

Assessment Report

Level 3 Visual Arts 2017

Standards [91455](#) [91456](#) [91457](#) [91458](#) [91459](#)

Part B: Report on standards

91455: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within design

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- started by producing a media/type/image/material resource bank that they could instantly work with
- operated two processes within each collateral phase - the first generated options and the second regenerated and refined options towards a resolved final outcome
- utilised and understood a selection of appropriate design conventions - often capitalising on their personal drawing skills alongside digital competencies
- understood the need to clarify their process by working systematically within a serial system
- produced just enough integral moving image work to support and substantiate a moving image submission versus a folio
- produced a brief and body of work that enabled them to evidence the standard
- presented a brief and selected an aesthetic sensibility that showed alignment with their topic and audience
- used a coherent grid structure in the layout of their folio and had enough work to substantiate and evidence the assessment criteria
- controlled their colour palette and at the upper end of 'Achieved' selected typographic choices that went beyond obvious desktop publishing options
- focused on gaining knowledge of design conventions and integrated these alongside one or two aesthetic sensibilities. This assisted in the communication of coherent links between phases of working.

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

- presented an indecipherable brief and/or employed a visual look and feel that was at odds with their brief and subject
- fell short in generating a range of visual resources or ideas to sustain a systematic process across three boards
- overused digital treatment tools resulting in visual confusion and illegible graphic outcomes
- did not research enough conventions and/or practise applying them to artwork to generate and regenerate ideas

- generated options that were completely separate ideas, which prohibited integration, development of coherent links and or systematic cohesiveness
- spent too long on one detail/outcome or developing technical facility (learning technical software programs). Whether it was character development or a site for a game, these candidates were unable to evidence a systematic body of work that fulfils the assessment criteria
- spent too long creating panels of character investigations (when working with a graphic novel brief) and were hindered by not producing the book or developing typographic outcomes
- would have been better served presenting their work on a folio board than as a Moving Image submission due to the inherent nature of the 2-D printed matter they had produced.

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

- provided a clear and coherent brief which was believable and situated within a real world design context
- applied a range of drawing strategies at the outset of their brief such as photo shoots, vector illustrations, analogue drawing and mixed media experiments
- executed every piece of work with consistency and consideration. This shows through in selection of conventions, colour choices and systematic layout across the folio
- demonstrated understanding of foundational design strategies supported by an array of design conventions (composition, unity, repetition, texture, space, line, text and image relationships, reversed motif and figure/field, holding devices, die cuts, interplay between analogue and photographic imagery, floating frame, pattern and texture, text as image etc)
- managed a serial and iterative process that combined particular conventions and capitalised on their technical skills to revisit and refine ideas
- showed their ability to analyse what worked best between series and phases of work. Often these submission lifted halfway through board two
- managed a moving image project that they understood the context and conventions of, and had the capacity to execute - showing proficiency of procedures and concepts
- used all 3 minutes in their moving image submission to evidence phases of working, purposeful integration of conventions and regeneration and refinement of ideas.

Candidates who were awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

- presented a comprehensive brief that offered the scope for experimentation and an open-ended investigation, in order to create unanticipated outcomes
- established a range of ideas and possible avenues to explore from the outset - all of which were supported by an in-depth bank of content and visual resources
- had a genuine interest in their topic and operated from a position of research, experience and/or a point of view
- were able to adapt and take ownership over stylistic starting points to serve their own ideas and outcomes
- created a thorough range of images, strap lines, characters, sites, collateral, photography, illustration, icons, montages etc to suit the context of individual collateral types they were developing
- selected, used and developed typographic language in a creative way that aligned with their ideas, audience and context
- demonstrated a high level of craft and technical execution and were fluent in terms of integration of ideas and visual execution.

Standard specific comments

The diversity of topics and range of cross-disciplinary modalities being explored by Level 3 Design students was a standout feature this year. At the high end of Merit and Excellence performances we witness a strong linking between ideas, content and technical execution. Candidates were deeply invested in their narratives, subjects and contexts, often related to personal experience. The fact that they operated from a position of knowledge or point of view resulted in genuine thinking, risk taking and exploration.

A key characteristic of candidates achieving at Excellence, alongside commitment to their subject is evidence of a diligent work ethic. This type of performance affords a phase of 'curatorial and editorial decision making'. These candidates have produced enough work that they can omit weaker ideas to make way for reformation and the synthesis of new outcomes.

To foster this type of on-going enquiry and iterative process candidates need to articulate a brief that clarifies the 'why' as much as the 'what' and 'how'. The brief also needs to clarify the intention of project, rather than a list of collateral types that the candidate will be producing. A vague or unrealistic brief makes it difficult for the candidate to communicate the message or purpose of the product, service, message, campaign, game, narrative or brand throughout the folio/MI submission.

Candidates should be encouraged to revisit their brief in an ongoing manner. In the instance where they detour or reform their intentions they should update their initial proposition before pasting it on their folio. It's important to show a coherent investigation that creates links between the brief and the conceptual and visual strategies explored. A list of collateral outcomes (individual briefs) is only one aspect of a design brief.

A few fundamental issues appear to prevent candidates from achieving the 14 credits in Design Level 3. These are: incoherency in terms of design brief and outcomes; lack of regeneration and systematic enquiry; insufficiency of work across three boards; over-reliance on research precedents and lack of visual or technical control.

Submissions that suffer from time management issues are easily identifiable - in these instances visual outcomes are presented at inappropriate scales and/or there is simply not enough work across three boards to reward performance. Candidates can sometimes over-rely on stock imagery, artist models or present such a limited image bank at the outset that it reveals a lack of engagement and sufficiency to achieve.

Performances that are overly reliant on current styles or visual design trends unravel. Candidates need to be mindful of over-reliance on stylistic trends that resemble little relationship to their topics, audience and content. These presentations look and are superficial and in some instances visual outcomes and aesthetic types struggle to marry up with clients, audience and brief.

It is positive to see more students generating their own material, typography, objects, drawings and taking their own photo shoots - all of which contribute to candidates taking ownership of their topic from the outset. The panel felt there were fewer entries reliant on stock imagery from the Internet which is a positive shift forward. We are also seeing an extension of collateral types - moving into advertisement, fashion, animation, information and motion graphics, graphic novels, performance and site based work.

Design encompasses such a wide range of media and communication modalities it is great to see teachers and candidates engaged in all manner of design disciplines and encouraging cross-disciplinary research and practices in Level 3 Design.

91456: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within painting

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- were engaged with phases of work and could develop and link ideas to previous work; were clearly systematic in approach

- appeared to have limited research supporting the production of artwork; selected relevant artistic practice but jumped to another option without fully understanding the pictorial concerns in the artist's work
- seemed to have a predetermined outcome in their body of work. Candidates seemed, at times, not engaged in reflecting on the process
- resorted to space fillers or resized colour photocopies of earlier work, thus being unable at stages to advance ideas, becoming repetitive and distracting from issues being dealt with
- handled media and chosen conventions with facility needed. Some were restricted by approaches like tracing, which didn't allow candidates to develop their drawing skills and compositional knowledge and can also cause authenticity questions.

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

- produced a full year's work but showed a skill level below the curriculum level required
- did not produce sufficient evidence for a body of work
- created unsystematic, one-off works with no relationship to each other: no sequences or development of ideas; themes or ideas changed from board to board
- presented little evidence of ability to address picture-making concerns of the artistic practice they signalled
- suffered from time management issues, repetition of work through colour photocopies or cut up pastiches of own work to pad out the board and/or resorted to whole panel painting on last board without the skill or time to succeed
- did not seem engaged in a considered layout on board and showed little evidence of having reflected on their learning in relation to the artistic practice of others.

