

# 2015 NCEA Assessment Report

## Design and Visual Communication Level 1 91063, 91064, 91065

### Part B: Report on standards

#### 1. Assessment Report for 91063: Produce freehand sketches that communicate design ideas

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>submitted sketches that communicated functional, but not aesthetic qualities limited candidates to achievement, when merit or excellence was possible if both qualities had been communicated. This was evident in the increasing number of portfolios submitted by candidates of hard materials technology</li> <li>produced appropriate sketches using uninspiring design briefs or contexts, where the candidate found it difficult to produce anything but simplistic ideas. Focusing on deeper development of their ideas would have improved their grades.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>did not communicate through their drawings their own design thinking in response to a design brief</li> <li>submitted instrumental or digitally generated work that was rendered to show tonal change</li> <li>submitted sketched drawings showing only 2D or 3D views, when both were required</li> <li>produced sketches that attempted to address aesthetic values, but were completely unrelated to the candidate's design ideas</li> <li>produced sketches that did not use sketching techniques to enhance shape and form.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clearly showed an exploration of design ideas</li> <li>submitted drawings containing evidence (often linked) from both product and spatial design contexts. As they were able to show more detail across the two contexts, these candidates were more likely to gain merit grades, or higher</li> <li>used a wide range of sketching 3D methods</li> <li>showed proportion by having either dimensions or a person / human body part in their design.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>included drawings that utilised a variety of sketching techniques, some clearly showing ideation strategies</li> <li>communicated function well through sectional, detail and exploded views showing construction details, including human forms such as hands interacting with design ideas</li> <li>produced a large number of drawings, including thumbnail sketches, showing the evolution for one design were more successful at communicating their design ideas</li> <li>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 functional and aesthetic details in depth.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>Presentation and organisation of portfolios did not show a lot of care for some schools. Candidates that presented their work in a logical manner were able to communicate the evolution and refinement of their own ideas with greater success. Candidate that only communicated design ideas at a concepts stage found it hard to move beyond Achievement, while candidates that deliberately developed and refined ideas to a final solution were much more successful at achieving the higher grades. Teachers need to ensure that freehand drawing also encompasses the user of the design in some way, to show proportion more appropriately. Some teachers are disadvantaging their candidates through the use of contexts which are very limiting. This standard is not only about freehand sketching skills and techniques but it is also about communicating through sketching.</p>

	<p>Candidates that submitted work covering two or more projects / contexts were more successful in communicating both functional and aesthetic detail, and thus conveying intent. In general, product design contexts allowed candidates to communicate functional and aesthetic details in more depth than spatial contexts. Product design contexts also communicated intent and purpose more effectively than spatial contexts, by including human forms interacting with the product.</p> <p>Showing the wider context in which the design ideas were situated made for very effective communication for both product and spatial contexts.</p> <p>While it is sound pedagogy to scaffold candidates to the initiate design ideas standard at level three, the predominance of ideation sketching in a portfolio at this level 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.</p>
--	--

## 2. Assessment Report for 91064: Produce instrumental, multi-view orthographic drawings that communicate technical features of design ideas

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>produced at least two views using projection including some common conventions, such as, title, orthographic symbol, labelled reference line and drawing title</li> <li>contained sectional views attempting to show internal details, but due to the poor choice of section plane this prevented the candidate from gaining a grade higher than Achievement</li> <li>drew clearly detailed drawings showing complex shape or form, but did not draw to any indicated scale, verified by dimensioning.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>selected a design of inadequate complexity such as; simple furniture, letterboxes</li> <li>showed no evidence of projection between views</li> <li>used CAD packages that showed two or more views containing different materials, such as different cladding or roofing materials between views.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>projected views accurately, including a sectional view, however, the sectional plane was poorly chosen to provide the amount of detail required</li> <li>contained drawings with too much detail in their sectional views / hidden detail lines, making the features unclear and thus preventing the candidate from gaining excellence.</li> </ul> <p>In this situation two versions should have been drawn, one with hidden detail lines and another with a sectioned view, thus the quality of effective communication would have been met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>used CAD to produce neat, accurate construction and correctly applied conventions.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>produced drawings that showed a high level of construction skills</li> <li>multiple drawings that clearly showed adequate details without excessive detailing within one drawing to reduce the overall clarity</li> <li>used digital programmes effectively to present high quality drawings of internal and external details showing the accuracy of construction of complex forms.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>Apart from construction and presentation quality, success is heavily influenced by the design ideas in this standard. Predominantly, simple design ideas did not get higher than achievement even if a section view was included as for the most part, these did not add any extra detail to the drawing.</p> <p>A number of candidates tried to show too much in their drawings which ended up becoming more unclear rather than effectively communicating detail. Candidates were more likely to work with complex shapes within a product context, not so much spatial. Candidates who used well-controlled, detailed multi-view drawings, with accurate use of conventions were most successful when aiming for Excellence. Paper quality needs to</p>

	<p>be considered as poor paper quality limits potential line quality for hand drawn work. Drawings that contain a large proportion of given, or standard components, give the appearance of being at a high level of achievement, yet when looking for content that contains the candidates own design ideas, the overall standard achieved is lower. This is common when class exercises are submitted.</p>
--	--

### 3. Assessment Report for 91065: Produce instrumental paraline drawings to communicate design ideas

<b>Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>submitted constructed drawings that were not detailed enough to achieve higher grades</li> <li>produced work with only one view constructed</li> <li>submitting two drawings that did not relate to each other</li> <li>showed limited detail of internal components</li> <li>used CAD programmes to produce two or more drawings which were superficial and did not add any extra detail.</li> </ul>
<b>Not Achieved</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Not Achieved commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>submitted work that had minimal design ideas, including some cases where class exercises were submitted outlining that there was very little candidate generated responses to a design brief</li> <li>included rendering in their drawings which removed any evidence of construction and line work</li> <li>included only freehand sketches or drawings that had very limited instrumental work</li> <li>contained work drawn in perspective, which is not a parallel line pictorial method</li> <li>included simplistic design ideas with very little detail.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Merit</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Merit commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outlined details of internal parts of their design by drawing exploded views</li> <li>enhanced their drawings by producing additional views to show further details of their design ideas</li> <li>produced drawings that were accurate and complete, using appropriate line weighting</li> <li>produced complex form that was effectively communicated using CAD, but did not control hidden detail, producing wireframe drawings that cause visual confusion.</li> </ul>
<b>Achieved with Excellence</b>	<p>Candidates who were assessed as Achieved with Excellence commonly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>constructed accurately drawn, high quality drawings which showed design ideas from multiple angles including internal details and / or design features through a series of drawings, rather than a singular drawing</li> <li>contained a series of views which showed detail through accurately constructed drawings, e.g. sectioned, exploded and cut-away views</li> <li>produced CAD drawings of their final design, which showed appropriate detail, e.g. exploded, sequence and / or sectional views.</li> </ul>
<b>Standard specific comments</b>	<p>Candidates that kept pencils sharp, were able to control measurement, angles and line consistently well, whilst conveying in-depth information through multiple and / or complex drawings were most successful when aiming towards Excellence.</p> <p>Pen over the top of pencil line work more often diminishes the quality of the work rather than improving it.</p> <p>Heavily rendered work makes assessment difficult.</p> <p>More candidates seem to be opting for easier to draw items and then showing the internal components and exploded views, which allows them to get higher grades. Complex shapes and curves seem to stop candidates often from getting higher grades due to lack of technical skill and precision in line work.</p> <p>Some schools, to create a final clear drawing, traced over their construction drawing,</p>

	<p>which had been worked over and was no longer precise.</p> <p>Many schools that could have entered this standard that had produced CAD orthographic drawings, didn't enter this standard. Most schools that entered the paraline standard entered the orthographic standard as well.</p> <p>CAD output in bitmap form pixelates when printed at large size, and therefore cannot meet clear and precise line-work criteria for excellence.</p> <p>Related drawings are considered to be two or more drawings of the same object when each drawing communicates information not visible in the other drawings.</p>
--	---