Media Production
Course Code: MED315112

Externally Assessed Folio – Screen &TV/Radio

Technical:

• Sound was an issue in many of the short films submitted. Without external mics or quality control over the vocal work and dialogue some films were compromised and their assessment therefore suffered.
• The new time duration of a minimum of 4.30 mins WITHOUT credits was of concern to the marking panel. Some folios had opening credits of black slates with white text that lasted for up to 30 seconds in some cases. End credits starting at 4 mins were also considered under-time as they did not meet the specifications in the guidelines. These products were penalised on Criterion 3 when this occurred - product was assessed then reduced by 1 mark eg B moved to B-.
• Due to the format of TV advertising, commercials must adhere to the industry standard of 30 or 60 seconds.
• The clapper and countdown is only used at the beginning of a TV Commercial product as per the guidelines.
• Some candidates were disadvantaged because of the nature of the product they chose to produce as their major. School assembly presentations, music video clips, and single interview disguised as a documentary are not challenging or don’t give enough scope to demonstrate technique and narrative relative to the pre-tertiary standards.
• Weaker candidates major projects tended to have poor narratives. Some products focused on montage that was irrelevant to the intended narrative eg “filler” shots to pad out the 4.30 mins. Simplistic narrated montage is not considered a finished product at the pre-tertiary level. The panel would encourage candidates to employ all aspects of film making to tell a comprehensive story or drama.
• Montage shots needed to be relevant to the topic of the documentary. B-roll shots should match and support the theme, not act as visual filler for the product.
• Export settings are important to the examination/folio assessment. The folio guidelines stipulate the settings to be used. Some candidates products were uncompressed and were excessive and impractical in size.
• Some products were named incorrectly on the USB. All files should be digitally labelled clearly according the folio guidelines.
• The animations submitted this year were generally below standard. This was due to a mis-understanding of what film animation entails ie the use of a camera as an integral tool as part of the production process. Stop-frame is the preferred method of animating in this. The animation still needs demonstrate camera, lighting, sound and editing techniques which includes, change of camera composition, movement. The guidelines for animation in 2016 will be amended to encourage the use of camera to animate. (Stop-frame animation as opposed to graphic tablet illustrated process). The narrative needs to still be considered as a major component of the animation.

Folio – Print

Technical:

• Examiners noted that although student work wasn’t penalised some print folios weren’t presented by schools in protective packaging, therefore some posters and materials which had obviously had much work, time and thought put into the presentation were compromised as a finished product as examiners were presented with damaged work for assessment.
• Some folios demonstrated a lack of technical skills with their photography for their products. There were a number of products with soft focus and over/under exposure and lack of control with composition.

• The examiners strongly recommend that candidates do not use iPhones or iPads as their camera as it doesn’t allow them to demonstrate appropriate use of technologies and techniques.

• A number of folios were weak in terms of their content of the articles, their length and overall structure. Many were littered with typos and spelling mistakes demonstrating a lack of overall editing, care and control of their product.

• It was encouraging to see the majority of candidates utilised inDesign. Major issues with layout and design were font size. This may have been an issue with the output at the print stage. The industry standard is 9-10 point font size, however a large number of folios contained body copy font size 12 and 13. Font choices were more effective overall this year:

• The stronger candidates adhered strictly to the conventions of their chosen genre. Some candidates; however, were less inclined to adhere to the conventions of their genre or simply made one up to suit. For example, a travel magazine and or brochure is not a travel log or blog post of a holiday.

• Candidates need to be aware that they are being assessed on their employment of a broad range of technologies and techniques and risk their overall results if they limit themselves to simple layout choices. Examiners suggest that candidates spend more time reflecting and researching their chosen genre before going into production.

• The examiners strongly advise that candidates output their final product to paper that is in line with industry standards for magazine publications. Suggestion is to print onto paper ranging from 100 – 160gsm.

• Appropriate use of vectors as well as support within the production documents about the processes undertaken to create originality of someone else’s work. Eg copying a vector illustration and changing one colour does not constitute original adaptation. Some candidates simply downloaded over the 5% quota of non-original material. The documentation that supports the products MUST outline the process the candidate used to transform the vector to an original graphic either in screen-shot form or written description.

