

Examiners' Report

Summer 2010

Principal Learning

Creative and Media Level 1 Controlled Assessments

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our Diploma line on 0844 576 0028 or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Summer 2010

Publications Code DP023707

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Contents

	Page
1. General Introduction	1
2. Unit 1 Report	2
3. Unit 2 Report	3
4. Unit 3 Report	4
5. Unit 4 Report	5
6. Unit 5 Report	6
7. Unit 6 Report	7
8. Grade Boundaries	9

Level 1 Principal Learning in Creative and Media

General Introduction

The use and placement of Candidate Record Sheets in the front of files has now been adopted by most centres. However, there were still occasions when these records were only partially completed and centres are reminded that it is a requirement that both Candidate Record Sheets and Authentication Statements are completed and signed. Details such as centre and candidate numbers were also often left out.

There was a positive engagement by centres with the particular requirements of each unit, but also the continuation of basic errors in the content of submissions, this is dealt with in the commentaries for each unit.

Where performance fell below what was expected it was again due to inadequate documentation of evidence leaving gaps in coverage of the learning outcomes.

Hard evidence must be provided to show coverage of all criteria in the Marking Grid for Mark A, as without it marks cannot be confirmed. Good practice was seen in supporting evidence that included the use of witness statements, observation records and annotated commentary. These documents were well used to support photographic, sketchbooks and digitally based records, but centres must find a method of clearly presenting information for moderation.

Organised visits and events fed into the development of evidence production and where practitioners were used to provide experience of particular sectors, this often inspired directed activity and often showed delivery at its best.

Centres were better at providing documentary evidence of activities in suitable formats, but there is a need to clearly identify where learners have made individual contributions to group events. Pro-forma sheets are being well used, extensively in some cases, to collect and collate information. However, these pre-prepared documents do not always focus on the requirements of the learning outcomes and as a result learners are missing opportunities to present key information.

Centres are again reminded of the advice given in the last three moderator reports:

- **Individual contributions** to group activities must be clearly identified and logged if evidence is to be considered.
- CD/DVD evidence must be chaptered and indexed to reference each individual. Individuals must be **quickly and easily identified**.
- Paperwork must contribute tangible evidence matched to the learning outcomes if it is to be considered. Empty work sheets and writing frames make no contribution to evidence and should be removed.

Centres must use sufficient packaging to protect electronic evidence. Some completed work was stored on DVD which could not be opened due to damage in transit. Centres are reminded that it is their responsibility to ensure that material stored digitally can be easily accessed.

Unit 1 - Introduction to Creative and Media Skills

There continues to be a tendency to concentrate on the visual arts discipline to provide evidence for LO1 and LO2 at the expense of media production and performance art and centres are reminded that all three disciplines must be represented. Centres are encouraged to give equal resources for the production of visual art, performance art and media production for this unit.

Mask and hat making was very popular for the visual arts discipline with short film sequences providing media production evidence. Performance art work was more varied, ranging from Film Noir extracts to dance and improvised pieces. Some Performance Art tasks did limit the learner response, while more structured performances enabled learners to meet higher mark band descriptors.

Centres are still setting tasks that tend not to ask candidates for evidence of safe working practices.

There were centres that submitted evidence electronically, with some producing websites with clear links to each of the three disciplines. This was a very effective way of providing evidence as was other material where centres used You Tube and DVDs to show examples of work.

Accessing the evidence was sometimes problematic and centres are reminded that if work is to be provided in any electronic format, it must be easily accessible if it is to be considered.

Guidance on formats can be found in the specification.

LO1: Most centres provided evidence of completed work across all disciplines which was clearly organised into separate sections and assessed accurately. A minority of centres only provided evidence for one or two disciplines but awarded marks on the basis that all three were evident.

Most centres lacked evidence of safe working practices, but assessments and feedback to the learners did not reflect this. Stronger submissions provided equally weighted evidence across all three disciplines.

LO2: The learners from some centres showed evidence of detailed and completed research plans and where these were found assessment tended to be accurate. However, candidates from the majority of centres had no research plans or limited evidence of research plans that were produced retrospectively.

The best examples were where centres used templates encouraging learners to complete sections at the start of the unit and as they progressed through each activity. Providing centre-devised templates for research plans might prove beneficial in generating the necessary evidence.

LO3: This learning outcome continues to be assessed generously by a large number of centres. This was found where learners had only provided generic evidence of job roles and careers from internet downloads or had concentrated on one or two disciplines rather than all three. Where learners had provided original evidence across all three disciplines, assessment reflected the learning outcomes accurately.

Unit 2 - Visual Arts

Work produced at some centres in evidence for this unit was appropriate and in some cases excellent in experimentation and research. Other centres did not provide quality outcomes, but merely presented rushed and scrappy bits of work that were barely adequate to show coverage of the unit. Masks and hats were popular subjects for investigation.

Learners demonstrated good supporting work, where ideas were generated through sketches, notes, annotation and were particularly strong when planning was encouraged through the use of centre-devised handouts.