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

- used adventurous approaches to ideas, however edited less critically than higher candidates
- used media and conventions they were comfortable with; demonstrated they had a solid understanding of the grounds and surfaces they were dealing with
- included no superfluous work, rethinking the layout on board throughout the process
- showed their work output was grounded in sound research of appropriate art practice
- produced a narrower proposition than higher candidates, reflecting less depth and range of ideas, or last board reflected less fluency in painting when changing to larger scale works

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

- presented original propositions with clear student ownership and investment in idea evident
- demonstrated mastery of technique, consistent across board
- critiqued and edited earlier layouts of the board so that the final portfolio showed a high starting point
- submitted of a more generous amount of works on final board which showed they had options to extend ideas further
- used a confident approach underpinned by meaningful research; did not rely on particular artists and therefore produced a greater synthesis of ideas from the field of painting and other fields that were relevant to their enquiry
- showed a high and sophisticated level of understanding of picture-making concerns, visual devices and colour.

Standard specific comments

2017 saw a continuation of the high level of performance in painting, despite tighter deadlines in the classroom, which regrettably led to an increase in damaged work through insufficient drying time. It was extremely pleasing to see the strength of an increasing range of approaches, in particular at the highest end. These candidates presented original propositions, showing an investment in and therefore ownership of their body of work. This performance was evident in areas such as contemporary abstraction, social commentary, political satire, illustration, expressionist portraiture, still life, narrative.

This clearly showed that a solid foundation for a folio is when it is centred on ownership by the student, translating into them already having a degree of knowledge in that field. Candidates with a cultural underpinning, whether Maori, Islamic, Pasifika or skate culture, presented evidence of prior knowledge and understanding that translated into more convincing picture making.

The strength of the field of Painting depends on this range of approaches and markers have always encouraged diversity of painting explorations to meet the diversity of candidates.

2017 saw few Moving Image submissions. This shows the candidates' ability to intelligently decide whether this approach is suited to their exploration; positive evidence of critical thinking. In 2015 the best examples were seen and these related well to their picture-making objectives. There have never been many examples in painting but as best practice examples occur candidate understanding of the potential of Moving Image may increase - for example, refer to Lisa Reihana at Venice Biennale 2017.

Digital media as an aspect of painting performance continues to provide important learning opportunities for candidates. Many candidates look across fields to inform their decision-making. When this is a part of an ongoing painting drawing exploration, it can be easier for markers to find the evidence of the standard. Markers noted that thoughtful labelling can help identify software used, what was hand painted and then printed, and what were digital images. Also in relation to printing, gloss at times was hard to see and some images print darker than on screen, so candidates should be aware of use of tonalities and take this into account.

Some examples did rely heavily on other people's source photos from previous decades and other parts of the world. This stopped students from reshooting their own imagery to extend work, and created a potential for issues around authenticity. This is no different to more traditional approaches such as painting over photocopies, tracing others' compositions or overreliance on other artists' artwork.

New Zealand Art Education has a strong focus on learning from other artistic practice to solve issues in one's own work. This interpretation has always caused issues within the classroom and larger audiences. Assessment reports have always tried to explain how this is best presented on the boards. The use of examples of artistic models shouldn't be imposed on the work of students, but the result of meaningful research. Therefore, as students meet new issues in their work, such as colour, scale and mark making, a range of artists is studied to address the relevant issues. Thus, the candidate's development will lead to an authentic journey and not one plagued by authenticity issues. The student is at the centre and other artistic practice informs their problem solving, which is not the same as copying.

The layout of boards should be a primary focus alongside the production of artwork. Like the gallery or installation context this is a key component in art production, not just an assessment concern. A journey within the classroom that already involves this process will enable greater success and a framework for discussions about models, process, scale etc. Markers noted the successful use of smaller developmental passages on boards allowing for more options for refinement and extension of ideas. Reports often focus on the need to not glue too early in order to allow rearranging throughout the process. This presents critical thinking and the ability to take advantage of last minute successful risk taking or further editing to ensure the best arrangement to meet the criteria. Reading of a board is very dependent on how the evidence is presented: crowded work; coloured/painted backgrounds; unlabelled photos of larger works all do a disservice to the candidate's evidence. When interconnected works are presented they can often fall over as they complicate the reading of the body of evidence; when successful examples are presented teachers and candidates need to identify the aspects of their success within their chosen mode.

Candidates involved in editing and selecting discussions to do with the standard stand out in the marking process, as do those boards which attach their year's work to the board at the last minute. In 2017, damaged works were compounded by being poorly attached to the board, some remaining blu-tacked or stuck with double-sided tape that wasn't suitable for oil soaked canvas or cardboard. Drying times for oil are lengthy and the quality of spray gloss glazes seems variable at present. A focus in the classroom on some of these aspects of performance may help address these issues.

Looking ahead, it is hoped candidates continue to find student-centred, diverse approaches within Painting, chosen to suit their capabilities and performances. Meaningful research that allows them

to engage in intelligent picture making and careful analysis of board construction can only help this performance, allowing the continuation of such consistently high-quality work and thinking within this examination.

91457: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within photography

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- developed a proposition with limited research that enabled ideas to be developed and regenerated in a linear formation
- presented weaker work on panel 3 due to lack of research and time management
- displayed a sound understanding of the camera including technical processes, for example: photomontage, selective filters, overlays, colour selection and movement
- produced a similar series of works, however lacked the ability to edit
- formed an appropriate systematic order with reference to some established practice to influence decision making.

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

- selected a very limited or singular subject matter that did not provide sufficient material to revisit and undertake more than one photoshoot
- displayed inconsistent levels of technical facility appropriate to Photography, often presenting images with dense and dark contrast, incorrect exposures and weak technical ability to use text with image, paint, specific filters and photomontage
- presented a combination of irrelevant and often unrelated images which conveyed ideas that were unclear with no or very little reference of established practice to influence decisions
- did not edit out earlier phases of working due to insufficient work made throughout the course of the year
- did little or no research relevant to their concept or topic, often limiting their ability to clarify and regenerate ideas, which is required for Achievement
- cut up images randomly to attempt to make more images, used unnecessary 'fillers', attached inappropriate materials to their photographs and/or layout was not systematic.

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

- analysed and reflected on their ideas to make purposeful editing and sequencing decisions with each phase of work expanding on the previous one
- demonstrated proficient technical knowledge and skill with many processes appropriate to their concept or topic
- utilised research undertaken during the year that was purposeful to expanding their concept or topic to formulate an in-depth proposition that offered scope
- selected pictorial conventions and processes influenced by established practice to purposefully inform specific decision making
- established a range of combinations with particular conventions that were experimented with on panels one and two; however, panel three offered insufficient depth and regeneration of ideas required for Achievement with Excellence.

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

- mastered the technical requirements and characteristics of their chosen area of study, whether analogue, antiquarian processes and/or digital

- showed a high level of engagement and ownership with their proposition and processes used and presented an independent investigation that synthesised unexpected approaches and multiple directions to obtain original ideas
- used processes fluently to extend and consolidate ideas, while making intelligent decisions about editing, sequencing and layout
- were able to regenerate a depth of ideas and critically revisit previous work in order to expand and refine their intended outcome
- represented risk taking that demonstrated the ability to depart from established practice and make new informed decisions to direct ideas.

Standard specific comments

This year in Photography it was pleasing to have more candidates achieving the standard. Overall the standard of the work met the requirements with candidates being awarded accordingly. There was a very impressive upper end and in these performances, candidate backed themselves, playfully took risks and employed stylistic conventions that suited their individual skill levels. Many other portfolios submitted were strong with ideas and presented a genuine engagement with their proposition. Candidates showed their confidence to use the portfolio format to generate, develop and order work with little or no repetitive or redundant work. Regular reflection and critique certainly assisted with decision making and supported candidate performance.

The overall technical facility of candidates was stronger than in previous years. It was pleasing to see a better understanding was demonstrated by candidates with the use of their camera. Setting the camera correctly, decisions about focus (eg AF or manual) and selecting between natural or studio lighting appeared to be handled with more control and purpose. It also appeared evident that candidates trialled and tested more to lift their limited technical understanding, which enabled them to make better-informed decisions on their portfolio. The importance of learning from trial and error is very good practice.

Investing time into establishing a thorough proposition that provides more than one option or direction is still an area in Photography that many candidates could fulfil. Defining one's interests and exposing oneself to various types of photographic practice, such as scanning the internet or sites such as Pinterest and Instagram, can often offer the stimulus for establishing a proposition. Following the decision on an initial concept, regularly researching, critiquing and questioning "Why am I doing this?" or "What am I wanting to communicate?" should be part of a candidate's practice.

When candidates arrive at the exercise of layout and ordering their images, they should prioritise their images by selecting their strongest compositions and look to make these larger so that there is a degree of hierarchy. These should be the images that occupy Panel 3. If re-sizing photographs is required candidates need to be sure to print the original files and to test print quality first. This is particularly important when undertaking large panel print outs. Check print quality by printing regularly throughout Term 3 and ask yourself the questions, "Am I getting pure whites and blacks?" "Is there pixilation?" and "Is the focus correct in my photographs?"

At the lower end of the performance standard, there is still an over-reliance on one photo shoot which is immediately very limiting for a candidate. The importance of being able to revisit what it is candidates are photographing is paramount to ensure success. If candidates have not adequately used research processes to inform their ideas or visual investigation it becomes very noticeable as often the portfolio does not regenerate ideas and hence asks the question of sufficiency at Level 8 of the curriculum.

The numbers of Moving Image (MI) submissions in Photography remains very few, however what was submitted this year was more appropriate than in previous years. It is important that the candidate understands this genre. Some MI submissions were not three minutes in duration, while some time-based sequences travelled very slowly to cover the 180 seconds required. This revealed workload inadequacies. On a more positive note, sound was handled more appropriately and more candidates used a range of photographic conventions such as various viewpoints and angles, depth of field (soft focus and focus), varying distance to their subject, including using different lighting effects, through adjusting the light contrast or using a range of light sources. Lastly candidates undertaking an MI should

consider the phases of working and decisions regarding the transition of images going between one thing and another as these are critical to the way the submission is interpreted and read.

It is important that candidates embark on concepts and a topic that are relevant to their lives. A well-researched proposition is fundamental to successful performance, as it needs to sustain the momentum for the duration of a year, as are reflection and analysis as these assist with the regeneration of ideas.

91458: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within printmaking

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- began with a clear proposition to set up options and ideas
- built on some strengths through analysis of successful elements
- developed ideas through sequences of works and ordered accordingly
- understood development, although often images were repetitive and moved forward slowly
- demonstrated basic skills and some understanding of the characteristics of printmaking techniques.

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

- began with a narrow, single idea
- printed the same plate or imagery repeatedly
- distorted and stretched found images to fit a standard size plate
- showed a lack of sensitivity in the use of ink, often applying too much
- presented works that were not related or sequential.

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

- employed a wide visual vocabulary to set up options
- combined a range of pictorial devices to reform an idea
- ordered and sized images to emphasise decision making and strengths
- presented a well-developed understanding of specific print media
- maintained momentum and purpose across all three boards.

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

- embraced individual stylistic strengths and showed ownership of ideas
- analysed strengths to provide options and expand subject/concept
- selected and mixed colour critically to communicate meaning
- set up a range of possibilities built on previous learning
- confidently selected and used methods to emphasise ideas
- drew on ideas from a wide variety of sources and integrated these seamlessly.

Standard specific comments

Impressive technical skills, strong drawing, rich colour and sensitive use of ink were characteristic of many Printmaking submissions in 2017. Most candidates' learning showed evidence of deep thinking, analysis and sound decision-making.

There was a strong sense of ownership and portfolios built on individual stylistic interests and strengths; their voice clearly embedded in the work.

Candidates used printmaking to convey a range of ideas. A number of submissions dealt with conceptual concerns relating to cultural or social issues. It was pleasing to see an increased interest in formal picture

making and abstraction. Some candidates presented accomplished narratives, however it is important these submissions move conceptually or pictorially to regenerate ideas and meet the standard.

Ordering is critical to show development. Most passages of work were well-edited and arranged to clearly show ideas explored and a number of shifts across all three panels. Analysis of successful aspects, and prioritising these, helped advance and extend learning.

Many candidates intelligently translated images through one process to another to extend ideas and reform these into new works. This was most often seen in the use of digital processes where the integrity of the original printmaking method was maintained and enhanced, often resulting in more complex works layered in technique and in the meaning conveyed.

Colour was selected and used with purpose to communicate meaning. Sensitive and appropriate use of hand colouring to enhance a well-developed print practice was more evident in 2017, as was purposeful use of metallic media, including silver and gold ink, leaf and thread. These showed facility in their use and appropriate application in the context of the image making. Monochromatic ink with expressive plate tone was used well to convey an interest in gestural markmaking and surface. Another trend was the increased presence of embossing, often intricate, from laser-cut cardboard plates.

Candidates are strongly advised not to use the same plate more than once. Repeatedly using an existing plate is detrimental to development and often results in producing imagery that does not regenerate ideas and submissions 'jump on the spot' rather than moving forward. Instead, revisit previous work and consider further ways to move forward with new imagery, by changing scale, viewpoint or proximity. Evaluation and reflection of practice and process are key to successfully regenerating ideas.

While there was authentic use of found imagery on some portfolios, others showed an indiscriminate and casual approach to using 'borrowed' images from different sources, particularly the internet and Pinterest. Often such practices bordered on plagiarism and candidates must be diligent in sourcing their subject matter. It is becoming more common in all the fields to repeatedly see recognisable images on portfolios.

Referencing different cultures to develop a printmaking proposition was a growing trend and most of these were from a personal perspective and were particularly powerful when the candidate's own photos were used and printmaking conventions were strongly linked to cultural traditions. Where the candidate appeared to have a genuine connection to the culture, the work had the ability to communicate that personal association and many of these achieved at Excellence level. However, some candidates based their portfolio on found images of other cultures. For example, several candidates submitted one particular sourced image of American Indian culture. Without a link or personal ownership of the imagery, these were less convincing.

The marking team were impressed with the high skill level and refined use of print techniques. There was evidence of strong drawing skills based on both traditional and contemporary conventions. Printmaking techniques and methods such as monoprint, drypoint, woodcut and collographs (cardboard prints) were used seamlessly alongside screen print, pronto plate/lithography and digital or photographic processes such as solarplate. While some works were complex with multiple layered compositions, carefully registered and printed, other successful submissions relied on mastering one process, such as monoprint, and using this with flair in a sophisticated manner.

Straightforward and accessible processes, including hand printing, rolled slab monoprinting and frottage rubbings onto tissue are affordable, do not require a press and can be used to produce very successful results. Printmaking easily spans painterly, photographic, sculptural, graphic, collage, digital and illustration-based interests. It lends itself well to those who love to draw.

Cross field influences have become more common, particularly the use of photographic conventions, including the use of Photoshop to initiate and generate a body of work that was then translated into print. This was a promising development, as it suggests candidates are producing their own photographic imagery to develop their ideas. However, the random introduction of photographs can detract from the

systematic or purposeful development of their proposition. Candidates should consider how appropriate such inclusions are in the context of their print practice.

There was evidence of a more purposeful use of sculptural print work and installation in many of the portfolios and such practices have become more integrated with the selected print conventions. Often, installation was used to regenerate new ideas and help shift the work into new and different directions. There was also greater use of image and text to communicate ideas in the context of printmaking.

Most submissions demonstrated understanding of how to draw on and integrate aspects of researched artists' work, rather than mimicking established practice. This ensured authenticity and innovation, resulting in candidates maintaining momentum across all panels. Reflection and thorough analysis are key in the development and extension of ideas and fundamental to high performance in this standard.

91459: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within sculpture

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- made simple sculptural work with a narrow range of materials or processes
- explored ideas that had thematic connections to regenerate ideas in the body of work
- used drawing to illustrate a sculptural work
- demonstrated a basic understanding of traditional sculptural practice
- made small logical steps in the production of work within established sculptural practice
- used simple methods and techniques to develop predictable sculptural outcomes
- presented well-lit and ordered photographic documentation of sculptural work
- used a moving image submission to document genuine time-based sculptural work.

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

- demonstrated a lack of understanding of sculptural conventions
- engaged in creative play with materials that did not engage in sculptural ideas
- produced a very small number of sculptural works within a body of other creative activity
- presented a moving image submission showing how the work was made rather than presenting moving image documentation of time-based work
- presented a moving image submission of work that did not engage with sculptural practice.

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

- took ownership of a sculptural proposition that was easily explored via appropriate materials, processes and scale
- started the submission with a clear sculptural proposition that was well understood in terms of established sculptural practice
- explored combinations of ideas and employed a clear methodology when analysing links within and between the phases of working
- utilised readily available materials and economic processes with proficient technical skills
- submitted a moving image submission that presented photographic stills and edited video of genuine video installation or performance work.

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

- referenced a wide range of established sculptural practice in inventive combinations
- understood the different purposes of drawing to enable both a reflective analysis and exploration of potential new directions in the work

- displayed a confidence in the use of materials and techniques which were used to extend ideas
- deployed a strategic approach to recognising the best options in making sculptural work to extend ideas and synthesise conventions
- edited the work so that the sculptural proposition was clear and yet open to a range of possibilities
- demonstrated an understanding of how scale and site influences sculptural outcomes.

Standard specific comments

The standard of submissions presented for assessment this year was outstanding. A clear majority of candidates operated very successfully within the realm of established sculptural practice. The level of understanding and technical execution demonstrated by most candidates was highly resolved. Many candidates used readily available materials, processes and sites that enabled an authentic, student-directed sculptural inquiry. Locations such as the candidate's home, school or local public sites were utilised efficiently with manageable materials that are readily sourced and manipulated.

Many candidates implemented research to expand their sculptural proposition in discursive and surprising ways. Research undertaken reflected a wide range of cultural and scientific issues and questions. This allowed candidates to take ownership of their learning and resulted in relevant sculptural activity. The use of humour and an openness to experimentation with ideas in the production of sculptural work was also very evident in a large number of submissions.

Drawing in both two and three dimensions was used as a tool to rapidly investigate ideas before more time consuming and large scale sculptural work was investigated. This allowed candidates to prioritise and explore quickly important issues generated in the work giving a clarity to the sculptural proposition that was generally expanded upon logically.

Photographic documentation of sculptural work was of a very high standard this year. Candidates presented clear photographs in logical sequences that allowed examiners to get a sense of the scale and context of the sculptural work. When candidates make work where materials are significant to the reading of the work, or a site specific or scale idea is important, a small label indicating this underneath the photograph would help examiners understand the context surrounding the work.

Most candidates who submitted in the moving images format this year did so with a good understanding of the conventions around the presentation of time-based work. The sound component of this mode of assessment was either genuine field recordings or appropriate found audio/video.

Visual Arts subject page

Previous years' reports

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