



PRINCIPAL MODERATOR'S REPORT

ENTRY PATHWAYS CREATIVE, MEDIA AND PERFORMANCE ARTS

SUMMER 2016

ENTRY PATHWAYS

ART & DESIGN

Summer 2016

Principal Moderator: Roger Davies

This year's submission contained a good variety of work from all 9 unit areas. The standard varied from exceptional work where the candidates had clearly benefited from well-structured courses, to work that was of a very poor standard and badly presented. It is good to remember that moderators are seeing the work for the first time and have to make judgements based on the visual evidence before them. A very brief overview of the work undertaken would certainly help, along with well-presented and easily identifiable evidence. Conversely, a large number of photocopied sheets in a poly-pocket with little additional information would make moderation difficult. The WJEC website contains several different examples of how work can be presented. This year saw some very good PowerPoint presentations as well as clearly labelled photocopied sketchbooks and folders. (Please note that work is not returned so actual work should not be sent).

Research has improved considerably over the last few years with many centres organising visits to museums and galleries. This year it was also encouraging to see first-hand drawing from the environment and natural forms. A good range of artists and references were seen in all areas, although there is still a tendency to concentrate on well-known painters for most units. Candidates would benefit from broadening their research to include photographers, designers, ceramic artists, etc. appropriate to the unit being studied. Research should not be generic, but rather, related to the candidates' own investigations. Some centres make excellent use of worksheets which require candidates to make personal responses.

A range of materials, techniques and processes was seen in the development of the work. However, within the Photography unit it would be good to see more use made of candidates' own photographs during the development stage rather than manipulating second hand imagery. Many centres use photography to document candidates' progress and experiences in all units.

It was encouraging to see the skills, knowledge and confidence developed during the course result in a number of very interesting outcomes. The high standard achieved by some candidates using a variety of materials should be applauded.

As always there were a few areas of concern and although some of these have been highlighted in previous reports they need to be repeated once again.

Candidates being entered for the incorrect level:

It is understandable that centres are reluctant to enter good candidates for Entry 3 in case they do not satisfy the criteria and therefore end up with nothing. However, if previous centre reports indicate that Entry 3 might be more appropriate for some of their candidates then centres should look carefully at the examples on the WJEC website to determine whether this is a possibility. It would be a shame if candidates missed out on Entry 3 when their work clearly deserved it.

More of a concern is the fact that some centres are entering candidates for Entry 3 when the evidence clearly points toward an Entry 2. If this problem has been identified on the centre report then the centre is strongly encouraged to view the exemplar material online in order to understand the differences between the two levels. Failure to do this will seriously disadvantage future submissions.

Lack of appropriate evidence:

It is essential that clear appropriate evidence is provided for ALL assessment criteria. Separate evidence should be provided for each unit. If a candidate is entered for several units, the evidence cannot be shared.

The use of witness statements:

Witness statements should only be used in extreme cases where visual evidence is not possible, which would be on rare occasions, e.g. when work is accidentally damaged or lost. Whenever possible, practical work should be evidenced visually.

Centres who have been involved in the course for a number of years are now very familiar with its requirements. The successful submissions from these centres clearly show how much their candidates are benefiting. However, it is also most encouraging to note the quality submissions from new centres who have clearly embraced the Entry Pathways Art & Design courses. Equally satisfying to note is the improvement in submissions from centres who have taken advice from previous centre reports.

It is hoped that this report together with the individual centre reports sent out this year will help alleviate any problems or misunderstandings and encourage good practice throughout the different units of study.

Thank you all for your hard work this year. If you have any concerns or need any advice, please do not hesitate to contact the WJEC.

ENTRY PATHWAYS
DESIGN & TECHNOLOGY
Summer 2016

Principal Moderator: Des Evans

It was pleasing to see that standards had improved in most areas of all the Design and Technology units.

I would like to thank centres for following and accepting advice suggested in previous reports.

For candidates to have the relevant experience, so much depends on the quality of teaching and guidance given. In order to enhance these aspects and also assist in the administration of the course, I suggest the following:

- only completed work should be submitted;
- advise candidates how to efficiently achieve the criteria for each unit;
- maximise and enhance the experiences gained by the candidates, by emphasising the practical aspect of the course;
- track the evidence presented according to the Assessment Criteria and enter candidates for the correct level;
- indicate the location of the evidence on the tracking sheet;
- use any means of recording and presenting the evidence.

Design and Modelling

Candidates had produced appropriate research and relevant information, together with some evidence of design thinking.

It is not required for candidates to produce the actual outcome (a model will suffice).

