

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1 – short film

Nostalgia

The evidence for this candidate has achieved a total of **49 marks out of 50** for this assignment. The marks were assigned as follows:

Section 1: Planning

a. Creative intentions in response to the brief

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

1 mark is awarded for each of the paragraphs in this section. Each paragraph contains a different well-justified plan relating to: form and title, use of home videos with a filter, using props to target audiences, use of technology, and the use of the café setting.

b. Content research

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

1 mark is awarded for paragraph 1, which includes a simplistic research finding about the use of a fade transition, along with a detailed and specific plan for how to use this type of transition in the candidate's own film. Paragraph 2 gains **1 mark** for the finding of a black and white filter and the plan to use this to create the sense of adult life being boring. Paragraph 3 is awarded **1 mark** for the research and plans relating to the use of piano music. **1 mark** is awarded for paragraph 4 which discusses the use of grainy filter: this is a development of the idea first mentioned in part a, as the candidate mentions a specific example of a scene in which they will use the filter and discusses the connotations they hope to create. The final paragraph is also awarded **1 mark** for the well-justified plan about layering sounds in the film.

c. Production role(s) and/or institutional context research

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

Paragraph 1 is awarded **1 mark** for the research and plans relating to the production role of location director. Paragraph 2 is awarded **1 mark** for the research and plans relating to the role of music director. Paragraph 3 is awarded **1 mark** for the plans and justification about fulfilling the role of hair and make-up designer. Paragraph 4 is awarded **1 mark** for the plans and justification about how they intend to fulfil the role of editor. The final paragraph is not awarded any marks as the research and plans are too vague.

d. Audience research

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

1 mark is awarded to the first paragraph, which includes research into audience opinions on the use of voiceover and subtitles, and the detailed plans for how to do so in the film. **1 mark** is awarded for the second paragraph which includes research into audience opinions on the impact of home footage in creating a reflective tone. This is a development of an idea the candidate has already mentioned, as here they discuss a specific clip they intend to include, to create the reflective tone. Paragraph 3 is awarded **2 marks** for the research into audience opinions on the use of music and the developed plans for the inclusion of specifically composed music. **1 mark** is awarded for paragraph 4, which includes research into audience opinions on the pace of the film and the subsequent planning decision about the ending. Although the candidate has already achieved the maximum 5 marks for the section, the final paragraph could also be awarded **1 mark**, as it contains audience research into the use of colour, and a development of a previously mentioned idea about the contrast between black and white colour. The candidate references a specific clip they will use which is brightly coloured, to contrast their use of a black and white filter.

Section 2: Development

a. Evaluation of process

The candidate was awarded **10 marks**.

There are 4 developed points of evaluation, which clearly relate to the process of producing the text within the institutional constraints. The candidate evaluates how well they fulfilled the production roles of music director, editor and make-up designer, as well as the institutional factor of location. As there are 4 developed points of evaluation relating to the production process and the institutional context, the upper mark in the 10-9 box is awarded.

b. Evaluation of content

The candidate was awarded **20 marks**.

There are 5 developed points of evaluation. Each paragraph of the response refers to a specific timestamp within the text, and includes both detailed discussion of the meaning created by a range of codes, and detailed evaluation of how well these have worked in the final product. For example, in paragraph 4, the candidate focuses on a 9 second clip from the film and discusses and evaluates the meaning created by camera work, mise-en-scene, editing, and costume. As there are 5 developed points of evaluation, and the combination of the evaluation and the finished content conveys a highly technical and insightful understanding of how to use and combine a range of codes and techniques to achieve creative intentions, the upper mark in the 20-19 band is awarded.

Candidate 2 – short film

Get out of my house!

The evidence for this candidate has achieved a total of **17 marks out of 30** for this section of the course assessment component. The marks were assigned as follows:

Section 2: Development

a. Evaluation of process

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

Paragraph 1 discusses institutional difficulties with location and cast availability and the consequent decision to make a trailer with no other actors rather than a short film, with a brief evaluative comment about the effectiveness of camerawork. Paragraph 2 discusses the benefit of the strike days, with a very brief evaluative statement at the end of the paragraph. Paragraph 3 discusses the factor of cast availability with a brief evaluative statement at the end of the paragraph. Paragraph 4 is a developed point of evaluation on the role of make-up artist in which the candidate describes the challenges they faced in this role, and their consequent decision to use fake blood on themselves instead of on the monster as they had originally planned, which they then evaluate in terms of the effect on the audience. As part of their evaluation of this role they also reflect on the effectiveness of their decision to make marks on their arm, which they evaluate positively in terms of its narrative effect, but also negatively in terms of the way they think it would confuse their audience. Paragraph 5 discusses technology, with a very brief evaluative statement.

There is one developed point of evaluation, but as the other paragraphs only contain brief evaluative statements about institutional factors and production roles, the candidate is awarded the lower mark in the 5-6 band.

b. Evaluation of content

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**.

Paragraph 1 discusses the POV shot from the monster, and there is an evaluative comment on the way a panning shot would have been better, though some of the paragraph focuses more on the process of filming the shot rather than the ways in which it creates meaning. Paragraph 2 discusses the vlog-style shot, with an evaluative comment on the found-footage effect. Paragraph 3 discusses the shot of the candidate leaving the house, with an evaluative comment on the effect of the wide shot. Paragraph 4 discusses the kitchen scene, and there is a brief evaluative statement towards the end of the paragraph. The final paragraph discusses the final scene and there is a brief evaluative comment on the effect of the lighting in the bathroom.

As there are several evaluative comments, and the combination of the written work and the film conveys a consistent understanding of how to use codes and techniques, the candidate is awarded the higher mark in the 11-12 band.

Candidate 3 – short film

A Settling Duel

The evidence for this candidate has achieved a total of **13 marks out of 30** for this section of the course assessment component. The marks were assigned as follows:

Section 2: Development

a. Evaluation of process

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The candidate writes about a range of production roles and institutional factors, from a clear production perspective. There is understanding of the production process, and the candidate demonstrates understanding of institutional contexts and production roles. The response is largely descriptive rather than evaluative, although there are a few evaluative statements. These relate to the difference in the quality of cameras used; not having been forceful enough as director; the use of sound effects to improve humour; and the impact of using greenscreen. These brief evaluative statements, along with the clear understanding of the production process, mean the candidate is awarded the upper mark in the 4-3 band.

b. Evaluation of content

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**.

The combination of the film and the written response demonstrate understanding of how to use codes and techniques to convey meaning, although at times this strays into a discussion of the production process which would be more appropriate in section 2a). Across the response there is some evaluation of the finished product in relation to: delivery of lines being more humorous than intended; the use of a bridging shot that made the film flow better; the way the fight scene not being as good as hoped led to humour; and in relation to the Dutch tilt added while cropping a shot during the editing process. The understanding that the film was not entirely successful in achieving its creative intentions also adds to the evaluative stance. Overall, the combination of the written response and finished content, along with some evaluative statements throughout, place the response firmly in the 10-8 band so it was awarded a 9.