Write-ups:

• Highly generic statements were made in the accompanying paperwork. Guiding stems in the pro-formas are intended to stimulate analysis. Some candidates provided a generic diary-like narrative of the production process. Analysis of own work was often too simplistic eg “I was really happy with the way my product turned out”.

• Stronger write-ups were able to use correct terminology within their analysis and reflection about their own learning and artistic intentions. Poor expression tended to use sweeping statements, generalised discussions and irrelevant idioms to communicate their intentions eg “fast camera edits”, “I took photographs” and “simple lighting was used”. A stronger response would be “I utilised a three-point lighting plan with daylight as the key light, a reflector as the fill light and a LED panel as the backlight.”

• Critical analysis is not always about the things that went wrong. Too many candidates went on a blame-game/winge about the process and the product. Such things as “I didn’t have enough time” or “I didn’t know how to use the camera” or “I had forgotten to take batteries” or “my friends let me down” were far too common in their analysis. These are not critical analysis statements. The examiners were looking for evaluations that detailed the justification of the technical process and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the techniques that they utilised in the product, eg “I shot the scene in 50fps to enable me to slow-down the sequence in editing which was in-line with the conventions of the product I was trying to sell” or “I found it difficult to see if my shots were in focus due to the glare on the viewfinder. In hind-sight an external attachment eg a viewfinder hood would have been of benefit when trying to pull focus”.

• There was a lack of technical language across a large number of write-ups. Some candidates weren’t able to demonstrate the technical process as their discussion was too colloquial and casual.
Written Paper

Overall – strong responses were able to demonstrate their understanding of the theoretical component of the question and provide current and appropriate examples as well as bring it back the criterion that was being assessed.

Section A

Question 1

- Some responses were too conversational in tone and diary like when discussing their own product.
- Low level answers dwelled on poor time management, lack of commitment of others, poor equipment rather than an analysis of the artistic decisions and conventions of their chosen genre.
- Many candidates did not name or provide a short synopsis of their own product.
- Strong responses were able to successfully discuss the differing techniques that were utilised in their product and how those techniques helped engage their target audience.

Question 2 and Question 3

- Strong responses were able to describe the production techniques utilised in their chosen product AND how those techniques were used to engage its intended target audience.
- Weaker responses did not define the codes and conventions of news/advertising, nor did they describe what these conventions look like in a technical production sense.

Question

- Some candidates chose inappropriate products to help answer this question.
- Stronger responses were able to describe the differing techniques used to create a compelling story with relation to their chosen area of study (eg lighting, sound, camera and editing for video/TV) as well as critically analyse the use of these techniques to effectively hit its intended target audience.

Section B

Question 5

- Strong responses focussed on the code of ethics and their role in the media landscape as well as selecting strong examples to justify their point of view of the statement.
- The question asked for specific examples ie more than one to support their view; this was not always evident in responses.
- Successful candidates were able to bring in the criterion by discussing the impact a breach of impartiality has on our society.

Question 6

- Most candidates used this question to discuss how the media informs and animates democracy in a political sense eg reporting on immigration issues.
- Some candidates discussed media ownership in this question to their detriment.

Question 7

- Strong responses included discussion on social values and stereotypes in advertising as well as the premise of what we watch is driven by ads and the commercial nature of media being driven by profit. “A” candidates were able to bring their response back to the criterion and discuss the impact this has on media consumers.

Question 8

- Weaker responses used incorrect or sweeping facts to back up their thoughts.
• Very few mentioned/discussed the media ownership laws in Australia and what this means for consumers.
• “A” responses were able to use strong examples to back up their opinions regarding diversity of opinion being hindered due to concentrated media ownership eg biased political reporting.

Question 9
• Strong responses were able to discuss how the immediacy, privacy and accessibility aspects of digital technologies have impacted the media (both positive and negative) as well as the impact this has on consumers.
• “A” responses provided concrete examples to back up their opinions.

Question 10
• The choice of examples presented by candidates ultimately determined how successful they were on this question with strong responses discussing two examples of contrasting nature and depth.
• Weaker responses discussed two examples without tying it back to the question and discussion why it is important that the Australian Public are made aware of the breach, or simply provided a re-hash of the story highlighted by Media Watch.

Question 11
• Most response focused on tabloid journalism and celebrity news/gossip/scandal as their examples for this question. Stronger responses were able to bring their answer back to the question and criterion by discussing the speculative nature of this type of reporting and its impact on media consumers.