Assessment Report

Level 3 Design and Visual Communication 2017

Standards 91627 91631

Part A: Commentary

This is the first year that External DVC standards have been split into separate specialist marking panels at level 3. The requirement of reduced page numbers and to copy or scan Scholarship evidence has been problematic when:

- poor colour copying has been submitted and occasionally some black and white copies
- generally poor colour copying of pencil mediums which cannot be adequately assessed as detail is lost
- copying of layered transparent work on pages occurs. These are photocopied as one page so work could not be read / deciphered as details are hidden under all the layers
- no sequencing of photocopies, work in a state of unreadability and train of thought diminished has meant difficulty for the marker to decipher
- portfolio work is no longer a holistic body of design work – some candidates can be misguided on what evidence to submit. Some are submitting 'front end' – without evidence of regeneration of design thinking, where others are selecting a page here and there, and including both spatial and product designs (both internals)
- post it notes are included to show / identify to markers what work needs to be considered for the marking for the standard.

The use of transparent and multi layered drawing paper has benefits when it is used with purpose and meaningful visual communication strategy. It can, however, be used for non-functional beautification reasoning.

Where a sketchbook is used as a presentation technique that does not enhance the visual communication, and is not fully utilised, consideration needs to be given toward if the whole sketchbook is submitted, or if the pages are removed and submitted.

Combined level 3 and scholarship portfolio submissions – a change for 2018:

If a level 3 standard 91627 (Initiate design ideas through exploration) is combined with scholarship 93602, the portfolio will no longer need to be separated. Both can be contained within the samecandidate portfolio. The portfolio will be assessed against the achievement standard 91627 before being assessed against the scholarship performance standard.

If a candidate is entered for scholarship and the level 3 standard 91631 (Produce working drawings to communicate production details for a complex design) , then candidates are to produce clear, coloured copies of their work, and send the originals for scholarship and the copies for 91631.

Part B: Report on standards

91627: Initiate design ideas through exploration

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used visual communication techniques (e.g. observational sketches, sketching from photographic sources and other existing images, to 3-D modelling) to explore shapes, forms, compelling details, and other aesthetic elements (textures, line, negative space, etc.) to visually analyse a starting experience. The starting experiences were varied but often included natural influences and experiences such as plant, shell, animal, and/or bird forms. Other starting experiences included existing product and spatial designs, and occasionally themes from literature, film, and music
- used visual communication strategies (explanatory note 4) such as: abstraction, re-combination, tessellation, exaggeration, rotation, inversion, translation, translocation, deconstruction to interrogate and regenerate new shapes and forms. Candidates who limited their range of visual communication strategies to two or three were more successful than candidates who used all possible strategies
- selected promising foundation points from their explorations to regenerate into design ideas showing some aesthetic and functional qualities. Demonstrating some links to a potential design idea is a requirement of the standard
- did not constrain their idea initiation to a brief. Candidates were more likely to succeed if they experimented with and explored potential shapes and forms without a pre-determined design idea
- had a theme (a train of thought), but this was not effectively used to informthe design ideas
- did not provide evidence of further analysis and re-interpretationbeyond initial regeneration to reach Achievement with Merit.

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

- did not use a starting experience, just began to generate initial ideas, e.g. a house or a bike
- used a brief that asked them to begin generating concepts straight away
- did not use alternatives and variations to explore and regenerate ideas
- did not link idea initiation to their own design ideas, and only used this to merely explore shape in an independent manner, thus treated it as a separate assignment exercise which had no connection to anything tangible
- carried out initial exploration of shapes and forms but did not regenerate these into design ideas
- explored only shapes from an experience but did not use these or extend into any design ideas
- submitted only teacher driven ‘ideation’ exercises on shape and form
- derived shapes from a source and repeated these shapes to generate surface patterns of the same shapes; this was common in a fashion context, where patterns were used as an appliquéor print, but not taken and regenerated into structural, silhouette or design lines
- did not generate any original ideas, only copies of pre-existing ideas from known designers
- used starting experiences and forms too literally, e.g. a crystal was a crystal lampshade, or a seashell was a seashell house, and thus no visual interrogation occurred
- submitted only evidence for a different standard, such as one of the internal standards
- did not produce evidence of level three visual communication skills
- included extensive research pages that were unnecessary and had too little or no starting experience being explored and too little or no regenerated design ideas connected to the earlier explorations
- included parts of multiple projects that had no connections or regeneration of design ideas.

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

- showed evidence where they had selected an idea that had been explored and regenerated, and showed further analysis and re-interpretation during development
- took an emerging product or spatial design and further interrogated it with an obvious theme (a train of thought)
- used thoughtful and carefully chosen visual communication strategies to extend and grow ideas, e.g. observational drawing techniques that deconstructed elements (not the entire starting experience), tracing / overlays from quick experimental sketch models or SketchUp models to examine ideas and consider alternatives, then reconstructing and recombining particularly while considering the product or spatial design that they are designing
- showed elements of risk-taking by allowing their ideas to be continually adapted through further interrogation and purposeful exploration that informed what they are doing
- demonstrated evidence of purposeful research and knowledge undertaking and applied, though in-depth visual communication of design drawing details
- regenerated their ideas by using analytical visual thinking. This included iteration, re-working design elements, depth of thinking through experimentation and level of creative play
- introduced new and extra elements to their ideation, with secondary exploration to take the design idea to a new stronger and more considered outcome.

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

- were well organised and communicated their thinking very clearly with a strong narrative
- used sophisticated and varied visual communication techniques and strategies
- showed extensive exploration to challenge thinking through divergent and perceptive alternatives
- questioned / stimulated new thought, by engagement with discovery and perceptiveness
- showed an ability to extend and transform both aesthetic and functional elements of the design idea. This extension and transformation was usually symbiotic and complementary, i.e. aesthetic elements informed functional elements, and vice versa
- re-interpreted and combined dissimilar ideas and identified connections between them that challenged predictable outcomes. This led to enhanced solutions and ideas that had unexpected non-predictable newly evolved outcomes
- continued to redevelop and reflect on their design ideas after substantial development. This meant that candidates would seemingly ‘complete’ or resolve their project, but then show they had reflected further on aspects, and then re-ideated in a perspective / improved way to continue to push a previous idea into a new form or level of resolution
- went back to their intended context and re-thought and used further ideation strategies to refine the product further
- had clear consideration of thought of human and environmental interaction within spatial projects
- demonstrated clear consideration of thought of human use, environment use, and how the design outcome could conceivably work in reality
- covered a variety of elements to the design outcome without being drawn out or too narrowly focused.

Standard specific comments

‘Ideation” continues to consolidate through teaching and learning in DVC programmes and is increasingly being included in Fashion and Workshop programmes. This is encouraging and offers candidates broader access to pathways to tertiary education programmes, particularly in Design.

Teachers and candidates are advised to refer to the 2018 Assessment Specifications which outlines restrictions on what should be submitted.

It is encouraging that more briefs are being used that are designed to include “ideation” as an integral stage of the design process, and there is less use of outdated briefs which do not expect candidates to spend time initiating design ideas. The starting experience needs to be considered carefully and ensure it is one that will be able to generate extensive exploration from.

It is important to understand that this standard is assessed separately; but is intended to be part of the same design practice and evidence and should be embedded and found in the divergent thinking (initial experimentation and initial idea generation) and convergent (development) work of the internal standards “Resolve a spatial design through graphics practice” and “Resolve a product design through graphics practice”. It is intended to be part of the same design practice. Evidence for Ideation AS91627 will be found in the divergent thinking (initial experimentation and initial idea generation) and convergent (development) work of the internal standards.

There were some candidate submissions that included all their work for the year including research and work for the Presentation standard. This is only appropriate if they are also submitting work for Scholarship. It is important to submit full projects (spatial orproduct) and not disjointed segments from both.

Some teaching and learning programmes continue to treat the work required for this standard as a quick mini-project in which candidates could generate a range of shapes and forms from an origin or starting ideas. This does not allow candidates the opportunity to re-interpret, analyse, or extend their thinking any further and gain higher grades. It is important that the experience and starting point be developed into spatial or product thinking to enable connection for design outcomes to occur.

Evidence from Technology projects is often unnecessary in the submission as it does not benefit the visual communication of the design idea. Large quantities of writing and research defeats what the intention of this standard is about.

Some projects where a brief has been provided, and appear to be ‘exercises’, do not flow into, or have little or no connection to the candidates own individual work that follows.

While an appropriate design brief is a crucial part to candidate’s success, the timing of its introduction is also important. Introducing the brief early can predispose candidate thinking towards an outcome without the benefit of unhindered creative thinking. The brief can be introduced after design initiation has commenced to allow this thinking. Successful submissions had briefs that had a context, allowed for candidate understanding of function, purpose, and aesthetics, and to have a narrative and personal viewpoint within their design exploration. While ideation can happen early, this can be re-introduced later in the process to encourage creative thinking and expansion of the design idea to fully extend and transform and take advantage of the brief context.

It is important for ideation skills to be integrated into learning programmes at earlier year levels. The standard which is assessed at level 3, does benefit from prior learning and practice, and to communicate design thinking using visual communication skills is necessary for successful achievement. There are teaching and learning programmes that fail to provide for the continued development of sketching and presentation skills.

The following guidance is re-published this year – it is an unpacking of the stages of candidate work required for this standard:

- *identify an experience (or a source of inspiration)*:from natural and / or built landscapes, film clips, music extracts, observational drawing, conceptual modelling, photography, language devices, etc.
- *select visual communication techniques:* from modelling (real and / or virtual), photography, sketching, collage, tracing, etc
- *select visual communication strategies:* from interpretation, abstraction, recombination, tessellation, exaggeration, rotation, inversion, translation, translocation, deconstruction, etc
- produce explorationsfrom the starting experience using selected techniques and strategies. The emphasis should be on a range of interpretations and observations to meet the requirement of “interrogate" from the ideations produced in the previous step ‘generate new ideations’. This means that the starting ideas are abstracted from the starting experience by two stepsof interrogation. They of course may still reference the starting experience but are now new (the candidate’s) ideas
- show the initial ideas that emerge from the ideation, this provides evidence and validates the ideation process as it provides the beginnings of design ideas

- continue to ideate throughout your initial experimentation and initial idea generation and development phases: it doesn't have to stop.

While these stages describe the activities required for ideation, candidates should still organise their work so that the ideation story makes senseand can be followed. It can be difficult to follow the thinking of the candidate (for assessment) when there is a range of exploration(s), making this obvious and clear would be helpful to both the candidate and marker. Use of techniques such as cut and pasting thumbnails or photocopies on the candidate's later work linking origin ideas to further regeneration would also be helpful.

Allowing peer critiques can be a successful process, where a candidate lays out each page in the order of evolution of the standard, and then allowing peers to 'interrogate' the chosen order.

91631: Produce working drawings to communicate production details for a complex design

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- selected a design of adequate complexity to produce working drawings for this standard
- included views and modes that would conventionally be used as a set of working drawings including: site plans, floor plans, elevations, cross-sectional views, assembly views, detail views, material information
- included exterior and interior detail relating to the construction and / or assembly
- showed some proficiency in drawing conventions such as labelling, section planes, details and views, dimensioning, use of appropriate scales, line weights and types
- indicated the relationship of one drawing to another using recognised conventions for cross-referencing of drawings, e.g. north point symbol, elevations, section and detail reference symbols
- identified materials using appropriate hatching, colouring or symbolic reference of material types or use of labels
- produced elevations which were drawn neatly using conventions, and a sectional view was available to show some detail of either materials that would be used or how it would be assembled.

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

- selected a design of inadequate complexity such as; simple furniture, letterboxes, decks
- produced only working drawings of the exterior or interior, and not both
- did not communicate construction or assembly of their designs using appropriate detailed drawings
- did not communicate materials or components / parts adequately
- produced only generic design working drawings, generally from a pre-published source
- produced class exercises
- lacked understanding in the use of drawing conventions such as titling, dimensioning, use of appropriate scale, detailed drawings, line quality and accuracy
- produced drawings that were not linked to each other or showed no relationship to each other
- included drawings with contradictory information, e.g. different measurements for the same item
- did not complete a set of working drawings.

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

- showed precise measurement and dimensioning, accurate line-work and good application of drawing conventions. The use of CAD helped candidates to produce precise drawings but still requires knowledge and application of conventions used in New Zealand

- produced a complete set of linked drawings with the exterior and interior detailing helping to explained the construction and assembly of the design with greater accuracy
- showed that this was the outcome of considered design thinking and represented a solution to a design problem.

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

- showed excellent and consistent use of drawing conventions and standards
- included all relevant drawings to clearly communicate detailed construction and assembly information using carefully selected series of plans, elevations, section views, assembly views and enlarged detail views
- included three dimensional drawings, pictorial views and / or CAD models or animations to clearly communicate assembly and construction. The animations offered sequential information that clearly communicated assembly and rotational views that explained 3-D design details.

Standard specific comments

The suggested 15-page limitation / suggestion for this standard seemed adequate and most candidates adhered to this.

This standard is suited to candidates with strengths in CAD and / or those with strong 2-D manual drawing skills. It is about producing a set of related instrumental working drawings showing exterior and interior detail of components related to the construction and assembly of a design.

The most common type of submission this year was through spatial design, with many submissions being produced using CAD. This growing media is enabling candidates to produce complex designs that are directly related and accurately executed. However, candidates must also understand projection, conventions and standard drawing practices used in New Zealand. Some submissions showed contradictions to this, i.e. sectional planes facing the wrong way, cross hatching all running in the same direction and at the same angle. Other submissions used non-recognised scales. Some candidates enlarged views to better fit the page but to unusable scales like 1:1.765 or similar. The CAD submissions also frequently showed details of unrelated parts of their design or did not show any detail at all, e.g. incorrect symbols or components that did not make sense.

Candidates must be encouraged to use accepted scales that help show detail or information. For large complex designs it may be necessary to show cross-sections of smaller slices at a readable scale than slices through an entire building. CAD software enables greater presentation capabilities yet some candidates produced elevations showing very little detail.

Some schools still produce submissions using conventional drawing methods and are gaining very good results. Once again, scale selection is crucial to showing detail and this standard does not require proof of projection, i.e. plans and elevations can be on different sheets but should still be referenced by labelling or north point orientation.

At this level of study candidates should be gaining an understanding of construction and assembly. This could include materials knowledge and how things fit together. Even though this standard is more about communicating construction and assembly it was clear to see that some candidates also understood how it all went together and how it worked.

Many submissions were of a complex nature; however, this also needs to be expressed throughout the submission.

Some candidates failed to do more than just produce a large number of drawings that did not communicate anything about their design.

It is important to show a range of dimensions on working drawings to make them useable. Some submissions with plans did not have any dimensions.

Candidates should understand the importance of referencing drawings especially when detailing. Candidates that reference a well-produced detailed drawing back to the area the drawing is relating to, are more likely to gain higher grades.

There were many well executed product design submissions of complex designs, however there were also a few candidates who produced simplistic drawings of a complex shape, e.g. a simple desk lamp with a complex shaped shade. Similarly producing a CAD true shape or auxiliary view of a design does not always show constructional or assembly detail.

Design and Visual Communication subject page

Previous years' reports
2016 (PDF, 0KB)