International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

FILM

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 13	14 – 29	30 – 42	43 – 54	55 – 67	68 – 79	80 – 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 13	14 – 28	29 – 40	41 – 53	54 – 67	68 – 80	81 – 100

Production portfolio

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 7	8 – 15	16 – 23	24 – 29	30 – 34	35 – 40	41 – 50

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 7	8 – 14	15 – 21	22 – 28	29 – 34	35 – 41	42 – 50

The range and suitability of the work submitted

At both levels a wide range of work was submitted, with work at the highest levels being almost professional in execution. At this point, centres seem very clear on the requirements of the assessment. For HL candidates, the biggest continuing problem seems to be the treatment of the trailers within the body of the candidate commentary. Frequently the trailer is dealt with in only a line or two, and in the worst cases it is ignored entirely, although it is clearly referenced in the criteria for the assessment.

Time is another important factor at both levels. Sometimes candidates reveal that the work on this important assessment has been done in a very short period. The best work has clearly benefited from time taken to do the best work and careful planning and work in pre-production, production, and post-production periods. Those films that cluster in the lower grade bands frequently seem to have been rushed to completion. As well, there are still candidates who provide no graphic or photographic evidence of their work in the commentary. As this evidence and any captions included do not count against the word count, and as evidence is required by the guide, candidates who fail to include this material are really working against themselves.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A can be problematic, especially when no graphic or pictorial evidence is presented to develop either the planning/production stage or the candidate's own role in the production. The best work presents an engaged and organized candidate who illustrates the development of the project and the personal role (as well as problem solving in that role) with appropriate evidence. As noted before, sometimes the candidate ignores the requirement for documenting the creation of the trailer. Criterion B is problematic likewise if candidates have not documented the creation of the trailer except in their rationale. Since Criterion B requires the candidate to discuss the logistic and artistic problems of their role, it is usually one of the areas that is focused on in the commentary. However, the requirement from B to look logistically and artistically at their completed work 'as a whole' is frequently ignored or done in only the most superficial way.

Criterion C and D both look at the candidate's work in their role, as evidenced by the film. These are usually the two strongest criteria as it is far more common to overlook the commentary than overlook the film itself. The factors that influence performance the most for these two criteria are the knowledge and experience the candidate has gained in their role and the amount of time the candidate has put into the creation of their film. Knowing what to do and taking the time to do it right are the most important determiners of achievement here. Frequently, candidate ability to work in their role and express themselves in film language is almost professional in quality.

With Criterion E, as with Criterion C and D, the more time a group spends going through the necessary stages of Pre-production, Production, and Post-production, the more likely it is that candidates will achieve well in terms of their creative output.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

As noted, time is essential for the best work to be done on this important assessment. The teacher is allowed to have input as the project progresses, so making sure a proper pre-production, production, and post-production process is done will give every advantage to the candidate (as well as providing the candidate with lots of opportunity to produce the graphic and photographic evidence necessary to support their Commentary). The best preparation for the Production Portfolio is to have many experiences making short films during the two years of the class. Class assignments should have some form of commentary attached to them as a requirement so that the skills of gathering evidence and working it into a prose commentary are developed. As well, short films as well as features should be viewed so that candidates have a strong sense of the short narrative form. Finally, trailers from different historical

periods should be viewed so that candidates come to the part of the assessment which requires making a trailer with a variety of models in their background.

Further comments

It is important to remember that all work on display in the films is done by the candidate. No music or visuals should be used that the candidate was not involved in creating (copyright-free material is not exempt from this requirement). Candidates may work with musicians to create music (and details of this should be provided in the commentary), but any visual materials should be created by the candidates themselves. A television playing in the background of the scene will result in marks being deducted so care should be taken with the mise-en-scene at all times.

Independent study

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 10	11 – 13	14 – 17	18 – 20	21 – 25

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 10	11 – 13	14 – 17	18 – 20	21 – 25

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Especially at higher level, work ranged from very engaged and very competent studies of Film Theory and Film History, to weaker scripts that showed not only little knowledge of Film Theory and History but also little engagement with, or seeming knowledge of, their chosen films. The best work was clearly done by candidates who had watched and re-watched their chosen films, so that the secondary research they did was supported by a solid understanding of the films they had chosen and their chosen topic. In the case of weaker work, which sometimes hardly references the chosen films at all, it seemed that candidates had in some cases only read about the films or view excerpts on YouTube or other online sources. Overall, most centres seem to have a solid grasp of the requirements of the two column documentary script, and for the most part format is not a major factor.

Overall, this assessment seems to be the most difficult for the standard level candidate. Though some scripts are clearly written at the highest level of achievement, work tends to fall in the middle range and lower. Just as with higher level candidates, a frequent problem is a

candidate who does not really understand what a Film Theory or Film History problem is. As well, with a minimum of two films satisfying the requirements, it is important that the films are chosen well. The best work has a clear history or theory topic, narrowed to an argument that can be adequately explored within the page requirement, with films well-chosen to explore the topic.

The one area which is still sometimes ignored at both levels is the requirement for an annotated bibliography, and this frequently leads to some candidates achieving a mark lower than they would have otherwise deserved. Overall, the best work here is very good indeed.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual areas

Overall, most papers show at least some understanding of Film. It is often less clear whether the candidate is truly engaged in their film history/film theory topic. Many weaker papers spend a long time getting to their chosen films, spending two to five pages simply setting up the topic of the script. Clearly this leaves little time to develop real scope and depth of argument. With the limited number of pages available at SL, this is even more damaging to the scope and depth of the argument they are presenting than it is for candidates at higher level. Film choice often reveals stronger scripts early on. The best scripts have focused and narrowed their topic to the point where specific films can be pinpointed as the best possible choices. Weaker papers often select films in the general vicinity of the topic, ignoring choices that would have been obvious to anyone who had spent a little more time researching the topic. The most frequent problem with the script form is that the visuals are ignored and an essay is presented - broken up for the narrator to speak - in the audio column. Choosing films that will engage the candidate and provide rich material for the study is important. This year saw the appearance of a number of scripts exploring the work of a single director working in multiple countries. This is not to be recommended for a number of reasons. Of course, the intent of this assessment is to show that the candidate has studied filmmaking as an international activity, but as well the criteria require that 'points of comparison are explored with care and coherence.' It is extremely difficult to come up with very significant comparisons when all the films are created by the same individual. Candidates should not make this choice.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

The guide asks that candidates engage in 'some depth with a cinematic tradition that is unfamiliar to their own culture.' The teacher will obviously consult with the candidate about this choice, and this guidance is essential. As well, Theory and History must be covered in class in such a way that candidates have some choice when they come to choose topics. Though topics will vary from classroom to classroom, theories such as Formalism, the Auteur theory, Gender theory, Psychological theory and others should be introduced, as well as the history of various film periods and countries, so that the candidates have a model they can follow when they come to this assignment.

Further comments

It seems that nothing is more telling in the assessment than candidate engagement. The best papers always showed evidence of a candidate who had watched the films, had researched their topic with real interest (frequently venturing much farther than the internet in their investigation), and who had taken time to thoughtfully consider the questions, arguments, and comparisons asked and made. All of this takes time, of course. Even watching the films themselves will be an undertaking, and for a candidate to achieve at the highest level on this assessment they must organize the time so that they come to the writing of the script prepared. As well, for standard level candidates, it should be noted that choosing two films is a minimum requirement. At this level, particularly in the case of studies of film history, choosing more films may give the candidate a real advantage when trying to put a genre or movement in perspective.

Film presentation

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 9	10 – 12	13 – 16	17 – 19	20 – 25

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 9	10 – 12	13 – 16	17 – 19	20 – 25

Area of special concern

There have been many instances where candidates are seemingly being allowed to read either their entire Presentations from a prepared script or significant sections of the Presentation. Schools are reminded that candidates are only allowed to use brief notes as aides-memoire. It is the supervising teacher's responsibility to ensure that this rule is adhered to. Should a candidate come to the recording with inappropriate notes/script these must be removed or the candidate may be asked to return with appropriate notes.

Candidates who are suspected of reading their presentations will be put forward as examples of suspected malpractice.

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The most successful presentations, disappointingly few in number, showed candidates to have used their preparation time effectively. In these, candidates had engaged enthusiastically with their chosen films and had displayed incisive analytical and critical skills. These candidates were able to incorporate well-researched and thoughtfully selected and detailed information. They had carefully selected their extract so that it could be used effectively to reflect upon the film as a whole. They were able to draw together areas of analysis such as framing, lighting or mise-en-scene and consider patterns of analysis rather than describing the sequence shot by shot.

The strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in the treatment of individual areas

Candidates were generally aware of the appropriate filmic language. The most successful presentations moved fluidly between their selected extract, the film's narrative and, more broadly, the socio-cultural context of the film. The most successful presentations did not use the selected extract as a visual aid.

Several of the candidates wasted too much time at the beginning of their presentations by offering lists of information such as the film's date of production, the main cast list and awards either won or nominated for. Some went on to give short biographies of the directors. Relevant facts were not integrated fully into the presentation itself.

Some of the presentations were general surveys of the film chosen and neglected to offer an analysis of a specific section chosen from the film. Many candidates offered detailed descriptions of the film's narrative and of what happened in the chosen sequence but there was very little of how or why particular meanings were constructed or themes explored.

Most of the candidates were particularly weak on directorial intent and socio/cultural contexts. Where genre was discussed the comments were mostly generalized and superficial.

Some candidates used only a limited amount of their time – in one or two cases only 10-11 minutes of the 15 available at higher level. It was also clear that some candidates had not prepared their presentations with sufficient care and in some cases they seemed to be thinking through their ideas for the first time.

Many of the candidates seemed to have problems with constructing a coherent and detailed presentation which used the selected extract as a means to discuss connected and developed points, relating its features to the film as a whole and to the wider socio-cultural context. Candidates tended either to focus in too much descriptive detail on the extract itself, making few broader connections, or were too vague in their presentation, not providing enough detailed analysis. On the whole, candidates were limited in their discussions of the purpose and effect of directional choices and did not provide enough support for any assertions they made. There was a general lack of awareness as to how the camera communicates, and the importance of framing was often overlooked.

Recommendations for the teaching of future candidates

- It is not possible to overstress the importance of a close and exact reading of the current syllabus and assessment details.

- Candidates need to approach this task as they would any research essay and plan in great detail.

- Candidates should be given substantial practice with textual analysis using extracts from films that have not been set for the examination.

- Exemplar presentations should be studied in class in conjunction with the detailed analysis of the assessment criteria.

- Candidates need guidance in the use of the terminology and in researching the socio-cultural context of films.

- Candidates need help and guidance in the preparation of useful notes as aides-memoire.

- Candidates should be given the opportunity to practice their presentations before the examination.

- Candidates must link the evaluative interpretation of the extract to broader, relevant information.

- Preparatory time must be spent on constructing a detailed argument that connects supported points and moves towards a reasoned conclusion.

- Candidates need to show they understand by analysing how and why the techniques they emphasise are used.

- Teachers should be aware of when to prompt candidates and of the kind of prompting that is appropriate during the presentation. (Please see guidelines in the film guide).

International Baccalaureate®
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional