



General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Applied Art and Design
(Double Award) 3811**

Report on the Examination

2006 examination - January series

- 3810/3 Working to project briefs

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

GCSE Applied Art and Design (Double Award)

Unit 3 Working to project briefs 5

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades 8

This page has been left intentionally blank

Working to project briefs – Unit 3

General

There was an increase in the number of centres with entries for this externally set unit as the specification gains in popularity. Centres familiar with the vocational requirements of the award provided the best evidence for assessment, where candidates were well prepared and work reflected the vocational process. In this unit candidates learn to understand and use the creative process to meet a set brief in art, craft or design. Assessment is designed to confirm candidates' understanding of the set brief and the working methods and resources needed to fulfil it. The unit is internally assessed and externally moderated. Moderators look to the assessment marking criteria grid to ensure that evidence is complete. The grid has two components: the line across the top of the grid which indicates the type of evidence that must be produced, e.g. research and developmental work to meet the brief; and the columns that give the quality indicators contained within the evidence. Teachers need to ensure that underpinning knowledge and guidance on the practicalities of working to a brief are covered through sufficient similar, vocationally related activities, in the form of smaller briefs and assignments. Candidates should be encouraged to adopt a professional approach through planning, recording and evaluating their progress throughout the project.

Response to the briefs

The responses to the briefs, based on the theme of Seafood Restaurants, were generally very good, and some vibrant, confident, ambitious and exciting work was seen. Candidates who embraced the theme and sought to develop ideas which were creative, and had a practical value, were most successful and some marketable and appropriate ideas were produced. There were a good number of responses to each of the five briefs, and popular choices were the design for a menu, in which the theme of the restaurant was to be promoted, and the design for a mural to be in the form of a triptych, reflecting the richness of the ocean. There were fewer responses to the 3D briefs, to design a sculpture for the foyer of the restaurant, and for designs for tableware items such as a candelabrum, tureen, platter or a table centrepiece; but there were some innovative and well researched responses. In some cases however, insufficient note had been made of the constraints identified in the brief, for example, 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 some candidates visited markets and took photographs of seafood and fish. Images of restaurant interiors were also popular as a primary source. Others' work, especially that of contemporary artists and designers, was not always well recorded in preparatory work. Such work was not always used in a meaningful way to develop ideas, and lacked vocational contextualisation which directly influenced the work. There were some centres where ICT and other technological media were used very successfully. The use of the internet for research was more focused than in previous series in order to obtain relevant information. The requirement for the equivalent of two, and not more than four, A1 sheets of preparatory work (or a sketchbook or other suitable form) was met by the majority of candidates. Good sketchbooks often included information and ideas that led to exciting and successful design proposals. In some cases a range of appropriate alternatives was lacking, and generally this was still a weakness in the design process. A broad range of appropriate materials was not always explored, especially where the 3D design proposal was selected, with a lack of 3D prototypes or samples being

presented. Final ideas were often very successful, and candidates had clearly enjoyed the process of development and production, although they often failed to identify suitable scale, health and safety considerations, and materials best suited to the final design.

The first brief was to design a mural for the main restaurant area, which was to be a triptych with three related images reflecting the richness of the ocean, in either abstract or figurative style. The most successful candidates explored the theme well and used different artists' styles to inform a variety of different responses. Other candidates did not produce convincing images which used the size and shape illustrated in a successful way. The inclusion of the instruction that, 'the design must reflect the richness of the ocean', was important and some candidates failed to address this aspect of the design. The need to reflect, 'the atmosphere and rich decoration of a stately home or a palace', as described in the scenario, was also ignored by some candidates.

The second brief was to design a sculpture for the foyer of the restaurant, which could be functional or non-functional. The most successful candidates explored the theme well and used a variety of media and techniques to produce ambitious and exciting work. However, others did not address the requirement that the sculpture must reflect a range of seafood and use elaborate decoration. Some designs did not consider the size of the proposed sculpture, safety issues and the siting of the sculpture. Those candidates who had a clear understanding of the impact and context of designs produced striking and successful outcomes.

