NZQA

New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Assessment Report

Level 1 Visual Arts 2017

90916: Produce a body of work informed by established practice, which develops ideas, using a range of media

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- operated at Level 6 of the New Zealand Curriculum across a range of art making practices
- produced a sufficient amount of New Zealand Curriculum Level 6 work to warrant 12 credits at NCEA Level 1. This tended to equate to at least four completed works per panel, covering approximately 95% of the folio
- used a range (two or more) of media, but did not always select and use media which best suited their intended purpose. This included, at the lower end of the grade range, using paint or ink colours straight from the tube
- produced a body of work which developed ideas but seemed to lack a system, or identify relationships between works which would move the body of work forward
- had a thematic approach to the development of ideas
- at the lower end of the grade range, worked from a narrow proposition that limited the development of ideas
- referred to established practice, in the form of recognisable models and / or conventions appropriate to the domain or field they were producing work in
- made explicit reference to artist models and in some cases appropriated without demonstrating the candidate's own interpretation or understanding
- recorded accurately from subject matter
- repeated imagery rather than using different approaches to the subject matter
- combined elements from earlier work in a simple way in order develop new work
- showed limited understanding of size and scale of art works in relation to each other, or struggled with the change of scale when moving from small to large works
- when producing design-based submissions showed limited understanding of text (eg. readability, appropriate font selection and hierarchy)
- when producing design-based submissions, showed limited understanding the conventions of the product they were designing
- when producing photographic submissions, showed limited understanding of colour balance, and struggled with density of shadows and highlights
- when producing photographic submissions, used a limited range of viewpoints of subject matter, often repeating centralised compositions

Submissions at this level often benefitted from a scaffolded programme which capitalised on student interest and level of skill

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

- operated below New Zealand Curriculum Level 6 in their ability to use media
- did not complete or fill two folio boards. In some cases, this was half to one panel completely empty, but it also appeared in the form of works presented with excessive amounts of white space around and between them
- presented submissions where a significant number of pieces were below NZC Level 6
- presented unrelated or repetitive work which failed to develop ideas
- used media that was not suited to the purpose (eg. A majority of simple pencil drawings)
- produced very repetitive works, such as repeating the same subject matter from only one or two viewpoints
- did not refer to established practice or art making conventions appropriate to the field they were working in
- worked from subject matter that did not allow the candidate to show an appropriate level of skill
- traced images or worked over the top of photocopies, which restricted the candidate's ability to demonstrate competence at the appropriate curriculum level
- submitted a collection of 'one-off' or unrelated images, which did not develop ideas
- relied on large-scale works to cover the folio
- relied on multiple copies of prints or photographs to fill space. This was most evident in photography and design-based submissions.

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

- showed a clear understanding of their idea or proposition, and made some of their own decisions within a scaffolded programme
- showed a personal engagement with the subject matter and proposition
- progressed their ideas in a systematic manner, however, this idea development was sometimes repetitive
- identified successful elements within earlier works and further explored these
- presented a logical pictorial development of ideas that showed the candidate had been thinking about their next steps
- showed purposeful selection and arrangement of works with reference to pictorial elements, compositional devices, and ideas
- coped successfully with the scale shift from smaller works to larger, more refined ones
- used compositional devices, motifs, symbolism and colour palette to provide coherency across the submission
- selected media appropriate to the conventions or field that they were working in, and used it with control
- made decisions regarding colour which supported relationships between the works and moved the body of work forward
- showed an understanding of colour theory and colour mixing
- showed an understanding of surface (e.g. Painted over a prepared ground)
- made implicit references to artist models and established practice, rather than direct representations of particular examples of models' work
- worked with their own source imagery, particularly in the case of design-based submissions.

Submissions that were close to Excellence but remained in the Merit grade range commonly: appeared to have run out of ideas in the second panel, and showed a lot of repetition or re-phrasing of previous ideas, rather than developing into new work; showed some fluency with media, but not consistently across both panels; presented two or three large works on the second panel, which limited the opportunities for showing clarification.

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

- began from a clear proposition that was sufficiently focused to allow depth of investigation, without being so narrow as to inhibit diverse ideas

- engaged with ideas in a way that showed strong student voice, even when working within rigid programmes
- took ownership of the ideas and subject matter they were working with
- selected, and used with confidence, media appropriate to the ideas they were investigating
- showed consistent fluency with the range of media used
- worked in media which highlighted the individual candidate's strengths
- used colour in a sophisticated manner
- explored their subject matter from a range of viewpoints and perspectives, often moving work forward in unexpected directions
- investigated each idea thoroughly
- investigated ideas and media adventurously
- used stylistic and pictorial conventions that were appropriate to their proposition
- referenced a range of established practice
- made clear links to established practice, but developed their own interpretations rather than emulating the model's work, to advance their own ideas
- explored multiple outcomes for an idea and extended and refined the more successful ones
- demonstrated critical thinking in decisions about composition and developing ideas, building clear relationships between the works that were often innovative and interesting
- ordered their works to show a clarification of ideas, although this did not always take place at the end of the folio
- when producing design-based submissions, had understanding of designing for purpose, and successfully combined image and type to meet the brief
- showed understanding of relevant art making tikangaor conventions of the field they were working in, and used these to advance and clarify their ideas (e.g. use of depth of field in photographic works; font selection for double page spreads in design works).

Standard specific comments

It was pleasing to once again see a diverse range of approaches to this assessment. Teacher decision making, both for the assessment of candidate work and the guiding of students in their learning reflects a high level of competence, with the vast majority of assessment decisions being accurate.

Programmes of teaching and learning that lead to successful work commonly provided a structure which gave clear guidance to learners, while at the same time leaving room for independent decision making. They allowed for skill and technique development within two or three key media, reflected student voice and interests, and took into account cultural protocols and beliefs. It was evident that students had developed their conceptual and technical skills and understanding of art making practice through a strong programme of junior art, and the folio capitalised on this multi-year grounding.

There continued to be evidence of a lot of borrowed imagery presented as part of a candidate's own work. This highlights the need to build greater awareness and understanding around appropriate use of imagery, particularly that sourced from the Internet. Digital citizenship should be at the forefront of guiding principles for appropriate image use.

The increase in design-based submissions at Level 1 that was noted previously, has continued. Although it was still common to see a lack of understanding of basic conventions of design, like hierarchy of text and concept development, there has been an improvement in this area. As noted above, many successful Level 1 programmes are the result of a multi-year grounding in artmaking tikanga, and design is no different.

Comments specific to Digital Moving Image (DMI) submissions:

There was a decline in the number of DMI submissions in 2017, which may reflect an acknowledgement by many in the sector that the field specific submissions made at Levels 2 and 3 are a more appropriate place for DMI. However, the comments on DMI from the 2016 Level 1 Assessment Report are included below, to support those of you who are guiding students in DMI submissions.

Sound

Where sound is used in a DMI submission, the candidate needs to consider and then design the sound appropriately.

In many instances, the placing of an arbitrary music track over the submission did little to aid the submission, and in some cases, it was a distraction. The placing of a single song over the submission also strongly suggests that the submission should be considered a single entity and as such it would struggle to meet the requirement of the standard to develop idea(s) plural. To achieve with excellence, candidates need to show clarification, which requires a number of works to be seen within the submission.

Hierarchy

The two-panel folio has a strong and understood layout with the candidates later work being placed on the right panel and the earlier work on the left panel. The same exists within a DMI folio with a strong chronology established by the time base nature of the submission. Candidates who understand this and placed their trials, experiments and generative works in the first section and then their final or more resolved works later in their submission have more likelihood of accessing higher grades as the evidence they presented often read as more systematic.

Transitions

DMI candidates need to showcase their work in the best way possible. Still frames should be shown still: bouncing frames in or other transitions are distracting and do not allow the work to be seen in the best light. Simple presentation is often the best way, and it also provides clarity about which sections are Moving Image and which are not.

One-off investigations

Candidates who conceive of their DMI submission as a single entity (an example might be a music video or short film) run the risk of not meeting the explicit and specific requirements of the Visual Art standard to show the development of ideas.

Subject-specific assessment

Candidates will need guidance from their teachers to clearly understand that they are entering a Visual Arts standard. It is helpful for them to separate out ideas about content and narrative (and as such unable to be legitimately assessed in this subject) from those associated with their Art practice, i.e. space, rhythm, texture, colour, sequence, pattern et al.

Where the content is driving the project then the candidate and teacher should consider the potential to use other standards to assess the work against, such Media Studies AS90994.

Time allocations to individual works

Candidates should consider the time allocated to the different sections of their submission. Highlighting key sections by placing them later in the submission and giving them more time provides opportunity to show a systematic approach.

Bringing the learning through

Candidates working within the traditional portfolio presentation are able to clearly show how what they have learned from making one work informs the next and subsequent works. DMI also need to have that opportunity. Making small pieces as tests or trials allows them to learn without the pressure of making a large final work until their skills and conceptual framework is sufficiently well developed to accommodate such an ambitious proposal.

Many successful DMI submissions began and remained modest. Each work built on the previous works, technically, conceptually or in their use of established practice. Sound was used only when and if it could form an integral component of the work, rather than as an unwanted or needed overlay.

Mode of assessment

Care must be taken when selecting the mode of assessment (two-panel folio or DMI). Candidates need to consider the most appropriate mode for the majority of their work.

Single project

If the candidate is using a combination of print/graphic and then shifting in and out of time based components, they still need to consider it as one project with commonalities including conventions used, established practises et al, rather than two parallel projects with a shared content.

Visual Arts subject page

Previous years' reports
2016 (PDF, 0KB)