

## Principal Assessor Report 2004

**Assessment Panel:**

**Art and Design**

**Qualification area**

**Subject(s) and Level(s)  
Included in this report**

**Photography for the Media**

## Statistical information: update

Number of entries in 2003	50
---------------------------	----

Number of entries in 2004	115
---------------------------	-----

### General comments re entry numbers

Entry numbers were up by 65 candidates in 2004 at pass mark stage. This award is gaining popularity and it appears that centres who previously offered stand-alone photography Units are now offering the Group Award (this includes a mix of colleges and schools). However, there was a shift in candidature this year with more candidate entries from schools than in previous years.

## Statistical Information: Performance of candidates

### Distribution of awards

#### Pre-appeal:

17.4%	of the total candidature received a	A award
32.2%	of the total candidature received a	B award
38.3%	of the total candidature received a	C award
12.2%	of the total candidature received	no award

### Comments on any significant changes in percentages or distribution of awards

There was an improved performance at the top end this year, especially the schools presentations. However, there was a slight dip in performance mid-range (due to poorer entries from FE centres).

### **Grade boundaries for each subject area included in the report**

Distribution of awards	%	Cum %	Number of candidates	Lowest mark
A	17.4	17.4	20	140
B	32.2	49.6	37	120
C	38.3	87.8	44	100
D				
No award	12.2	100.0	14	52

### **Comments on grade boundaries for each subject area**

There have been no changes to the grade boundaries.

## **Comments on candidate performance**

### **General comments**

There was a general increase in the quality and consistency of the candidate presentations. Although traditional photography was very much in evidence, a greater amount of practical work was generated via digital imaging. However, the outcome, in terms of marks achieved was similar.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates performed well**

Again the practical element was the area where candidates performed well, however sometimes the inclusion of unrelated images, however good, lowered candidates final mark.

The Action Plans were well done and there has been a significant improvement in the Evaluations on last year. Overall, presentations were refreshing with some candidates attempting challenging and wide-ranging themes such as “drug abuse in schools”, “Oxfam” and “Laura Ashley”.

### **Areas of external assessment in which candidates had difficulty**

The evaluation showed improvement but was still the weakest area of the award. The production of research evidence was particularly poor or missing from some centres.

## **Recommendations**

### **Feedback to centres**

Centres should be aware that proposals written in the past tense do not really represent proposals. Within the proposal, including lists of equipment to be used does not add anything to the proposal; candidates would be better describing the techniques they propose to use. Evidence of research, eg contact sheets, found images from the internet or periodicals, ideas and sketchbooks, etc were lacking or missing from many presentations which cost the candidate valuable marks. Where evidence is supplied, it must relate to the final project and the development of the final images and should be seen within the research evidence. If the practical element changes as the project develops and what is produced is not what was proposed this must be explained effectively within the evaluation.

Centres should note that the evaluation has a maximum word limit of 1,000 words.