FOLIOS

The examining panel felt there was a genuine improvement in the overall quality of the folios – particularly in the print specialisation. A marking rubric was developed to assist in the marking of the folios – this will be refined and sent to TQA as an appendix for the syllabus as the marking system that will be used in the future.

VIDEO/RADIO

The examiners noted the following issues with the video folios:

• TITLE SAFE – it was obvious that a number of candidates did not use the title safe process in their respective editing packages as a number of titles disappeared off of the TV screen. Examiners watch all products on a TV, not a computer screen, which requires the title safe function to be used during post-production.

• DVD menus – the majority of menus were clear and examiners could navigate around the three products with ease. There were some DVD’s that were not clearly labelled or did not have the three separate projects as individual links on the menu. This is clearly outlined in the guidelines.

• CLAPPER/COUNT-DOWN leaders – as per the guidelines, the only product that has a clapper and count-down leader is the commercial. A number of candidates had a clapper and count-down for all their products. The clapper is an industry-based identification system for commercials only.

• CREDITS – the only product that should have credits is the major. The ad and minor product DO NOT need credits. The examiners discussed the length of the credits (see below “Considerations for Guideline Changes in 2014”).

• CLASSIFICATION – a number of major products had high-level violence, adult themes, drug use etc. The examiners discussed the need for a classification leader at the beginning of the product and also a discussion in the write-up as to the rationale behind the choices made (see below “Considerations for Guideline Changes in 2014”).

• WORD COUNT – it was obvious some candidates struggled with the word count limit – particularly for the major product. The examiners discussed the possibility of increasing the limit in 2014 (see below “Considerations for Guideline Changes in 2014”).

• PRODUCTION ELEMENTS – sound, as always was an issue for a number of candidates. Inconsistent levels, distortion, wind noise and general lack of control with microphone placement and selection often let a production down in the overall quality. Lighting was an issue in some productions; possibly due to the lack of resources schools have in this area. The rubric addressed and assessed criterion 7 for this aspect of the production.
PRINT

The panel were pleased with the overall balance between photographic content and the written text within the publications. Fewer examples of unoriginal imagery of ‘Google materials” where found and adjudicated over.

Most original photography and imagery was within the 95% ratio stated in the guidelines. Small logos and barcodes where often utilised from other sources which give appropriate authenticity to a publication seeking to clearly define its genre and target market.

Content was generally appropriate and the unity of design, font, colour and imagery was a ‘cornerstone’ of a successful magazine or folio. Magazines rich in detail, layering and diverse in articles and voice where well received and scored highly on the rubric.

Advertising assignments were also viewed in relation to the major article and many of them supported the assessment by having powerful imagery and utilising persuasive language techniques to sell their products or messages.

Magazines which had over stretched images, poor text/little text or ill-defined target audiences didn’t do well against the marking rubric.

EXAM PAPER

SECTION A

Question 1

• The examining panel felt this question was poorly worded in part (b). “What were you pleased about” caused very generic responses from candidates. Comments such as “I was overall very pleased with my final product” were common. Examiners put more weighting on part (a) than part (b) due to this fact. (80% for part A and 20% for part B

• Target audience wasn’t addressed very well overall and in some cases not at all. Some provided a very broad range eg 4 – 90. Surely values, interests and attitude-based discussion should be more of a focus? Perhaps we need to incorporate this aspect into our teaching?

• Suggestions for this question in the future could include “critically analyse their product with regard to the conventions of the genre”, “how appropriately did you use the production processes in your product and provide examples”. Perhaps the same type of question for target audience – “Evaluate the use of codes and conventions to meet the target audience expectations – and provide examples”.

• Stronger responses were able to address the codes and conventions of their style/genre.

• Compositional choices/artistic decision making – candidates needed more specific descriptions of the processes used eg camera use, lighting, inverted triangle for writing article, post production editing choices to be successful in this section.
• Too many candidates spoke about the narrative development for the majority of their answers. (A good analysis tool was using composition principals – that are universal for every product – contrast, unity, movement and balance).

• Too many candidates spent time reiterating the challenge of the syllabus – eg “this year, I had to make a short film”. Some were very journal/diary type discussions – eg I spent 3 weeks thinking about my story (stream of consciousness!!). Telling us about the previous ideas they may have had when they should be just talking about the one that was produced!

QUESTION 2

• Candidates struggled to discuss how their product was made technically. Conceptually answered well but technically lacking. Successful candidates referenced, lighting, camera, editing and suggested processes eg transitions

• Target audience wasn’t discussed successfully in terms of conceptual choices or technical choices.

• Candidates didn’t analyse the key components of the ad or its successful attributes. Instead they tended to observe the narrative in its simplistic form by providing too much reiteration of the storyline/narrative.

QUESTION 3

• Good technical responses with regard to codes and conventions of news anchors and news stories.

• Some candidates spoke and compared current affairs programs instead of news.

• “A” responses were able to discuss both technical codes and conventions as well as content differences between public and private news bulletins.

• Very few discussed the “layout” aspect.

• First statement of question seems obsolete?

QUESTION 4

• The subjective nature of the language of “favourite” directed the students to write in a personal tone about “liking or disliking” the magazine.

• The rest of the question was worded well. The stronger responses seemed to lend themselves to a reasonably strong analysis of technical such as layout and design elements as well as artistic and content when comparing the differences in the two magazines.

• Last part of the question should have focussed on “similar genre” instead of “similar magazine”.

SECTION B

QUESTION 5

- Almost all answers argued in the affirmative.
- Strong responses included a confident and statistical definition on Rupert Murdoch, his status, background and significant influence on specific social, political and topical events of 2013.
- Sustained answers had several specific examples on editorial bias and control and lack of diversity.
- Weaker responses didn’t have sound examples and didn’t link the examples they did have back to the question or how it demonstrated their response.

QUESTION 6

- Candidates were able to identify the difference between public and private. Successful candidates were able to define and discuss what drives each broadcaster providing reasons behind their choices ie ratings driven as opposed to social/educational benefit.
- Too much emphasis on production values and techniques were often described in this question much like a Criterion 2 response.
- There was not enough discussion on the impact it has on society in general and the changing priorities of the target audience eg entertainment vs information dissemination.
- Not enough discussion of the ABC charter or code of ethics.

QUESTION 7

- Question could specifically ask for candidates to respond to the impact of the breach of the code of ethics may have on society.
- Successful candidates were able to relate the question back to impact on society and the desired impact on the target audience through sensationalist reporting.
- Generally candidates were able to pick two different breaches of the code of ethics as outlined by Media Watch and were able to explain the role of Media Watch in society.

QUESTION 8

- Difficult question with only 29 candidates attempting.
- Students found it difficult to define cross-media ownership within Tasmania. Strong responses were about able to discuss effectively how socially and politically a small state like Tasmania could
be negatively impacted by a lack of diversity of voices and access to information. They also directly stated facts from legislation and current acts and provided specific examples of ownership within Tasmania eg Mercury and Examiner ownership and that they access their stories from mainland newsfeeds and news rooms.

- The weaker answer reiterated the information from question 5. There was a blurred response as they were narrow in their understanding and simply talked about Rupert Murdoch/Gina Rhinehart and their overall ownership of media within Australia.

**QUESTION 9**

- Most candidates focussed on the negative aspect to the question that ALL news via social media is untrustworthy.

- Successful candidates were able to articulate that there are also positive aspects of social media in terms of news and can be as balanced as other media outlets.

- Some provided good examples where social media has allowed access to news quickly and gave a balanced view point of negative and positive aspects of news via social media.

- Regulation and code of ethics in relation to social media were mentioned by stronger responses.

- Others discussed traditional vs digital, convergence and the generational change between traditional and digital media.
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#### Award Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year (all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Distribution (SA or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>