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	47	40	33	27	21
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

AD04 (216 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	49	42	35	29	23
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

AD05 (224 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	47	41	36	31	26
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

ADA6 (90 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

ADB6 (26 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

ADC6 (27 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

ADD6 (48 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

ADE6 (51 candidates)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

ADF6 (1 candidate)

Grade	Max. mark	A	B	C	D	E
Scaled Boundary Mark	60	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Provisional statistics for the award

Advanced Subsidiary award (166 candidates)

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	5.4	22.9	39.2	59.6	78.3

Provisional statistics for the award

Advanced Subsidiary Double award (144 candidates)

	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE
Cumulative %	11.8	21.5	36.1	44.4	57.6	67.4	72.9	79.9	84.7

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum mark required by a candidate to qualify for a given grade.

Mean Mark: is the sum of all candidates' marks divided by the number of candidates. In order to compare mean marks for different components, the mean mark (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Standard Deviation: a measure of the spread of candidates' marks. In most components, approximately two-thirds of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus one standard deviation from the mean, and approximately 95% of all candidates lie in a range of plus or minus two standard deviations from the mean. In order to compare the standard deviations for different components, the standard deviation (scaled) should be expressed as a percentage of the maximum mark (scaled).

Uniform Mark: a score on a standard scale which indicates a candidate's performance. The lowest uniform mark for grade A is always 80% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50% and grade E is 40%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and the uniform marks for the units which count towards the AS or A-level qualification are added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.