Health and Safety

There was ample evidence of related Health and Safety issues to the practical work produced. This was well recorded and photographed thus giving this unit relevant value and not as an exercise in itself.

Planning

Whilst this unit is the most challenging to all ability ranges of candidates it is required to have some references to estimating time and reviewing. I am not expecting 'in depth' reporting but a general reference to a plan or stages of production. Where this is done candidates could achieve Level 3.

Making a Product.

With reference to previous suggestions that this unit could be a 'hub' activity, I would expect a completed product with an appropriate 'finish'.

Whilst it is always a pleasure to see items and products of a complex nature I strongly suggest a simple product completed to a good standard, rather than the candidates having taken on more than they can manage. The size of the project can also influence the quality of management. I would also remind centres that it is acceptable for candidates to present a suite of items as well as one product.

ENTRY PATHWAYS

DRAMA

Summer 2016

Principal Moderator: Stuart Jarvis

It is pleasing to report that there has been a slight increase in the entry and most centres have a very strong understanding of the specification. However, there is some concern because centres are not sending the DVD/Audio recording with the sample. For example, if a centre is entering the *Using Voice in Dramatic Context unit*, it is **vital** that either a video or audio recording is submitted to provide **evidence** of each candidate's attainment of the assessment criteria. If Centres fail to meet this requirement, it is unlikely that WJEC can support the marks they have awarded. This year, we had an increase in centres failing to send the evidence and this caused us problems with the moderation process.

A number of centres sent a separate recording of each piece of evidence for each of the criteria and **this is not required**. It is possible to include some practical work covering **all** of the assessment criteria. It is essential that all the work is marked before the centre sends it to WJEC.

Almost all the centres met the deadlines for the submission of marks and subsequent delivery of work. Moderators reported that they were satisfied that centres had understood the requirements of the specification: indeed there was much evidence this year, that centres had carefully planned their course.

Please note that work by all candidates entered for the qualification needs to be authenticated by both staff and candidates. Authentication sheets can be found on the WJEC website and must be signed by all candidates.

The overall standard of the work submitted was very good with most candidates being awarded the Entry qualification for which they had been entered. In nearly all submissions, centres had assessed the work correctly and had supported the submission of work with relevant commentary.

It is very important to stress, however, that most centres have clearly embraced this specification and are providing well-structured courses. It really is pleasure watching so many candidates being so engaged with the work and enjoying the learning experience! This is a result of so many centres approaching this specification in a creative and imaginative way. A large number of centres this year had planned their practical work carefully and their candidates were able to submit their work to show clear evidence across a range of drama units.

It is very important to point out the key difference between Entry 2 and Entry 3 in many of the units is that at Entry 2, candidates must produce **different** types of evidence of skills, whereas at Entry 3 they must produce **contrasting** evidence. It is essential that centres are aware of the need to ensure that candidates are entered for a unit at the correct level and to ensure that the evidence produced clearly links to the assessment criteria.

USING THE VOICE IN DRAMATIC CONTEXT

It is important to stress that centres should check their DVD before sending them for moderation. Please make sure candidates are identified and the sound is audible. It should be stressed that most centres this year covered the content well, producing DVDs of candidates using a variety of voice skills. It is also helpful in the moderation process if these DVDs are supplemented by detailed records of work completed by teachers and candidates' own responses using grids, tick boxes and questionnaires. It is pleasing to note that **all** centres applied themselves to the use of voice across a range of situations, characters and moods within a dramatic context.

It really is vital to stress that a teacher comment is **not** sufficient evidence to moderate a candidate's work. Centres **MUST** submit a DVD or audio recording of the candidate's work in order to **support** their comments. Unfortunately, as already mentioned, we had a few centres this year who failed to do this. These recordings may be short, just to show the candidate has "hit the mark". The more **evidence** the centre supplies us with, the more we can support the centre marks. **Evidence needs to be provided all the time!**

USING BODY IN A DRAMATIC CONTEXT

This is now the third year, where it has been pleasing to see most centres providing a good range of skills involving slow motion, mime, dance and synchronized movement. Centres covered the content well, producing a good range of evidence such as photographs, DVDs, sketches, written candidates responses and teacher comments.

Once again, it is very appropriate to mention that centres should support teacher comments by recording and submitting work on DVDs, or providing photographic evidence of the work produced.

CONTRIBUTING TO A DRAMATIC IMPROVISATION

Candidates often produced interesting storyboards, character development work and drawings. They responded well to the choice of stimuli used, often producing very acceptable improvisations, sometimes with the use of costumes and props. Good attention to detail was observed in both role-playing and character building, bringing together the use of costumes and props. Once again, it is very important to stress that teacher comments do need to be supported by recording or submitting work on DVD as evidence of the work produced.

CONTRIBUTE TO THE CREATION OF A GROUP DRAMA PRESENTATION

Recordings on DVD were generally well-produced, focusing on candidates' abilities to display their skills and relate to an audience. Centres, this year, produced some impressive pieces of drama, involving all the required elements. Candidates responded well and clearly enjoyed all the work presented to them. They were fully engaged at all times and very well motivated. This is due to the professionalism of the teachers involved with the delivery of this specification. There was general agreement amongst the moderation team, that every candidate had given their personal best.

Detailed programmes were often provided, giving information on the cast list, technical team and the scenes of the presentation. Photographs of the cast helped greatly in the identification of the candidates. Finally, it is worth noting that candidates do not have to perform the piece more than once in order to meet the assessment criteria. There were some instances where candidates performed the piece to cover the acting criteria, and then performed again using props and costume to fulfil the other criteria. One performance using props and costume will suffice and this may reduce some of the burden on the centres.

Finally, centres are to be commended for their commitment to this specification and their understanding of its demands. There was strong evidence this year of careful planning and assessment. Candidates were fully engaged with all their work.

Many thanks to all the centres who have delivered the specification so successfully.

ENTRY PATHWAYS

MEDIA

Summer 2016

Principal Moderator: Mark Dunphy

The May 2016 submission was generally of a high quality, with some samples of an excellent standard submitted. There was some excellent task setting in evidence, showing a good awareness of the demands of the assessment criteria. Some centres had clearly gone to great lengths to accommodate the needs of candidates with severe learning disabilities, showing evidence of candidate-centred planning and innovative resource design. Enthusiastic teaching and great learner engagement has clearly taken place in many cases, and many centres deserve acknowledgement of the hard work and dedication which has clearly been shown.

The E2/E3 distinction continued to be problematic, mostly for centres new to the specification. There was a tendency to “hopefully” enter candidates at E3, despite the evidence (and the assessors’ own comments) indicating otherwise. The distinction between identifying and outlining again needs reiteration, as does the importance of looking at the website’s resources and exemplar material and referring closely to the unit amplification guidance at the planning stage. Centres should also be reminded that the option is available to amend entries until the end of April. Some centres adopted a very cautious approach, submitting E2 samples which were comfortably at the higher level. They have been informed of this for future reference.

Paperwork, was completed to a good standard. All centres submitted the Authentication forms. Folders were generally well organised and ordered, greatly simplifying the moderation process. This has not always been the case in previous years. The majority of centres had used the Assessment Record most 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 Records. All centres labelled work with the relevant Learning Outcomes, and the use of annotation, with one or two exceptions, was good. One cause for concern was the total absence of marking or written feedback in quite a few cases; the marking of work is, surely, a necessity.

There was a lot of evidence of scribing having taken place, in some cases with no acknowledgement or record in evidence. Witness statements must be used in these circumstances.

Feedback on Individual Units

6300 - Exploring Film Genre

This was again a very popular unit. There were some excellent submissions, showing evidence of good subject knowledge, enthusiastic teaching and excellent resource design. Some rather exhaustive explorations of the criteria were submitted, which did show a tendency to over teach some elements of the unit. 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 very good standard, although the planning evidence for LO3 was often somewhat thin. Candidates need to be given scope to demonstrate various techniques in order to meet the criteria, especially at E3.

6302 - Creating a Print Media Product

Assessment was on the whole accurate, although again some centres submitted labelling, spider diagrams, etc. as “outlining” evidence. Some centres did not give their candidates the opportunity to use DTP for their production work, which was disappointing to see.

6332 - Designing a Music Website Homepage

The few centres that entered candidates for this unit provided good evidence, with improving awareness of the key features of websites on the part of teachers and candidates shown. Some examples were excellent, with working dummy websites on Powerpoint submitted.

6334 - Creating an Audio-Visual Sequence

Again the entries for this unit were in the relative minority, but there was some excellent work on show, some centres, especially the special schools, clearly providing exciting, stimulating experiences for their learners. This unit is arguably the most accessible, creative and fun of all, and centres who grasp its potential are to be applauded.

Conclusion

- Assessment judgements have been on the whole, accurate. Some excellent teaching and learning is in evidence, and very well-conceived and executed resources are being employed, especially at the lower end of E2.
- The administrative tasks have been completed to a generally high standard.
- Confusion over the E2/E3 distinction remains, but this seems to be predominant amongst “new” centres. Teachers need to consult the Unit Amplification Guidance when planning and selecting/producing materials, and consult the WJEC website for resources and exemplar material.
- Centres should be encouraged to be more adventurous in attempting other units, especially the Website and AV Sequence units.
- Centres need to be reminded that if scribing has taken place, this needs to be clearly documented, both on the work and in the form of a WJEC Witness Statement.

ENTRY PATHWAYS

MUSIC

Summer 2016

Principal Moderator: Sarah Williams Burton

It was pleasing to see that the overall standard of the work submitted was of a very high standard with most candidates being awarded the Entry qualification for which they were entered. In nearly all submissions, centres had assessed the work correctly and had supported the submission with relevant commentary.

All work submitted was correctly authenticated by both staff and candidates. Authentication sheets can be found on the WJEC website and must be signed by all candidates.

Centres took note that it is not possible for the moderator to 'downgrade' a candidate who has been entered but not achieved the Entry 3 criteria even though the work may cover the Entry 2 criteria. It is of paramount importance that centres enter candidates for the correct Entry Level and provide evidence to demonstrate that the candidate has fulfilled the assessment criteria set out in the specifications; please refer to the Amplification of Content.

Presentation of work was well organised. However, there were a large number of centres who submitted work on multiple CDs. All work for all candidates submitted in the sample should be recorded onto one CD and accompanied by a clear track list. Work for all the music units at both E2 and E3 should be submitted on one CD.

Please ensure that the evidence submitted for moderation is sufficient and fulfils the Assessment Criteria. Again, please refer to the Amplification of Content for more details.

It was pleasing to see such a broad range of imaginative tasks set and so many good quality resources produced to help candidates structure their work and therefore enhance candidate attainment.

It is encouraging to see so many centres making innovative use of ICT to enhance and support performances and compositions.

Solo Music Performance

As usual outcomes in the Solo Music Performance were good. Centres, where the solo work was accompanied, provided the candidates with a greater sense of performance and more successful outcomes were generally achieved.

Please ensure that **2 pieces** for each candidate in the moderation sample are submitted at both E2 and E3 as specified in the Amplification of Content.

It was pleasing and enjoyable to see so many concert performances submitted as evidence.

There were several candidates who were entered for Entry 2 and performed above the expected standard; in these cases moderators have suggested that candidates are re-entered using the same pieces for Entry 3 on the centre reports.

There were some very good performing evaluations submitted, both orally and written. However, some centres failed to provide evidence that candidates had evaluated their performances; as this meant that not all criteria was met, some candidates were not awarded the level in this unit.

Ensemble Music Performance

Entries for the Ensemble Music Performance were also of a high standard. Centres entered a variety of ensembles which played to the individual candidate's strengths.

Please ensure that the candidates being assessed are clearly identified in the ensemble. Information regarding what part the candidate is playing in the ensemble must be included in the supporting submission notes.

Centres should be aware that it is considered 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. Whole class singing in unison with piano or backing track accompaniment is not considered an ensemble performance for this qualification.

Again, please ensure that **2 pieces** for each candidate in the moderation sample are submitted at both E2 and E3.

As in the solo performing unit, there were some very good performing evaluations submitted, both orally and written. However, some centres failed to provide evidence that candidates had evaluated their performances; as this meant that not all criteria was met, not all candidates were not awarded the level.

Composing Music

Composing Music unit continued to deliver very successful outcomes again 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 Amplification of Content 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 2 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.

Centres must ensure that **2 contrasting compositions** for each candidate in the moderation sample are submitted at both E2 and E3.

There were some very good composing appraisals submitted, both orally and written. However, some centres failed to provide evidence that candidates had appraised their compositions; as this meant that not all criteria was met, some candidates were not awarded the level.

Appraising Music

In the Appraising Music unit, most centres used the suggested tasks from the WJEC that ensured all the assessment criteria were met, adding their own tasks where necessary. However, there were a few centres who failed to meet the assessment criteria as insufficient evidence was submitted. This unit is worth 5 credits and the work covered must reflect this. Please refer to the Amplification of Content 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 2 contrasting genres, and for Entry 3 the criteria should be met in 3 contrasting genres.

Please ensure that work submitted has been teacher marked and that a record is kept of these. There were some cases this year where candidates had given many incorrect answers and therefore had not met the criteria.

Some centres submitted work for every candidate. Please refer to the specification where the sampling formula can be found. For centres with ten or less candidates, a sample of three for each unit at each level to show evidence of all units should be submitted.

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 delivery and enable staff to engage candidates in areas in which the candidate, staff or centre have a particular interest.

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