

CCEA GCSE - Art and Design (Legacy)
Summer Series 20#*

Principal Moderator's Report

art and
design

Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of CCEA's General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) in Art and Design (Legacy) for this series.

CCEA hopes that the Chief Examiner's and/or Principal Moderator's report(s) will be viewed as a helpful and constructive medium to further support teachers and the learning process.

This booklet forms part of the suite of support materials for the specification. Further materials are available from the specification's microsite on our website at www.ccea.org.uk.

Contents

Assessment Unit 1	The Core Portfolio (Controlled Assessment)	5
Assessment Unit 2	Working to a Stimulus	6
Contact details		7

GCSE ART AND DESIGN (LEGACY)

Principal Moderator's Report

The Principal Moderator, Chief Examiner and moderation team would like to thank the Principal and Head of Art and Design at Saintfield High School, Saintfield, for their hospitality and co-operation during the 2018 Briefing Meetings for GCSE Art and Design moderators.

Administration

The majority of centres had all necessary documentation ready and completed correctly in preparation for the moderation process. It is essential that teachers review the check list that CCEA provides in the 'Instructions to Teachers' booklet to assist teachers in the preparation for their centre's moderation. Moderators are dependent on centres providing complete and accurate paperwork as inaccurate completion of paperwork can cause delays to the moderation process. From 2019 a new eCRS system will be rolled out for Art and Design. Guidance will be provided from CCEA at Agreement Trials and through the Instructions to Teachers booklets. Labelling art work correctly is important and aids in the smooth running of the moderation of candidate's work. Centre labels are acceptable. The use of a map to show the location of candidates' work is vital to the smooth running of the moderation process. Internal standardisation is an essential requirement, and will ensure that all candidates have been marked to the same standard. On occasion where teachers mark independently of each other, different standards are applied which often leads to erratic marking within the centre.

Display and presentation of candidates' work

The sample of work requested for moderation should be easily accessible. There are many acceptable ways of displaying and presenting candidates work. When the sample requested for both units is displayed in rank order and separated by Unit, this allows moderation to proceed with greater ease. Issues arose this year when both units were displayed together where it was difficult to see where one unit stopped and another started. Often candidates' work overlapped with unclear division of work. This can lead to long delays and slow the moderation process significantly. As moderation is by centre and not individual teacher, the sample should be displayed in one room rather than the sample being mounted in the classrooms of individual teachers. Centres were aware that additional work outside of the sample may be requested and all requests were met with ease. One centre however had additional work outside of the classroom located in a classroom where teaching was taking place. This is not to be recommended as it delays the moderation process.

The moderation of work

It is crucial that the moderation process is allowed to take place in a quiet and secure area, without unnecessary interruption, throughout the moderator's visit. It is not appropriate to have students, technicians or others working in or coming in and out of the rooms where moderation is taking place. This year has seen a notable rise by moderators in reporting such interruptions. This is unacceptable and unfair to the candidates in your centre. Centres are given sufficient notice of the moderator's visit to ensure that this should not happen.

Marking

The majority of centres have a good understanding of the assessment objectives and mark within the acceptable range. However, there is still a significant pattern of centres marking to edge of the acceptable range. Where this happens centres run the risk of an adjustment to marks impacting severely on the marks of some candidates. Erratic marking was evidenced in some centres and this resulted in a re-mark of all candidates' work in the centre and not just those in the computer generated sample. Most of the centres whose work was re-marked were as a result of internal standardisation not having taken place. Many centres continue to mark leniently at the top levels and severely at the lower levels. There were a larger number of candidates marked severely at the grade C and below boundaries in this series. The same care and attention in using the assessment matrix should be taken when marking these candidates as is taken when marking candidates at the higher levels. Pushing marking to the edge of the acceptable range may have a significant impact on some final grades. There were fewer centres requiring adjustment this year.

Work Produced

Work produced varied greatly in content, approach to themes, materials used and in scale. There was evidence of excellent standards of work across centres in terms of creativity, the development of ideas and analytical skills. The specialism of teachers and facilities available in centres played a large part on the work produced by candidates. Many centres displayed evidence of excellent practice which allowed candidates to work from primary sources, visit exhibitions, engage in workshops and develop research skills which supported the development of their work. Experimentation with a range of resources resulted in some original, fresh and exciting work being produced. Moderators noted that many centres were influenced by the new specification and the work of candidates was more experimental involving a higher level of risk taking which was fresh and innovative, allowing candidates to be more confident in the development of their ideas and outcomes. There were some centres however that still relied on a mundane formulaic approach where all candidates produced very similar work. When candidates are given the opportunity to learn new techniques, use new materials and experience new processes which in turn informs their work, candidates work to their strengths and often develop fresh and innovative outcomes. Where candidates in a class are all using the same contextual references the work produced can be very predictable and lack individuality.

Addressing the Assessment Objectives

Candidates should cover all four Assessment Objectives equally. Moderators found that while most centres had addressed AO1 and AO3 well, AO2 and AO4 were less well addressed.

AO1 Candidates across all centres had developed a range of ideas. While candidates had contextual references, these on occasions weren't used to inform their ideas with understanding of purpose. In some instances they were no more than tenuous. More able candidates presented research that was both relevant to the development of their ideas and their final outcome. Ideas were recorded using reference material with thought and insight, whereas weaker candidates were often over reliant on secondary sources and were unable to develop their ideas and their drawings were repetitive.

- AO2** 'Refining of work/ideas' was weak in a number of centres where marking was lenient in this particular assessment objective. Experimentation in many centres was often very prescribed and done as an exercise that had little or no bearing on the development of the work of any candidate. Through experimenting with materials, techniques and processes, candidates should be encouraged to streamline their choice of materials and techniques to those that would best inform their own individual theme. Candidates should be encouraged to think for themselves and develop their own ideas while reviewing and modifying their work as it develops. This aspect of the development was missing in the work of many candidates across centres. Opportunities for risk taking and the creative development of ideas were missed in many cases. In other cases where candidates had some excellent examples of positive experiences with experimentation, these did not inform their final outcome in any way. These were missed opportunities. Mistakes and accidents are also learning experiences from which candidates will learn.
- AO3** In some centres, candidates recorded solely from secondary source images when first hand sources were easily available. It was disappointing to read that many moderators noted the lack of first hand direct observational drawing. Many centres on the other hand encouraged candidates to draw through a range of interesting media such as recording three dimensionally with wire and recording observations in collage, print, and wax resist. Candidates should be actively encouraged to draw from first hand sources. Photographs are not first-hand sources when pupils work from them. That said, there was some teaching of photography in many centres. While there was a variety of media used in all centres, some candidates struggled to explore more than pencil and paint.
- AO4** Many responses marked at level 4 and level 5 did not meet the criteria for those levels. Often responses were successful but not well balanced when looking at the work of the candidate holistically. There are a range of marks available at each level. Candidates may meet all of the criteria in the level but not achieve all of the marks available at that level. Candidates must meet all of the criteria at the highest level in order to achieve the top mark. Many centres were awarding the full marks at each level of the assessment matrix, when the work merited being marked at the lower or middle range of marks available. This 'strategy' of over-marking often results in centre marks being outside of the acceptable range and can cause centre marks to be adjusted. Final responses should be supported and informed by connections made to the work of others. In many cases these links were tenuous. Moderators also noted that many well-known 'Pinterest' images were presented in some centres as the candidate's own image for their final outcomes. This is plagiarism and could be investigated as malpractice.

Assessment Unit 1 The Core Portfolio (Controlled Assessment)

Preparation work was produced mainly on loose sheets and in sketchbooks. Sketchbooks ranged in size from A1 to pocket size. Many of the smaller pocket sized notebooks were used to record written ideas and rough sketches which were very personal and rich with ideas and images. In general, there was more evidence on the focus of drawing using a range of materials which produced some exciting and interesting work. Moderators reported a greater number of candidates producing work in a variety of media as a result of attending workshops on felt making, embroidery, printmaking and ceramics to name a few. Experimentations using textiles and a range of textile techniques are becoming increasingly popular. Tearing, cutting, layering and adding heat alongside using new textile technologies are encouraging candidates to risk take and become more involved in the unexpected

outcome. Quality is always more important than quantity particularly when work produced is done merely to decorate or fill pages. Assessment Objectives were generally well addressed; however in some centres assessment objectives one and two were not as well met. Moderators noted again this year that some excellent experimentation with a range of techniques deployed was not reflected in informing the candidates' work. While there were examples of fashion, design, textiles, ceramics, batik, and mixed media, this year saw an increase in 3D paper based constructions and 3D modelling in wood, wire and plastic. Better use of contextual references was evident in an increasing number of centres. Weaker candidates are still too dependent on copying the work of other artists for no apparent reason. Moderators noted a growing practice in candidates tracing over existing images of the work of others and passing it off as their own. Photocopying artists' work and colouring in over the top is of limited value in developing skills and creativity. Such practice needs to be referenced so the moderator understands how the image has been produced. The use of Photoshop is continuing to increase each year, helping candidates to develop their ideas in an imaginative way. The use of photography as a medium is also on the increase. The use of Pinterest is ever growing in being used as a source for inspiration for many candidates. Researching and investigating the work of others is part of this specification but plagiarism can be tempting to some candidates and it is the centre's responsibility to ensure that work is produced under medium supervision. In several cases it was found that candidates copied images from Pinterest and presented them as their own. Final outcomes were 2D Fine Art in the main.

Assessment Unit 2 Working to a Stimulus

Teachers and candidates responded well to this year's stimulus paper, 'Transformation' and there was some outstanding, creative and skilful work presented in centres. Candidates responded well with clear focus and purpose. It was evident that the paper appealed to boys and girls equally. Stronger candidates used primary sources and developed their ideas through a range of media and techniques. Experimental work was encouraged in many centres with candidates using multimedia techniques. Photographic recording was very popular across all centres. Time constraints and confidence may well have influenced choices of the majority who produced 2D Fine Art outcomes. There were, however, some excellent examples of work by candidates that resulted in ceramic, textile and fashion outcomes. Contextual work was generally relevant and supported the development of ideas. Many candidates were well guided by the contextual reference suggestions from the examination paper. This led many candidates to a variety of artist exploration which they used to inform and develop their work. It is part of the structure of the examination that candidates are required to start and complete their final response in a set 10 hour period. In many centres the preparatory work was often more detailed and stronger than the work produced in the 10 hour time frame and this is understandable. The purpose of the 10 hour period is to provide a level playing field for all candidates. That being the case it must be noted that the standard and commitment of candidates, was very high. The support provided by teachers is commendable.

Contact details

The following information provides contact details for key staff members:

- **Specification Support Officer: Nola Fitzsimons**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2235, email: nfitzsimons@ccea.org.uk)
- **Officer with Subject Responsibility: Anne McGinn**
(telephone: (028) 9026 1200, extension: 2263, email: amcginn@ccea.org.uk)