The third brief for a tableware item, such as a candelabrum, tureen, platter or a table centrepiece, was well handled by those candidates who chose it. There was appropriate research into elaborate styles of decoration and moderators saw some lively and interesting work. Designs were most successful when suitable materials and techniques were explored and where the candidates were able to work with confidence.

The design for the outer cover for a menu to be used by the restaurant met with a good response, although sometimes text was not well incorporated into the design and some work lacked a suitably professional finish.

The design brief to produce three panels for a furnishing screen in any suitable, textile or mixed media for the restaurant, met with some very successful responses. The theme of seafood was used to create colourful and rich designs in a variety of textile techniques including printing, batik and appliqué. In some cases, the designs lacked development with some candidates ignoring the requirement that the designs were to be used on both sides of the screen, and size, shape, and scale were not always adhered to.

The requirement to produce a short written evaluation of the design proposal generally produced a good response, and well annotated records of initial ideas and developments informed these successful comments. A clear understanding of the design process and the constraints and considerations of the brief was evident in the work of the stronger candidates, with an acknowledgement of *why* their idea was fit for purpose being clearly explained. The less successful candidates explained their work in a more descriptive format, with comments that were an account of *what* was done rather than a focus on the design proposal and *how* it was fit for purpose. At this level, candidates did not, review their work and intentions, or show a detailed understanding, particularly of the work of others. Candidates should be given guidance on form and content of the evaluation since it is particularly important that annotation is relevant and has evaluative (formative and summative) content. The lack of focus and time given to the written evaluation is a cause for concern in some centres, the guidance given in the Teachers' Notes is, 'no more than 30 minutes of the 10 hours of supervised time'.

Assessment

The accuracy of assessment varied, with marking outside the standard being both lenient and severe throughout the mark range. The 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. There were instances where insufficient regard had been given to the requirements of the assessment marking criteria grid in the allocation of marks, although accuracy of assessment in centres is improving as teachers become more familiar with the assessment criteria.

Administrative Efficiency

Most centres provided the appropriate paperwork as required, although there were instances where the correct record sheets were not used or were completed incorrectly. The section for Teachers' comments to provide justification of the mark awarded was not used well; better explanation here would help visiting moderators to 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. It is not necessary to mount or display the work, but all pieces must be accessible and the moderator must be able to read the written comments. In some centres, the moderator was not provided with a quiet room in which to moderate without interruptions. Adequate provision needs to be made for the moderation visit.

Recommendations

The individual, centre specific issues will have been identified in the visiting moderator's feedback report. However, there are some general issues that have relevance to most centres and candidates which can be summarised as follows:

- ensure that candidates are prepared for the practicalities of working to a brief through the introduction of similar, vocationally related activities, briefs and assignments
- ensure that candidates clarify accurately the requirements of the brief and understand the constraints
- encourage candidates to collect and make effective use of primary and secondary source material to inform and develop ideas
- encourage the development of ideas to include a range of possible responses and potential alternatives
- encourage candidates to develop their own ideas and images based on the work of others
- ensure that a range of appropriate materials are explored, especially in 3D design proposals, and make relevant reference to health and safety issues
- improve the level of annotation and include both formative and summative evaluative comments.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Unit 3 – Working to project briefs

| Unit | Maximum Mark (Raw) | Maximum Mark (Scaled) | Mean Mark (Scaled) | Standard Deviation (Scaled) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Working to project briefs 3810/3 | 50 | 50 | 24.7 | 10.3 |

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

Unit 3 – Working to project briefs (1041 candidates)

| | Max. mark | A* | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|-----------------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Scaled Boundary Mark | 50 | 42 | 37 | 30 | 23 | 19 | 15 | 12 | 9 |
| 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 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 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.