



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

ENTRY PATHWAYS CREATIVE, MEDIA AND PERFORMANCE ARTS

JANUARY 2017

ENTRY PATHWAYS

Art & Design

January 2017

Principal Moderator: Roger Davies

As in previous years, fewer centres enter candidates for the January series. However, within this limited entry there was a good cross section of work. While most demonstrated the high standards that are obtainable at this level, others highlighting issues that are encountered year after year.

Work was presented in a number of ways ranging from photocopied sheets in A3 or A4 folders to PowerPoint presentations on disc. The best of these were a pleasure to moderate with all evidence clearly identified using a number of good examples. In contrast, some submissions were poorly presented as odd scraps of different size papers held together with clips. The assessment record relating to the evidence was also confusing at times. It is very important that each separate assessment criteria be evidenced by a number of images showing clearly that the evidence has been met, rather than one image being used as evidence for several assessment criteria.

The initial research and references to artists, crafts-persons and designers has now become a strong element in most submissions, with candidates often responding with visual and written notes. Please note however that, for AC1.3 at Entry 3, the influence of the artists needs to be seen in the development and production of their own work. A pleasing aspect of this area of the work is the number of gallery visits that the centres arrange. This practice always enhances the candidates' art experience.

There were some superb examples of good practice using a variety of materials, tools and techniques. Particularly noteworthy was the work seen in the Ceramics, Printmaking and Textiles areas. Centres had provided many opportunities to experiment and explore different materials and techniques during the development of their ideas and it was very obvious from the results how much the candidates had enjoyed and benefited from their experiences. The inclusion of photographic evidence showing candidates working with various tools also aided moderation.

When deciding whether to enter candidates for Entry 2 or Entry 3, good indicators would be - AC2.1 where just basic techniques are used for Entry 2 and - AC2.3 where, for Entry 3, candidates should be capable of modifying their ideas as they develop.

Where candidates had been provided with good references and resources, and given ample opportunity to experiment and develop their work properly, outcomes of a high standard naturally followed. There were some excellent examples seen in most areas during this series.

Again it is worth noting that, for Entry 3 AC3.2, the outcome should be resolved and display an element of refinement.

There were some areas of concern this January which should be noted for future submissions:

- Some submissions met the criteria for Entry 2 but barely met the criteria for Entry 3. For the most part a greater quantity of stronger evidence is needed. This would especially apply to centres where this problem has already been identified on their centre reports. Please be aware that if candidates do not have sufficient evidence to support the criteria for Entry 3, there is no means of awarding them an Entry 2, even if they meet the criteria.
- Photography submissions can be particularly confusing at times where reference photographs and the candidates own work appear on the same photocopied sheet. Please identify the source of each image.
- There was sometimes confusion and a lot of overlap between different areas of study. This occurred between Ceramics and Three Dimensional Studies, and between Painting & Drawing and Printmaking.
- Centres are reminded that all candidates work should be authenticated and internal moderation of the assessments should also be carried out.

Thank you all for your hard work, it is encouraging to view so much exceptional work each series.

ENTRY PATHWAYS

Design & Technology

January 2016

Principal Moderator: Des Evans

The number of candidates entered for this course was considerably lower compared with the summer submission but the standard of work was very high.

It was a pleasure to see that all centres had taken on board suggestions and advice offered in previous years. The advice of using the Design and Make unit as a 'hub' activity has worked very well with candidates awarded the credit they deserved.

All documentation, monitoring and identification of evidence by all centres were completed showing attention to detail and thus made the process of moderating an easy task.

Design and Modelling

Candidates' responses confirmed that this unit offered ample scope to score well without actually manufacturing the full size artefact. The designing was very well supported by photographic evidence of the models completed.

Planning

The candidates showed understanding of relevant planning stages, improvements and adjustments to prepare for the manufacturing of their ideas. There was evidence of identifying the correct tools for the tasks intended.

Health and Safety

This unit has become a favourite with candidates as they become more familiar with the health and safety signs and images; candidates have had considerable success in this unit. It is also worth noting that this unit has become an integral part of the workshop experience rather than a paper exercise. There was also photographic evidence of safe working practices to enhance their responses.

