The markers’ panel for May 2009 Advanced Level in Art submits the following report on the general performance of the candidates who sat for the said examination.

102 candidates registered for the examination of which 6 were absent. The breakdown of the Grades obtained by the candidates was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Abs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coursework:**

The Coursework Portfolio shows that, in general, candidates have grasped the scope of the Coursework as outlined in the syllabus. The complaints noted in previous examiners’ reports, however, similarly apply to this year’s examination. The main issues are those of candidates presenting excessive hard mounts and tampering with the size of the portfolio provided by MATSEC. These candidates were penalised. The Examiner’s Board recommends that MATSEC issues a Memo to all schools on this matter.

The Coursework portfolio should show the selective processes through which candidates review the work that they produced during the previous two years of practice, research, and study. This is being achieved, even though the work of some private candidates clearly showed that they were not properly tutored.

**Paper 1 Project – Composition from a Theme:**

In examining the Project – Composition from a Theme the Examiners’ Panel feels that some candidates are not really grasping the nature of the Project and what they are concerned with is only the submission of a finished work. In the submitted portfolio, candidates should show how their work developed from the initial stages of creative thinking and research to the final piece. This has repeatedly been noted in previous examiners’ reports. Preparatory studies, work in progress, and other evidence of these important stages in the realization of the Project should form part of the candidates’ submissions.

**Paper I – Work from Observation**

This paper is divided into sections (a) drawing and painting from the model, (b) still-life with man-made and natural form.

The pattern of achievement for this paper follows what has been noted in the previous years. In general, candidates achieved higher marks and better results in the still-life section. Thus is a sad reflection on the pressing need for better training in approaching drawing and painting from the model. The human figure paper showed the same recurrent problems encountered year over year and some of the candidates opting for this section had little grasp of what they really needed to do. It is obvious that candidates require training which goes beyond that of a classroom situation and that they should feel the necessary need to practice their drawing continuously. It is only through careful study of the anatomy and hard work in practice that they will manage to capture the structure, movement and character of the human figure.

In the still-life section, the objects are arranged by the candidates and therefore great care should be taken on how the selected objects are placed. Examiners have repeatedly addressed this issue and noted that this section is not only about representation and interpretation but also about structuring the objects in interesting compositions.
Some candidates used media which are not quick drying or which are not appropriate for ‘single-session’ use.

Paper II - History of Art
Following the successful introduction of the new format for this paper in 2008, the Examiners’ Panel is generally pleased to note that candidates have shown a wider ranging interest in the History of Art. It is worrying, however, when artistically gifted candidates fail to perform well in this Paper. On the other hand, there are other candidates who show much greater maturity in writing about Art History than in the other Papers of the Examinations. The main issue in this Paper remains that candidates should keep in mind that they are clearly advised to spend 1 hr on Section 1 and the rest on Section 2. Marks are given accordingly. In Section 1, candidates are required to be concise and to discuss the work’s general stylistic context, basic information on its author, and the iconography and technical characteristics. In Section II, the recurrent issue is that some candidates simply do not read the set questions and regurgitate and essay which had been pre-prepared. This is obviously penalised. Similarly candidates should not write essays that concentrate on biographies, rather than on art-historical issues.
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