



General Certificate of Secondary Education

Applied Art and Design (Double Award) 3811

Examiners' Report

2005 examination – June series

- 3810/1 2D and 3D visual language
- 3810/2 Materials, techniques and technology
- 3810/3 Working to project briefs

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

Copyright © 2005 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 and Unit 2 Portfolio Units 6
- Unit 3 Working to project briefs 7

- Mark Ranges and Award of Grades 8

This page has been left intentionally blank

All Units

General

This was the second opportunity for full certification of this award. The number of candidates following this specification has increased and centres are now more familiar with the requirements and special features of the qualification. The best evidence for assessment was provided through well-devised centre set assignments which reflected the vocational requirements of the award. Centres have gained experience and confidence in this area and some strong, lively and stimulating work was produced.

Teachers need to ensure that assignments are sufficient to allow the required evidence to be generated, that the quality indicators are present in the work when it is assessed and that final outcomes are supported by development work which is both documented and logically presented.

Assessment

The accuracy of assessment varied, with marking outside the standard being both lenient and severe at the extremes of the range. It was apparent that not all centres had sent a representative to a teacher standardisation meeting and as a result had misunderstood the nature and focus of this award. Assessment requirements were not always fully addressed, especially where centres did not cross-reference the coursework units to bridge gaps and provide the range of 2D and 3D work required. The mark awarded by the teacher within a particular level should reflect not only that the candidate has achieved the necessary criteria, but also the quality of the work produced 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

Administration and presentation of work for moderation varied greatly. Centres could facilitate the moderation process by ensuring that all paperwork is completed and that the correct documentation is used. A number of discrepancies arose in this series between the marks supplied to AQA and those on the Unit Record Sheets. Teacher's comments on the Unit Record Sheets should provide a justification of the marks awarded, indicate where evidence can be sourced, and support the candidates' independence and approach to the working process. Well organised folders are essential, and when the work is presented and labelled clearly it aids the moderation process. If centres choose to display the work on walls they must ensure that candidates written comments are clearly visible to the moderator. Most centres provided all of the required sample and understood that the work of all the candidates should be accessible to the moderator if needed.

Recommendations

Centre specific issues will have been identified in the visiting moderator's report. There remain general issues that have relevance to many centres and which can be summarised as follows:

- the appropriate balance of 2D and 3D work in portfolio units was still an issue, and experimentation with different 3D materials and techniques should be encouraged
- there was a lack of work from direct observation and a greater emphasis should be placed on primary sources from which drawings can be made as starting points for work

- centre-devised briefs were not always vocational in nature.

The following recommendations are made:

- links made to the work of others, especially vocational contextualisation, should directly influence ideas
- ICT should be evident as a tool for developing and producing creative work
- the creative journey should be recorded by annotation and evaluation statements throughout to support the practical work
- the work should be organised, labelled, displayed clearly and cross-referenced with Units 1 and 2 where appropriate
- the brief which the candidate has followed should be presented with the work for Units 1 and 2.

Portfolio Units

Unit 1 – 2D and 3D visual language and

Unit 2 – Materials, techniques and technology

Assignments/Tasks

Some of the most successful candidates had followed well written briefs that reflected the vocational nature of this award and there was some very good evidence of understanding of the design process and of planning. Generally there was evidence of a wide range of 2D media being used. However, there was a wide variation in the range of 3D materials experienced, with insufficient evidence of the use of both resistant and non-resistant materials. In some cases 3D work was limited to surface application or relief and did not fully explore 3D object-making techniques as described in the specification.

Some centres worked predominantly in one area, for example, textiles and this led to a lack of breadth and depth of coverage of other contexts and processes.

A number of centres have built on previous experiences however, and have begun to address areas of weakness. Some centres provided a good quantity and range of work during the course and offered a good variety of opportunities for candidates to explore materials and processes in both 2D and 3D contexts.

Several centres had taken advantage of available funding to work with artists in residence, museums or art, craft and design studios/workshops, and these provided excellent experiences and relevant outcomes. Some good links with design technology departments also proved to be beneficial to candidates.

The use of ICT, as a tool to develop professional outcomes to design based briefs, was well used in some centres, but some lacked the necessary hardware and expertise to use the computer within an art and design context.

Some excellent use of sketchbooks was seen 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 of the work of others, and the more successful candidates explained their work and ideas well through the use of relevant and evaluative comments throughout. Some strong links were made with the work of others in final outcomes, but often these were not expanded upon to include how materials, techniques and technology had been used. Little written comment was made about others' working methods and their influence on individual candidate's work. Health and safety issues were not well documented and some centres had omitted comments entirely. Candidates should be given guidance on the form and content of such comments since it is particularly important that annotation is relevant and has evaluative (formative and summative) content.

Unit 3 – Working to project briefs

An improved understanding of the vocational process was evident, and good practice was seen in the work of those candidates who had clearly embraced the theme, and sought to develop ideas which were both creative, and also had an educational value. Some very marketable and appropriate ideas were produced. However, some issues remain. There was a lack of work from primary sources, and a range of appropriate alternatives was not always presented. Links need to be made to the work of others, and in particular, vocational contextualisation should directly influence ideas. Appropriate materials and processes to explore ideas should be evidenced, and a broad range of materials should be explored, with reference to relevant health and safety issues. Annotation and evaluative statements should be used throughout the process to support the practical work.

Final evaluations were generally a potted history rather than a focus on the final idea, how it was fit for purpose, or suggestions as to possible improvements that could be made. The lack of focus and time given to the written evaluation is a concern and the recommendation given in the Teachers' Notes should be noted.

The most popular brief was the textile option to design blinds based on the weather. Some colourful and creative work was seen, particularly where there were strong links with other artists' work. Unfortunately, many candidates had ignored the requirements and constraints of this brief with regard to scale, size, orientation and number of final designs. It was disappointing that some candidates lapsed into using existing cartoon characters, restricting their own design potential.

The brief for a mural for the creative corner was also popular. Designs were generally bold and bright although some candidates failed to adhere to the size and scale constraints to produce a design suitable for a corner. Another popular choice was the brief to design a chair for story time, with ideas which varied from small scale card models to decorated armchairs. Drawing from primary sources was more evident in this option, but words and text were not well incorporated into designs. The design for a floor mosaic to aid mathematical development was handled well in some cases, with lively and colourful designs which reflected numbers, counting, pattern and shapes successfully. However, suitable materials and processes were not always used. In some cases textile processes were used as the medium for the mosaic yet it was to be executed in ceramics. Relevant health and safety issues, which should have been paramount in this process, were not always considered or explained. The design for a wall chart to promote healthy living also produced some successful proposals, although the considerations of scale were generally not well met.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Maximum Mark (Scaled)	Mean Mark (Scaled)	Standard Deviation (Scaled)
2D and 3D visual language 3810/1	50	50	27.7	10.4
Materials, techniques and technology 3810/2	50	50	27.3	10.6
Working to project briefs 3810/3	50	50	26.4	10.9

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

Unit 1 – 2D and 3D visual language (2101 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	50	44	37	30	23	19	15	12	9
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Unit 2 – Materials, techniques and technology (2068 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	50	42	36	30	24	19	15	11	7
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Unit 3 – Working to project briefs (1563 candidates)

	Max. mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Scaled Boundary Mark	50	45	38	30	23	19	15	12	9
Uniform Boundary Mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Provisional statistics for the award (2062 candidates)

	A*A*	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	FF	GG
Cumulative %	6.9	19.9	40.4	64.6	78.0	87.1	94.1	97.8

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 the uniform marks for the units will be added in order to determine the candidate's overall grade.