

NCFE Level 2 Certificate in Creative Studies: Craft (601/0043/6)

Marking window: 19 January 2015- 2 April 2015

This report contains general information from the Chief Examiner. The aim is to point out the positives and negatives of the scripts in the marking window to guide you to areas that are doing well and not so well.

Key points:

- Administering the external assessment
- Standard of candidate work
- Referencing of external assessment tasks
- Evidence creation
- Interpretation of the tasks and associated assessment criteria
- Planning in the external assessment

It's important to note that candidates shouldn't sit the external assessment until they've taken part in the relevant teaching of the unit to ensure they are well prepared for the external assessment.

Administering the external assessment

The external assessment (both preparatory and timed period) must be independent from the teaching of the unit. Work completed during the teaching of the unit cannot be used in the external assessment. Any stimulus materials used by the centre during the teaching of the unit cannot be used in the external assessment. Candidates must complete all of the tasks independently.

The completion of the preparation tasks must be supervised by the Teacher and can be sat in the normal classroom environment. The tasks within the preparation period do not need to be invigilated. However, the preparation tasks must be treated independently from the teaching of the unit and candidates must complete all tasks independently. This means the preparation tasks must not be Teacher led.

The completion of the timed tasks must be Invigilated and sat in accordance with the Regulations for the Conduct of External Assessment - V Certs.

It's important that the external assessment is sat in accordance with the specified conditions.

Standard of candidate work

The standard of work for this marking window was variable at this level.

There were some examples of attractive work submitted during this marking window; however some seemed to be focused on the technical input rather than the creative aspect of the craft disciplines

The overall standard of the work produced by candidates was generally not seen to be at the creative or technical standard which is consistent with the level of the qualification. It is the centre's responsibility to ensure that the unit content is delivered in its entirety, before candidates sit the external assessment, to allow candidates the opportunity to achieve across all seven assessment criteria.

Referencing of external assessment tasks

Most candidates labelled their work effectively per task (in some cases this was just clear enough to differentiate), however there is continuous concern regarding candidate evidence and referencing.

Candidates are clearly informed to label each task separately (page 3 of the external assessment).

This wasn't seen to be consistently or reliably applied across the evidence during this marking window. Failure to follow this requirement may have significant implications for the awarding of candidate grades. If Examiners are not easily able to identify which evidence relates to which Task then a Not Yet Achieved grade may be awarded.

Candidates must avoid referencing their evidence with multiple tasks; the evidence needs to directly relate to a specific task.

Candidates should attempt all tasks in the paper, and these should be clearly referenced. Any tasks not attempted or not referenced cannot be rewarded and a grade of Not Yet Achieved will be recorded. This will result in an overall grade of Not Yet Achieved for the external assessment.

Evidence creation

In this unit, centres are required to deliver 30 hours of teaching and learning as per the Qualification Specification. This must be done prior to candidates sitting the external assessment. It is important that Teachers use the specification to guide candidates within their chosen craft discipline to ensure they are prepared for the external assessment; this includes key terminology and design processes.

Centres are free to choose a single craft discipline or multiple disciplines within classroom delivery; however the craft discipline chosen for the external assessment should demonstrate a good standard of candidate knowledge. In addition any evidence that is produced within the 30 hours teaching and learning cannot be used in the external assessment.

Most candidates used information from a limited range of sources, in many cases candidate research was not used to inform their ideas in response to the given design brief. In most cases candidates did use visual techniques (sketch pads, design sheets, PowerPoint Presentations) to present their final ideas, however the selection process was mostly unclear or unjustified. Finally most candidates attempted a costed project plan.

As there is no practical outcome for this unit teaching and learning of the unit content should be extensive with regard to interpreting a design brief, comparing and evaluating relevant craft techniques, research using a range of sources (primary and secondary), collating information and presenting findings, developing ideas, selecting final ideas and producing a costed project plan.

Interpretation of the tasks and associated assessment criteria

Task 1, AC 1.1

In this task candidates are required to interpret the requirements of a craft brief. Many candidates demonstrated this with mind maps and lists/notes, although this outlined the main aspects of the design brief, very few candidates demonstrated any investigation of the creative opportunities or limitations they may be faced with. Much of this evidence was focused on the theme of the brief rather than the practicalities such as the chosen craft discipline, possible techniques, possible outcomes, timeframes, own skills or resources.

Task 2, AC 1.3 and 1.4

In this task candidates are required research information using a range of different sources, then collate and present findings to inform their own craft ideas. This task was very limited in terms of the range of sources used, many candidates used solely online sources and unreliable sources. Referencing of sources was also limited and not at the required standard for this level.

When candidates attempted to collate information from their research, this was also limited and a clear link to the research and how these informed their own ideas was weak. Stronger candidates did demonstrate good links to purposeful research (primary and secondary sources) and their own ideas.

Task 3, AC 1.2

In this task candidates are required to compare and evaluate different craft techniques, the craft techniques should be relevant to their chosen discipline.

Many candidates misinterpreted this task and focused on materials rather than techniques, in many cases the evidence consisted of lists of materials and resources. There was little individual interpretation by the candidates.

At this level, simple tables of positive and negative attributes of craft techniques is not appropriate. This assessment criterion requires candidates to make comparisons between relevant techniques and demonstrate evaluative

statements.

Task 4, AC 1.5

In this task candidates are required to develop a range of craft ideas appropriately in response to a brief. Most candidates did this via annotated sketches; however some annotations to show development were very weak.

Most candidates recorded more than one idea, yet did not state their reasons or show how their ideas have developed. In many cases this assessment criterion was disconnected to the previous tasks.

Stronger candidates did this well via well-developed/illustrated design sheets that had clear annotation linked to their initial ideas and chosen craft discipline.

Task 5, AC 1.6

In this task candidates are required to select and present at least one final idea giving reasons for their choice. Most candidates did not fully evidence the selection process undertaken to arrive at their final idea.

There seems to be some misinterpretation of selecting a final idea as in some cases, candidates presented a different idea to those developed in Task 4. Weaker candidates presented a final idea but did not give reasons for their choice that were relevant nor linked to the design brief. This whole unit is about responding to a design brief and this should be prominent throughout the evidence for all tasks.

Task 6, AC 1.7

In this task candidates are required to produce a costed project plan based on the final idea they have developed. Most candidates interpreted a plan to consist of a step by step instruction document rather than a plan showing timeframe, resources and required production stages.

Most candidates provided evidence of a costing sheet, however some of these consisted of cursory records and many were in draft form. The final outcome for this unit is the project plan, therefore at this level it should demonstrate the required resources and production stages over time at the very least.

Planning in the external assessment

Centres are reminded to give due attention to the marking windows of the external assessment. It's not advisable for candidates to sit the external assessment early in their programme. It is far more appropriate to enter candidates once they have taken part in the relevant teaching to ensure they are well prepared. Centres would be in a better position to prepare their candidates for the external assessment following the support of an external moderation visit for the internally assessed units.

Name: Lesley Davis

Date: 25/05/2015