Exemplary centres also facilitated strong documentation of learners' work through annotated photographs and witness statements that accompanied submissions. In other centres learner work did not provide sufficient evidence of planning or recording the process of development to confirm mark levels. The encouragement of monitoring and reflection by the learners also varied from centre to centre.

There was less confusion in the response to this unit than in previous series, with learners providing evidence of two or more areas of visual arts disciplines rather than across the sector related disciplines.

LO1: Learners sometimes looked at positive/negative or likes/dislikes of a visual arts form rather than similarities and differences. When similarities and differences were identified between historical and contemporary examples, lack of research and exploration limited their possible use.

Investigations need a greater sense of purpose with descriptions of the intended and identified audience.

Centres are starting to show that there is an attempt to employ appropriate subject terminology in annotated comment, but potential evidence still remains undocumented.

LO2: Learners quickly proceeded into the production of 'a visual arts product' often without a plan to base the progress of their work. Production plans were generally presented as sketchbook records of making and did not demonstrate planning. As a result the exploration of ideas was limited and the exploration of potential materials and intentions remained undocumented.

Centres need to move away from the idea that documentation of process implies that planning has taken place as work progresses.

LO3. Without a production plan it was difficult to prove that learners were following procedures, including those relating to health and safety. This learning outcome was the most accurately addressed when evidence of achievement was clearly shown in photographs. However, there must be greater focus on the requirements of the criteria and evidence of the purpose of production.

LO4. Reviews tended to take place in the form of an evaluation at the end of making, rather than reviewing frequently throughout as work progresses and should at show the higher achieving learners using feedback that has a positive effect on both intention and outcome.

Unit 3 - Performance Arts

Performance work was produced by learners across the full ability range. At the upper end, there was evidence of excellent preparation and a good range of techniques.

Centres selected material that was appropriate and provided suitable platforms for their learners' skills. There was a mixture of devised and scripted work. Where existing repertoire was adapted it gave the performance structure and clear creative intentions, whereas devised work often lacked any clear purpose.

There was a mixture of both consistent and lenient marking in the work seen. Clear evidence of the development process is vital to support the higher marks as is evidence of relevant consideration of target audience that in turn informs the creative decisions throughout the development of the piece.

LO1: Some centres did not support learners in identifying appropriate work related links, whilst others covered this with visits and focused research tasks. The important issue of the target audience was not fully considered and must be identified in order to select appropriate skills and techniques throughout the development process. The most effective work that enabled learners to access the full range of marks was clearly chosen by the teacher and adapted if necessary. Themes, issues and intentions were explored in rehearsals and workshops to ensure the group understood the work. Drama and dance were both popular choices and within these a range of disciplines were explored.

The least effective examples involved inappropriate work being selected for a target audience and no recording of the performance work being submitted. A recording of the event shown in a photograph of the audience is insufficient evidence.

LO2: In some of the work seen, teacher assessor comments were not supported by the evidence provided for moderation. There was a tendency to reward attitude and interest a learner showed, rather than the aptitude and ability to deal with a creative process. Hard evidence of the practical development of work captured during rehearsals should be clearly documented.

LO3: Where performance work was intended to be performed live, the skills and techniques were at times more appropriate than if performance work was created for camera. The basic techniques that will provide a learner with a language of performance should be provided at this level.

Performances were accessible to the full range of candidate ability. Performance projects could have generated effective practical opportunities to access all the learning outcomes.

LO4: Candidates tended to understand the creative process, but did not always appreciate the effect creative decisions would have on the outcome. Written evaluations tended to be brief. Where appropriate Level 1 existing repertoire is used as source material it could inform a more explicitly evidenced development process, which would in turn provide greater opportunity for review to be undertaken at the correct level.

Unit 4 - Media Production

Centres tended to favour moving image for their media production work and this varied from short advertisements to stop motion animation.

Group work tended to dominate the process and some centres did not differentiate between learners to determine 'who did what' and therefore disadvantaged individuals. However, other centres provided specific roles for the learners such as editor or cinematographer and where this was organised assessment decisions were generally accurate.

LO1: There was evidence of some good research into various genres recorded using effective templates to provide appropriate evidence. However, this learning outcome was problematic for some centres where there was very little or no evidence at all of learners identifying media products their purposes and audiences. Where centres had encouraged learners to provide hard evidence to show their recognition of media products, purpose and target audience assessment was often accurately placed in either Mark band 2 or 3. Some centres set tasks that looked at stars or celebrities rather than actual products.

LO2: There was some good documentation of this learning outcome, where writing frames were used to collate information. Some folders lacked planning documentation such as storyboards, shot lists etc, but where templates were provided learners did have sufficient planning documentation to support the marks awarded.

Individually explicit evidence of production planning needs to be provided as failure to identify individual performance led to underachievement by otherwise able learners.

LO3: The combination of Performance Art and Media Production worked well for this outcome especially when learners demonstrated skills in both of these disciplines. Media products using print based material, such as advertising posters using original photography, were also successful. However, centres need to be clearer in their definition of 'what is a media product' and to identify individual input into group activities. References to safe working practices were also limited in this learning outcome.

LO4: Learners should show evidence that they are monitoring progress and organising their time and resources. Reviews tended to be summative rather than formative, which did not enable learners to show how the media idea had been planned and subsequently produced.

Unit 5 - Presentation

Work was produced by learners across the full ability range with the presentation of Visual Arts as a popular choice. The most effective work that enabled learners to access the full range of marks was clearly guided by the teacher, with realistic venues researched with appropriate tasks and roles allocated to individuals. The least effective work involved a group approach with general intentions and not supported with clear plans, roles or responsibilities.

This unit was marked with lenience by the majority of centres. Clearer centre planning documentation would have enabled more learners to access the higher mark bands particularly in LO1.

LO1: Learners tended to describe the work they were presenting, but did not always focus on the task of presentation or the presentation event itself. Practical opportunities to access all the learning outcomes could have been given by identifying clear roles and responsibilities.

The important issue of the target audience was not fully considered and should be identified in order to inform the planning stage.

LO2: In the work seen, teacher assessor comments were often not supported by the evidence put forward for moderation. For example the evidence submitted was more useful if documentation by the learner made it clear, who had done what and how tasks undertaken linked to the original plan.

LO3: Evidence for this learning outcome was problematic as it confused health and safety issues concerning the staging of a presentation, with overcoming problems. The safe use of ladders and lateness were often placed together in a learners thinking and learners found it difficult to be clear about how things had been resolved. The recording of hazards has a direct impact on CM106 and therefore needs clarification.

Unit 6 - Skills Report

The best evidence of Skills Reports was generated by records made from a range of ambitious presentations where venues were researched, selected and negotiated. This fed into the content of answers and gave the learners opportunities to respond appropriately.

This year more centres submitted work by the published deadline, but there are still centres missing this date and centres frequently had to be contacted to request submissions or to supply information such as the Attendance Register or the signed Authentication form. This caused delay in the marking of work and considerable problems.

Most centres correctly sent scripts in PDF format recorded on CD, but there were still some hand written submissions and some that were not recorded on the published examination paper. Learners may be disadvantaged by not using the template and having the questions to respond to and they also need to include a word count for each answer submitted.

Edexcel produces an electronic version of this paper which must be downloaded by centres from the Edexcel website, www.edexcel.com. Candidates must write their responses directly into the electronic paper.

Centres are again reminded that they must label discs and envelopes sent for marking with the centre number and include the completed attendance list giving the learner name and number.

Q(A1): Fewer learners appeared to be confused about the requirement to 'describe the work produced for the presentation and the response to this question has improved. Responses were often lengthy, but missed opportunities to gain marks by focusing on the materials, techniques and skills used to create the work or by not identifying group and individual contributions.

Q(A2): The specification asks for what has been learnt by looking at similar work done by other people both in the present and the past. Clarification of the 'things looked at' and their influence on the work produced needs to be made clearer in this response. Some submissions only considered current examples, while some learners missed out the second part of the question - 'explain how they helped you to create your work'.

Q(B1): Records of the planning process used for the presentation have improved, but comments on the monitoring of plans were scarce. Opportunities to gain marks for this question are often missed due to a failure to set out the planning of the presentation and record how well the plans were followed.

Q(B2): Answers to this question have improved, but still need to reflect sector specific considerations of a particular type of target audience. The audience was often described as family and friends but target age groups and intentions were better documented.

Q(B3): Where a targeted audience was clearly identified, answers to this question were fuller and better reasoned. Some centres devised questionnaires to collect audience responses and this often provided information that was essential to this question.

Q(B4): There were some excellent responses to this question but there remains a poor understanding of what is meant by a hazard. Many of the answers described a problem encountered. The potential problem was then described rather than a particular hazard being identified in the staging of the presentation and how it was dealt.

Q(C1): This question asks the learner to describe two jobs that require the sort of skills developed by creating the work that was presented in Unit 5. The range of possible jobs is broad when making a presentation of work and many learners were able to identify at least one area where they had developed work related skills in the sector.

Grade Boundaries

Level 1 Unit 1: Introduction to Creative and Media Skills

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B
Raw boundary mark	60	54	39	24
Points Score	8	6	4	2

Level 1 Unit 2: Visual Arts

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B
Raw boundary mark	60	52	39	26
Points Score	8	6	4	2

Level 1 Unit 3: Performance Arts

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B
Raw boundary mark	60	53	39	25
Points Score	8	6	4	2

Level 1 Unit 4: Media Production

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B
Raw boundary mark	60	53	39	25
Points Score	8	6	4	2

Level 1 Unit 5: Presentation

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B
Raw boundary mark	60	53	39	26
Points Score	4	3	2	1

Level 1 Unit 6: Skills Report

	Max. Mark	A*	A	B
Raw boundary mark	60	53	39	24
Points Score	4	3	2	1

Notes

Maximum Mark (raw): the mark corresponding to the sum total of the marks shown on the mark scheme or mark grids.

Raw boundary mark: the minimum mark required by a learner to qualify for a given grade.

Please note: Principal Learning qualifications are new qualifications, and grade boundaries for Controlled Assessment units should not be considered as stable. These grade boundaries may differ from series to series.

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code DP023707 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH