GCSE 2003
June Series

Report on the Examination

Applied Art and Design (Double Award)

- ■ 2D and 3D visual language

- ■ Materials, techniques and technology

- ■ Working to project briefs

CONTENTS

Applied Art and Design GCSE Double Award 3811

General

This GCSE replaces the Part One GNVQ Foundation and Intermediate qualifications. This was the first opportunity for moderation of units for this new specification. Centres were able to provide evidence for assessment through well-devised assignments reflecting the vocational requirements of the award. Assessment is designed to give credit for what candidates can do, as well as what they know, and is based on both internal and external assessment. Moderators look to the assessment grid to ensure that portfolio evidence is complete. The grid has two components; the Assessment requirements which indicate the type of evidence that must be produced, e.g. a range of 2D and 3D techniques, and the Assessment marking criteria that give the quality indicators contained within the evidence. Centres need to ensure that assignments are designed to allow the required evidence to be generated and that the quality indicators are present in the work when it is marked. There were instances where the quality indicators were missing and opportunities for independence, and a high level of technical skill and fluency in the work produced were not provided or recognised in centres.

Unit 1 – 2D and 3D visual language

Assignments / tasks

Some portfolio work submitted by centres was lively and imaginative, and had allowed candidates to explore a range of 2D and 3D techniques through well structured and interesting assignments. Examples of good practice extended the range of 2D media, and included relevant and, in some cases, a sophisticated use of the computer in generating images and effects that ran in parallel with traditional mark-making techniques. The range of 3D techniques and materials used was more limited and there was a lack of experimentation with 3D materials in some centres.

Sketch books were used well to record sources, explore visual language, and to develop ideas and intentions. The use of annotation is a significant feature of exploration and research, particularly in the work of others, and strong candidates explained their work and ideas well in relevant and evaluative comments throughout. In other cases however, the level of annotation was weak and did not explain or review the work and intentions, or show understanding, particularly of the work of others. Candidates should be given guidance on form and content since it is particularly important that annotation is relevant and has evaluative content which is both formative and summative.

Assessment

The accuracy of assessment varied with marking outside the standard being both lenient and severe at the extremes of the mark range. The actual numerical mark awarded by the assessor within a particular level should reflect not only that the candidate has achieved the necessary criteria, but also the quality of the work undertaken in meeting the criteria. At the higher levels candidates must demonstrate an independent approach and exhibit a high order of ability and understanding. This was often not evident in the portfolio work, and there were instances where insufficient regard had been given to the requirements of the assessment evidence grids in the allocation of marks.

Administrative efficiency

Most centres provided the appropriate paperwork as required, although there were instances where the relevant record sheets were not completed correctly. The space for teacher comments to justify the mark awarded was not well used; those who did use this box tended only to list evidence provided. A full explanation here would help visiting moderators judge where marks had been awarded. Most centres provided all of the required sample and realised that the work of all the candidates should be accessible to the moderator if needed.

Recommendations

The individual centre specific issues will have been identified in the visiting moderator's report. There remain general issues that may have relevance to centres which can be summerised as follows:

- achieve a balance between 2D and 3D work in portfolio units, and encourage experimentation with different 3D materials;

- encourage candidates to develop their own ideas and images based on the work of others;

- improve the level of annotation and include both formative and summative evaluative comments;

- when awarding marks, ensure that the requirements of the assessment evidence grids are met.

Unit 2 – Materials, techniques and technology

There were no entries for this unit in this series.

Unit 3 – Working to project briefs

The responses to the briefs based on the theme of garden centres was generally good. The most popular choice was the design for a garden feature, which often was not well developed and did not always use materials and techniques effectively. Some candidates did not state clearly which garden section they had chosen, despite the instruction in the Candidate Guidance document to do so. Japanese style gardens were very popular. Often, insufficient note had been made of the constraints identified in the brief, scale was not evident in the work, and the method of production of the final piece of work had not been given due consideration. A final finished piece to scale is not required, but the work presented must be of a standard and scale suitable to present to clients.

At the research stage, there was some difficulty in collecting information from primary as well as secondary sources, although many candidates visited garden centres, obtained information and took photographs. The use of others' work was not well recorded in preparatory work. There was a variable amount of work presented for assessment, the equivalent of two and not more than four A1 sheets (or a sketchbook or other suitable form), as stated in the Candidate Guidance document, was sometimes interpreted as any number of smaller sheets. Sketchbooks often included numerous leaflets, and information from garden centres that were not relevant to the briefs and candidates often became side-tracked by pump designs for garden ponds, etc. and lost track of their design proposals.

Final ideas were often fanciful creations which candidates had struggled to make in clay and mod-roc, and they often failed to identify more suitable, weatherproof materials. Another popular choice was the series of four images to be reproduced as greetings/ postcards. The best candidates explored the theme well and used the style of different artists to inform a variety of responses. Some candidates struggled to produce four convincing images with equal success. The use of different and mixed media to produce the work was not well explored, most being painted. Size and scale were not given due consideration in the choice of image. In this small entry, there were no responses to briefs three and four.

The requirement to produce a short written evaluation of the final idea generally met with a good response and well annotated records of initial ideas and developments informed these successful comments.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
2D & 3D visual language 3810/1	50	50	31.2	7.0
Materials, techniques and technology 3810/2	There were no entries for this unit in this series			
Working to project briefs 3810/3	50	50	19.7	7.3

For units which contain only one component, scaled marks are the same as raw marks.

Unit 1 – 2D and 3D visual langauge (44 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	50	46	40	34	29	24	20	16	12
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Unit 2 – Materials, techniques and technology (0 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	50	There were no entries for this unit in this series							
Uniform Boundary Mark	100								

Unit 3 – Working to project briefs (40 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	50	45	39	33	28	24	20	16	12
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Definitions

Boundary Mark: the minimum (scaled) 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 candidate lie in 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 90% of the maximum uniform mark for the unit, similarly grade A is 80%, grade B is 70%, grade C is 60%, grade D is 50%, grade E is 40%, grade F is 30% and grade G is 20%. A candidate's total scaled mark for each unit is converted to a uniform mark and, when subject grades are awarded in 2004, the uniform marks for the units will be added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.