Making a Product

Centres appear to prefer to enter candidates for this unit as part of the D&T experience rather than a standalone unit. Whilst candidates must show evidence of the requirements in the Assessment Criteria there was evidence of exceptional standard of manufacture and finish.

I would like to congratulate all centres for monitoring candidates' progress, and attention to detail in its recording.

ENTRY PATHWAYS

Media

January 2016

Principal Moderator: Mark Dunphy

The January submission was small, but generally of a high quality, with some samples of an excellent standard submitted. There was some really imaginative and criteria-focused task setting in evidence, and some very well-conceived and executed materials were on show, especially those aimed at the E2 candidates.

Some centres had clearly gone to great lengths to accommodate the needs of candidates with severe learning disabilities, using a wide range of assistive technology and employing support effectively. It is vital that the level of support received is clearly signposted, especially for E3 candidates with learning difficulties, which hinder writing.

The E2/E3 distinction, as ever, is unclear to some, with a few centres submitting near-identical evidence for candidates at both levels. Some centres adopted a very cautious approach, submitting E2 samples which were comfortably at the higher level. A couple of centres had optimistically submitted very thin submissions as E3. They have been informed of this for future reference. The distinction between “identifying” and “outlining again” needs reiteration, as does the importance of referring closely to the unit amplification guidance at the planning stage.

Where there had been more than one teacher delivering the course, there were, in the case of a few centres, discrepancies in terms of consistency of assessment. Robust internal moderation and verification procedures need to be implemented. One centre has again used an excellent in-house designed moderation procedure and format, and should be praised for this and the resultant accuracy of its assessment judgements.

Admin was completed to a good standard by most centres, but there was a tendency to distribute candidates’ Authentication Forms seemingly randomly throughout the samples. Centres should submit all such forms in a separate folder. Several centres submitted evidence as loose sheets in wallet folders and poly pockets. These should be avoided and pages should be treasury tagged together.

The majority of centres had used the Assessment Record sheets effectively, indicating where and how assessment criteria had been met, although it needs to be reiterated that page references must be included on the Assessment Record sheet. All centres labelled work with the relevant Learning Outcomes, and the use of annotation, with one or two exceptions, was good. A continuing cause for concern was the total absence of marking or written feedback in quite a few cases; the marking of work is a necessity.

It must be emphasised that witness statements should be used, in most cases, as a last resort; one centre in particular used these extensively (and needlessly) for E3 candidates who were clearly more than capable of generating written evidence.

6300 - Exploring Film Genre

This was again a popular unit, clearly due to its crossover with Additional English. There were some excellent submissions, showing evidence of good subject knowledge, enthusiastic teaching and excellent resource design. There was again 'overkill' in evidence from some centres, with folders over 40 pages long. There were a few residual problems with the identifying/outlining distinction, especially for AC1.2 and 1.3, but the standard overall was high.

6301 – Exploring Advertising

Submissions were generally of a good standard, although centres need to be clear that “outlining” purposes and forms of advertising needs to go beyond a spider diagram or list, and that brief sentences are required in order to merit E3.

The planning evidence for LO3 was often somewhat thin in some cases. Candidates need to be given scope to demonstrate various techniques in order to meet the criteria, especially at E3. It needs to be emphasised that print **and** TV adverts must be designed in order to pass at E3.

6302 - Creating a Print Media Product

This unit was popular, and generally very well executed in some detail, with some excellent final products on show.

6332 - Designing a Music Website Homepage

Of all of the units, this remains the least consistently delivered, and one of the least popular. This is a shame, as there is great scope for candidate engagement and functional learning opportunities here.

6334 - Creating an Audio-Visual Sequence

One centre had produced an excellent collaborative production, and based it on the ideas generated in the Film Genre unit. This approach is to be encouraged. There was some very enterprising use of ICT, although centres need to ensure that any submitted artefacts are in a common, recognised Windows or Mac format.

Conclusion

- Assessment judgements have been broadly accurate. Some excellent teaching and learning is in evidence, and high quality, differentiated resources are being employed, especially at the lower end of E2.
- The administrative tasks have been completed to a generally good standard. Centres should be reminded that for work samples folders, binders, etc. are unnecessary. Individual units should be tagged together, and pages should be numbered. Authentication sheets should be submitted all together in a single folder.
- Teachers need to consult the [Assessment Guidance](#) when planning and selecting/producing materials to ensure that the E2/E3 distinction is clear from the outset.
- Schools/departments must ensure that internal moderation/verification procedures have taken place when units have been taught by more than one practitioner. These procedures must be focussed on the assessment criteria, and consist of more than a perfunctory “rubber stamping” exercise.

ENTRY PATHWAYS

Music

January 2016

Principal Moderator: Sarah Williams-Burton

The overall standard of the work submitted in this series was very high with all candidates being awarded the level for which they were entered. In nearly all submissions, centres had assessed the work correctly and all centres had supported the submission with relevant commentary.

Centres took note from previous submissions and the work of all candidates entered for the qualification was correctly authenticated by both staff and students. Authentication sheets can be found on the [Creative Media and Performance Arts webpage](#). Some centres entered candidates for Entry 2 with work of a much higher standard than required and the moderator suggested that these folios be re-entered at Entry 3 in the next series.

Presentation of work was extremely well organised with all centres including a written index to the CD. All work for candidates were recorded onto one CD and accompanied by a track list. Work for all the music units at both E2 and E3 were correctly submitted on one CD.

Appraising Music

Most centres used the suggested tasks from WJEC that ensured all the assessment criteria were met, adding their own tasks where necessary. This unit is worth 5 credits and the work covered must reflect this. Please refer to the [Assessment Guidance](#) for further clarification, and take care to point out on the Assessment Record sheet where the candidates meet the criteria. Please note that for Entry 2 the assessment criteria should be met in **two** contrasting genres, and for Entry 3 the criteria should be met in **three** contrasting genres. Centres should guide the moderator to the evidence of where criteria has been met using the assessment sheets.

Composing Music

Candidates were again successful in this submission. Please note that candidates do not have to perform the compositions themselves. Compositions were more organised with a coherent structure exploring the musical elements. Please refer to the Assessment Guidance for more details including guidance on the expected length of each piece. Please note that while it is good practice to have a selection of compositions to choose from for submission, only two pieces for each candidate in the moderation sample are required at both E2 and E3. It was very helpful to the moderation process to have details of the composing tasks.

Solo Music Performance

As usual outcomes in this unit were good. Please note that centres where the solo work was accompanied provided the candidates with a greater sense of performance and more successful outcomes were generally achieved. All centres correctly submitted two pieces for each candidate in the moderation sample at both E2 and E3. There were some very good performing evaluations submitted, both orally and written thus providing evidence that all criteria had been met in this unit.

Ensemble Music Performance

Entries for this unit were also of a high standard. Centres entered a variety of ensembles which played to the individual candidate's strengths. Please note that an ensemble consists of the candidate's part along with at least two others. The candidate should perform their part on their own or in very small groups within the ensemble. Information regarding what part the candidate is playing in the ensemble must be included on the assessment record sheet. Whole class singing in unison with piano or backing track accompaniment is not considered an ensemble performance for this qualification. Again, all centres correctly submitted 2 pieces for each candidate in the moderation sample at both E2 and E3. As in the solo performing unit, there were some very good performing evaluations submitted, both orally and written, thus providing evidence that all criteria had been met in this unit.

There was much evidence in the wide range of imaginative, engaging tasks to show that centres have understood the advantages of the course. The course is designed to give more freedom in the delivery and enable staff to engage candidates in areas in which the candidate, staff or centre have a particular interest.

The Assessment Guidance was taken into consideration when entering candidates. For example in the Solo Music Performance unit, the amplification details the expected standard of the pieces to be performed and the number of pieces which must be completed.

Many thanks to all centres who have delivered the specification so successfully. I look forward to hearing further outcomes in the next submission.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk