

GCSE



**Chief Examiner's and
Principal Moderator's Report
Art and Design**

Summer Series 2019



Foreword

This booklet outlines the performance of candidates in all aspects of this specification for the Summer 2019 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 section on our website at www.ccea.org.uk.

Contents

Chief Examiner's Report	3
Principal Moderator's Report	6
Contact details	9

GCSE Art and Design

Chief Examiner's Report

Overview

This report provides an overview of the first series of the revised specification and has been compiled with the help of our moderating team, and informed by discussions with centre representatives and scrutiny of candidates' work.

The new specification required changes to course structure and delivery and this was challenging. Most teachers had read the specification thoroughly and were positive and enthusiastic about the opportunity to restructure and revitalise courses. In these centres the work was interesting, exciting, well informed and personal. In general, approaches taken by these centres enabled candidates to achieve at a level well matched to ability. However, some centres had not understood the extent of the changes to the specification and this resulted in disadvantage to candidates, who were unable to achieve one or more of the assessment objectives at a level that matched their ability. This was particularly evident in Component 1.

It was wonderful to see so many creative interpretations of the specification and variety of approach. Some teachers felt that the new specification allowed for greater choice and flexibility in course structure. Successful approaches were less formulaic than in previous years, particularly in Part B of Component 1. In general courses were well tailored, taking into consideration availability of resources, expertise, and the needs, preferences and interests of candidates. Many centres enjoyed success in availing of local resources for example, visiting galleries, studios and places of interest, or organising workshops with practitioners.

The best work was well informed by research, evaluation and analysis of images, artefacts and products leading to a better understanding of visual language. Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of purpose and intentions and were more rigorous in refining, improving and developing their own ideas. Candidates should be guided to use more credible, relevant and appropriate references which are widely available. Unfortunately, many candidates made only a cursory reference to artworks, often retrospectively with a disappointing number of candidates using sources that lack credibility, or incorrectly referencing sources. Centres are reminded of the requirement to acknowledge all secondary source material. Failure to do so is malpractice and can result in penalties applied to candidates' marks.

Some candidates produced large volumes of written work which often outweighed the practical work on display. It was often the case that this was superficial information about an artist, repetitive, or plagiarised directly from the CCEA website. Written communication cannot substitute for practical/visual demonstration of understanding. Whilst there is no formal assessment of written work in this qualification, it should support the allocation of marks and provide useful information and explanation of the work, and evidence the candidates critical engagement with their own or others work. (See section on "Annotation" in the specification)

It was good to see a variety of approaches to drawing, in particular drawing for different purposes, in different styles, and drawing from observation. In general, drawing work was more mature, and personal styles had been developed. There were some highly successful examples of candidates developing understanding of the visual elements through plein air drawing with different tools and materials and on different surfaces. We also saw more technical design drawing and digital drawing. Some candidates relied heavily on

found imagery and transcribing from photographs. Centres are reminded that there is a requirement to use primary and secondary sources. Where too much emphasis was placed on accurate transcription it was often not appropriate or relevant to intentions. Centres are encouraged to read the information on drawing on Page 8 of the specification.

Component 1

Part A – Exploratory Portfolio

A significant change in approach was required in Part A of Component 1 and it was good to see the variety of work produced. With successful delivery this provided an excellent springboard for the rest of the course. Learning about the visual elements through techniques and processes inspired by contextual references was very beneficial. This led to more mature and informed approaches to ideas development and impacted on outcomes in Part B and in Component 2. Candidates benefited from this opportunity to broaden their knowledge, skills and understanding, and establish strengths and interests before embarking on Part B and Component 2.

Many teachers were positive about the value of Part A and its usefulness in preparing for the remainder of the course. In general, candidates enjoyed and were motivated by this part of the course. Most centres met the minimum requirement of working in two disciplines with many doing more. Most of the work seen was 2D Fine Art, and Printmaking and Ceramics were also popular.

Many centres took an approach to evidencing learning about the visual elements through a range of basic exercises. This often resulted in high volumes of work that did not merit high level marks and often repeated learning from Key Stage 3. Whilst this might be appropriate and necessary for some candidates, some very able candidates were disadvantaged by this approach. Better approaches evidenced understanding of the visual elements through applying learning to their own work that they had gained through analysis of others. For example, one candidate had analysed David Hockney's use of colour, shape and pattern in his landscape paintings and applied their learning to a range of ceramic pieces based on a local landscape. In the worst cases candidates had only completed a set of exercises or a workshop for each visual element or discipline, had not undertaken any analysis of artworks and did not develop their own work in any depth. Whilst no final outcome is required it is important to balance experiencing different disciplines with the opportunity for candidates to apply learning to their own original work within the constraints of time and with the percentage weighting in mind. Streamlined approaches with careful consideration of the changes to learning outcomes and the criteria for Assessment Objective 1 were most successful.

Centres should note that there is no requirement to explore all the visual elements at this stage; but they should explore those relevant to the practitioners or disciplines which they are focussing on.

Part B – Investigating the Creative and Cultural Industries

Teachers commented on how they enjoyed the opportunity to provide pupils with an insight into working within the creative industries and they felt that many candidates were more focused and invested. They also reported that they had more control to differentiate by creating briefs or commissions appropriate to the needs and abilities of candidates. Some centres reported problems with time constraints but this seemed largely as a result of either too much time spent on Part A; Part B delivered as the legacy Unit 1; or the same volume of work expected as with the legacy Unit 1. Most work was 2D Fine Art or 3D Ceramics but there were more examples of exciting Graphics and Textiles than in previous years. There were some outstanding examples of the use of CAD and CAM and some very rigorous and

mature approaches to the creative process and design cycle.

For Part B most centres chose Option 1, a visual arts commission or a design brief, fewer chose Option 2, an investigation into an artist, designer or movement and even fewer chose Option 3, a collaborative project. Most tasks or briefs were either developed by candidates themselves or issued by their teacher. Centres are reminded that it is compulsory to use the guidance in the Controlled assessment booklet.

“Students complete one of the following tasks as described in the Controlled Assessment booklet...”

Very few used the tasks from the controlled assessment booklet. Most candidates had clear intentions for their work and were able to access marks at the appropriate level. However, it was clear that some candidates or teachers had written briefs for the sake of having done so and the work did not meet the requirements of that brief therefore disadvantaging the candidate. Candidates were disadvantaged as some centres had not fully acknowledged the differences between this part of Component 1 and the legacy Unit 1. This led to the production of unnecessary volumes of work and work which lacked focus on intentions. This work was often of a very good quality but candidates could not be awarded marks at the upper end of the matrix particularly for Assessment Objectives 3 and 4.

Where appropriate tasks were set with a greater focus on achieving intentions, there was generally better selection, discrimination and refinement of imagery, techniques, processes and ideas. This was a joy to see.

Component 2 – Externally Set Assignment

Teachers commented positively on the new style paper, the stimulus and the range of starting points, and reference materials provided. Teachers noted that the paper was accessible and engaging for candidates of all abilities. All candidates produced work based on the theme ‘pattern’ but many had not responded to a starting point from Section 1, or a brief from Section 2. The briefs and starting points in the paper could be better utilised to extend and build on pupils understanding of working within the creative industries gained through Component 1, Part B. Whilst responding to the stimulus alone is valid, many of the other questions were under used. Many candidates could have benefitted from selecting a brief or starting point and working in a more focused way towards achieving specified intentions.

The best work involved thorough analysis of appropriate, credible and relevant artworks or products and were well used to support and inform work. However, whilst many references were provided in the paper, very few candidates used them and often used less appropriate references instead. Centres are reminded that all candidates should receive a copy of the externally set assignment and candidates should be encouraged to use any of the references within the paper.

The stimulus itself led to a very wide variety of outstanding, creative and intelligent interpretations. In the best cases it was clear that candidates were very fluent in their understanding of visual language with great willingness to experiment and innovate as a result of the confidence they had gained in Component 1. In these centres work varied greatly, crossing disciplines and mixing media for example, fashion design with electronics, and installation with paintings, light and sound. Where candidates had full access to the paper and used it to support their idea development, work was very personal and diverse. Interesting responses included patterns of lifestyle, life cycles, code, behaviour, movement, and traditional textile patterns reimagined in contemporary styles. Where the paper was not used some of the work produced bore little relevance to the theme.

The outcomes produced were largely 2D Fine Art, but there were some examples of Textiles, Printmaking and Ceramics. There were very few larger scale 3D pieces, or digital

outcomes. In some centres outcomes were all of the same size and in the same media. They sometimes lacked ambition or were not the best or most appropriate outcomes for individual candidates. Often very exciting creative work was abandoned in place of a more conventional outcome. Centres should note that candidates should have the opportunity to develop a personal and meaningful response that is the most appropriate conclusion to their work. Many candidates produced extremely ambitious, large scale pieces, and very well resolved outcomes during their ten hour timed piece. Centres should note that final outcomes must be started and completed during the 10 hours. Working on final outcomes outside of this is considered malpractice.

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 Rathfriland High School, Rathfriland, for their hospitality and cooperation during the 2019 Moderator Briefings.

The moderation process ran much more smoothly this year with the introduction of e moderation. This eliminated human error in the calculation and transcriptions of marks. A few centres experienced some difficulty printing out the rank order for each unit, however these small issues were quickly remedied.

Whilst all centres received the relevant and necessary information from CCEA regarding a change to the moderation process relating to feedback, some centres were unaware of this change. As with all other subjects, there is no verbal feedback and written feedback is provided on the TAC6.

Part A - Exploratory Portfolio

There were many approaches taken by centres in the presentation of work. Most centres displayed the work for Component 1 Part A, The Exploratory Portfolio in either sketchbooks or folders. Where there was good practice, it was evident that learning had taken place from experiences and skills developed while exploring materials and processes of drawing with a range of media. Ideas had been developed on a personal and individual level. Poor practice in centres often involved all candidates doing exactly the same exercises for the sake of showing that they had learned a particular skill or process or technique, with all candidates using the same artistic referencing at a very basic and uninformed level. All candidates need to be given the opportunities for risk taking, innovation and creativity by taking ownership of their own work. It is from providing a range of opportunities for candidates that they can prepare for Part B and develop their own approaches and skills on an individual journey.

Exercises for the sake of ticking a box are not recommended. That said, there were some centres where candidates produced very little work for Component 1 Part A, The Exploratory Portfolio. In addition, each candidate produced identical work, identical artistic references were used, images were copied and traced, all of which lacked any personal involvement or meaningful learning on behalf of the candidate.

Component 1, Part A and Part B must be displayed separately as they are moderated using two different matrices. Work cannot be shared between the two components for the purpose of moderation.

Part B - Investigating the Creative and Cultural Industries

Part A and Part B of Component 1 should be displayed side by side. A number of centres did not do so and as a result the moderation process was delayed while clarification was sought as to which body of work belonged to which part.

Contextual research needs to be meaningful and relevant and inform the work of candidates. Work should be personal and individual to each candidate.

It was evident in some centres that teachers had not read the new specification in any depth and were, to a large extent, still delivering the old specification. In this new specification, the criteria for assessment has changed and the weighting of marks has changed. Moderators noted erratic marking in a number of centres and some teachers admitted marking to the old grade boundaries. Marking should be solely based on the language and understanding of the criteria in the new matrices.

It was good to hear so many teachers state that both they, and their pupils found the changes to the specification refreshing, energising, challenging and all-inclusive, allowing all pupils of all abilities to engage in a personal and meaningful way. While some teachers expressed concern about the amount of work pupils were 'expected' to produce, the specification does not stipulate an amount of work to be undertaken but asks that pupils experience working in at least two disciplines and that there is evidence that learning has taken place from their experiences in Art and Design. The nature of this specification allows for a wide variety of approaches. No centre is disadvantaged by having less access to resources than other centres with more funding. Many centres were able to be creative in making full use of all resources available to them including recycling materials and developing links with local businesses. Most centres provided a range of opportunities for candidates to work with Artists and Practitioners, including gallery visits and opportunities to work outside of the classroom, while first-hand observational studies were encouraged as part of the building blocks for drawing. A number of centres used a formulaic structure in their delivery of the specification. In many cases, work undertaken was not necessary, repetitive, and bore little meaning for the pupil, nor did it inform the development of their work. Teachers should afford candidates the best opportunities to succeed, and this can only be done by having a thorough understanding of the specification.

There were many excellent examples of good practice across centres. Some exciting and innovative work followed on from candidates exploring materials and ideas in Part A, The Exploratory Portfolio. Creativity can be encouraged through allowing pupils to develop their own ideas, take risks and learn through making mistakes.

Component 2 - The Externally Set Assignment

Teachers and candidates responded well to this year's ESA and there was some outstanding, creative, exciting and skilful work presented in centres. The majority of candidates responded well with clear focus and purpose, producing personal and individual outcomes. 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 more evident and showed that candidates had learned from the experiences they had gained in Component 1 with many candidates using multimedia and innovative techniques. Photographic recording was very popular across all centres. There was a notable increase in the number of candidates using digital technology with light and sound as part of their final outcomes. Again this year, time constraints and confidence may well have influenced the choices of the majority who produced 2D Fine Art outcomes. It was however disappointing to see that on occasion, the excellent development of ideas was laid by the way side in preference of a more conservative and 'safe' outcome. 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. 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.

Meeting the assessment objectives

In general, the assessment objectives were met more accurately in Component 1 Part B, The Creative and Cultural Industries and in the ESA.

Where centres were very lenient in the application of marks for Component 1 Part A, there was only limited analysis and exploration of the formal visual elements and yet teachers were awarding marks at Level 3 and 4. In centres where a rigid and formulaic approach was used, candidates were being awarded marks at two levels and more above where the marking should have been as the refinement of work and ideas was often limited and superficial.

Component 1, Part A, is worth 25% of all marks available and careful consideration needs to be taken when assessing the work of candidates for this part.

Due care and consideration needs to be taken when assessing the work of candidates at the lower end of the marks range. These candidates were often severely marked. All achievement needs to be recognised and rewarded accurately.

Conclusion

Moving on from the first series of this specification it is extremely important for all teachers to thoroughly read and understand the specification. Failing to do so does disadvantage candidates. It is essential to allow all candidates access to the achievement at a level appropriate to them. In addition, attendance at Agreement Trials is strongly recommended for all. This year will be the first year that work from this new specification will be on display and teachers will gain an insight into the variety of approaches taken as well as the application of marks in each component and at each level. Agreement Trials also provides opportunities to ask questions and collaborate with other professionals to share ideas and good practice. Agreement Trials are held in the Autumn Term of each academic year.

Attending the True Colours Exhibition is also recommended for teachers and candidates. It is hosted by CCEA in the Ulster Museum and the most outstanding work produced from this series will be exhibited. The achievement of selected candidates in both components of the course is an acknowledgement of the quality of standards and excellence achieved. It is also a testament to the quality of teaching in this subject area.

Thanks to all centres for their hospitality and co-operation during the moderation visits. The moderation period requires a lot of teacher effort to ensure that paperwork is correctly completed, and work is well displayed and easily accessed by moderators. Teachers are once again to be congratulated for all their hard work, ensuring that this year's moderation process was successful.

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)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

