

Assessment Report

Level 1 Design and Visual Communication 2017

Standards [91063](#) [91064](#) [91065](#)

91063: Produce freehand sketches that communicate design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated their own design ideas
- submitted sketches that communicated either functional or aesthetic qualities of their design, but not both
- used a limited range of recognised sketching techniques
- demonstrated some evidence of design exploration, but did not explore any one area in depth
- produced appropriate sketches using design briefs or contexts that did not provide the scope for candidates to produce anything but simplistic ideas. Being provided the opportunity to focus on deeper development of their ideas would have improved their grade.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not communicate their own design ideas in response to a design brief
- submitted photocopied, instrumental or digitally generated work
- submitted sketched drawings showing only 2-D or 3-D views, when both are required
- produced sketches that attempted to address aesthetic values, but were completely unrelated to the candidate's own design ideas
- produced sketches that did not use recognised sketching techniques.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- used a wide range of sketching 2-D and 3-D methods clearly showing an exploration of design ideas, e.g. considering a range of alternatives at the conceptual stage or refinement in the development stage
- showed more than surface details and features, e.g. construction or interior components
- submitted sketches containing evidence (often linked) from both product and spatial design contexts. As they could show more detail across the two contexts, these candidates were more likely to gain merit grades, or higher
- showed proportion by having either dimensions, a person / human body part in their design or the object in use or context.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- included drawings that utilised a variety of sketching techniques relevant to the design subject, some clearly showing ideation strategies
- communicated function well through sectional, detail and exploded views showing construction details, human forms such as hands interacting with design ideas and the object by showing it in use and / or context
- communicated aesthetic qualities such as form, shape, texture, surface finish that clearly indicated the materials being used
- produced a wide range of sketches, including thumbnails, showing the evolution of the design
- coherently communicated an aspect of the design through a series of related sketches, e.g. the operational sequence of a mechanical device or the evolution of an aspect of the design
- submitted work on a context that the candidate had clearly related to and had enough scope to explore and refine design ideas to a level where a comprehensive set of sketches could communicate both aesthetic and functional details in depth
- communicated construction and assembly features in textile submissions, e.g. stitching, pattern, details of construction components.

Standard specific comments

Candidates who engaged in an authentic and thorough design process often presented their work in a logical sequence. They clearly communicated the evolution and refinement of their own ideas in greater depth, often producing series of related sketches. Candidates who only communicated design ideas at a concept stage or followed a highly structured or directed design process found it hard to move beyond Achievement.

Fewer candidates appeared to be exploring the use, operation and context of the object they were designing. For example, they may develop the mechanism of a child's mechanical toy, but omit to explore the ergonomic relationship between the toy and child. They may design a back-country hut, but omit to show the relationship between the hut and the users, or the site it is located on. Exploring the relationship between the user, object and context is one means of communicating the intent of the design.

Some design briefs limit the candidate's opportunity to generate appropriate evidence for the standard. For example, static objects with no moving parts, tend not to have sufficient scale and complexity to explore the object in depth. Briefs that are based on the adaptation of an existing object or have a significant number of standard components can also constrain the generation of candidates own design ideas.

Including evidence from both the product and spatial contexts allows students to demonstrate a wider range of skills and techniques.

Submissions from a resistant materials context often focused on construction and structure, and did not address aesthetic considerations, limiting the submission to an achieved grade.

Several submissions showed evidence the types of sketches listed as examples in the excellence criteria of the schedule, but did not achieve at that level when the sketches were not directly contributing to the evolution or refinement of the design. To achieve at excellence level, students must not only be proficient in the skill of sketching, they must also use that skill to explore and communicate design ideas. Teachers are reminded that the title of the standard has two parts – the skill of constructing sketches, and the communication and exploration of design ideas.

While it is sound pedagogy to scaffold students to higher levels, for example ideation strategies, teachers need to be mindful of the skills required for this standard. A predominance of ideation sketching in a portfolio at this level may communicate some aesthetic qualities, but does not explore functional aspects. This often precludes the candidate from achieving at either merit or excellence. To achieve these grades, candidates must demonstrate consideration of both aesthetic and functional properties of a design.

Candidate continue to submit tracings of instrumentally constructed drawings which cannot be considered for assessment as Explanatory Note 3 states sketches "...must be created/produced unassisted by the use of instruments..."

Candidates who produce sketches using overlay techniques as the basis of the sketch and show significant evolution or refinement of design ideas between each iteration, can show a body of related sketches. Although the start of the sketch may be traces, the evolution of the design ideas differentiates the use of overlay techniques from tracing.

91064: Produce instrumental, multi-view orthographic drawings that communicate technical features of design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- produced at least two views using projection including some common conventions, such as title, orthographic symbol, labelled reference line and drawing title
- produced CAD drawings with some correct setting of line types and conventions
- drew clearly detailed drawings showing complex shape or form, but did not draw to any indicated scale, verified by dimensioning.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- submitted a design of inadequate complexity, e.g. simple furniture, letterboxes
- showed no evidence of projection between views, e.g. plans and elevations on separate sheets
- provided insufficient evidence of multi-view instrumental drawing knowledge and conventions.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- projected views accurately, including a sectional view or hidden detail that communicated more information than the main views
- produced drawings based on more complex forms that used appropriate construction techniques
- used appropriate conventions consistently – for example: title, labelling, correct differentiation between line types
- used CAD with settings correctly applied to produce neat, accurate construction and correctly applied conventions.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- produced drawings that showed a high level of construction skills
- produced multiple drawings that clearly showed adequate details without excessive detailed within the drawing that reduced the overall clarity
- used CAD programmes effectively to present high quality drawings of internal and external details, showing the accuracy of construction and correct application of conventions
- showed complex form and shape, constructed accurately.

Standard specific comments

The proportion of computer generated drawings continues to increase. Submissions include drawings constructed using drawing software, and orthographic views exported from three-dimensional modelling software. There is a wide range of achievement from these drawings, primarily influenced by the candidate and teacher's understanding and ability to set correct line types, weights, print parameters and apply conventions.

Submissions constructed using architectural drawing software using their default settings, do not necessarily conform to the drawing standards quoted in the standard.

Candidates and teachers are advised to ensure that evidence produced using architectural drawing or 3D modelling software employ the principles of orthographic projection.

The correct application of conventions is not limited to CAD drawings. There is a general decline in the correct use of title blocks, labelling, reference lines, and dimensioning conventions.

Some submissions used scales that are not recognized, limiting the possible grade to merit. Candidates should consider altering paper size, number of views per page or complexity of the drawing, to ensure they can use a recommended scale.

Apartment construction and presentation quality, success is significantly influenced by the design ideas that lack internal components, and may limit the candidate's ability to achieve at higher levels.

Conversely, designs that are too complex in detail or form, may too limit the candidate's ability to clearly show internal detail or show construction of complex shape or form.

Design briefs that require students to add design feature to, or around standard components can also limit opportunity for candidates to show their own design ideas. The drawing of a standard component cannot be considered a candidate's own design idea, and therefore cannot be considered as evidence for assessment.

The application of colour, tone or rendering to drawings can obscure drawing construction detail, and consequently, the level of achievement.

91065: Produce instrumental paraline drawings to communicate design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- submitted constructed drawings that only communicated exterior form
- produced work with only one view constructed
- submitted two or more drawings that did not relate to each other
- showed limited detail of internal components
- used CAD or 3-D modelling programmes to produce multiple drawings that did not add any extra detail.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- submitted work that had minimum design ideas
- submitted evidence where a substantial part of the drawing was generic design common to the class and had minimal candidate generated responses to a design brief
- included rendering in their drawings which obscured any evidence of construction and line work
- contained work drawn in perspective, which is not a parallel line (paraline) pictorial method.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Merit** commonly:

- outlined details of internal parts of their design by drawing exploded views
- enhanced their drawings by producing additional views from different viewpoints to show further details of their design ideas
- produced drawings that were accurate and complete, using appropriate line weighting
- produced complex form that was effectively communicated using CAD, but did not control hidden detail, producing wireframe drawings that cause visual confusion.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement with Excellence** commonly:

- constructed accurately drawn, high-quality drawings which showed design ideas from multiple viewpoints including internal details and / or design features through a series of related drawings, rather than a singular drawing
- contained a series of views which showed detail through accurately constructed drawings, e.g. sectioned, exploded and cut-away views
- produced a single, exploded view that communicated all design features of the object
- produced CAD drawings of their final design, which showed appropriate detail, e.g. exploded, sequence and / or sectional views.

Standard specific comments

Submissions constructed using three-dimensional modelling software continue to increase.

These drawings can include substantial amounts of hidden detail. If too much is included, the drawing can become difficult to read and do not meet the criteria for effectively communicate in-depth information.

Drawings from architectural modelling software included imported components, such as fittings and fixtures. As these items were not constructed by the candidate, they cannot be considered as evidence for assessment, only those aspects of the drawing that were constructed by the candidate.

Output from drawing or modelling programs exported in bitmap form pixelates when printed at large size, and therefore cannot meet clear and precise line-work criteria for excellence.

The application of colour, tone or rendering to drawings can obscure drawing construction detail, and consequently, the level of achievement

Drawings that included geometric construction of complex shape to generate complex form generally achieved at high grades.

Several candidates submitted multiple views of the same object drawn in different methods with the same view point that did not communicate any additional information. Related drawings are two or more drawings of the same object where each drawing communicates information not visible in the other drawings.

Design and Visual Communication subject page

Previous years' reports

[2016 \(PDF, 0KB\)](#)