

**Subject:** Visual Arts

**Level:** 1

**Standards:** 90916

## Part A: Commentary

The samples presented for verification in 2022 showed a diversity of approaches and subject matter being explored through engaging programmes of learning for NCEA Level 1 Visual Arts. It was a pleasure to see the rich and vibrant submissions presented, showing the range of opportunities for artistic discovery that this standard provides for candidates.

Programmes that lead to successful portfolios 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 relevant cultural protocols and beliefs.

Despite the break of two years from national verification of this standard, most teachers had accurately assessed candidate submissions. Although the impact of Covid19 was evident in some cases, in terms of student absence from school and limitation of time spent on submissions, it appeared that, by and large, schools had managed these impacts internally, and school samples presented for verification were similar to pre-Covid years.

The number of schools submitting samples for verification was lower than in 2019. In 2022 there were no Moving Image (MI) folios submissions presented for verification.

Schools are reminded to consult and comply with the *External Assessment Administrative Instructions for Level 1 and Level 2 Visual Arts* available on the NZQA Visual Arts subject resources page. This is particularly relevant in terms of the size and placement of candidate numbers on the folio, and the need for the candidate number to include the school code. Please note that candidate names should not be visible on the artwork side of the portfolio.

## Part B: Report on standards

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

### Examination

As outlined in the assessment specifications, candidates were required to present a portfolio for assessment consisting of either a two-panel portfolio (folio board), or a digital moving image portfolio, representing the requirements of the standard.

## Observations

Submissions awarded Achievement often benefitted from a scaffolded programme which capitalised on student interest and level of skill.

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.

Programmes of teaching and learning that supported candidates to achieve at Excellence provided sufficient structure to give the candidate direction but allowed them to take ownership of the visual and conceptual elements of the body of work.

## Grade awarding

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; i.e. at least four completed works per panel, covering approximately 95% of the folio.
- had clear connections between the various pictorial elements, often through subject matter, but also included consistent colour palettes or art-making techniques
- had a range of source imagery, not relying on one or two key images
- used a range of media (two or more), but did not always select and use media which best suited their intended purpose, with an inconsistent level of media application at the lower end of the grade range
- presented works with a small amount of space around them to differentiate one work from the next
- showed some understanding of tonal modelling, with rendering of basic forms using only a single light source, at the lower end of the grade range
- showed a basic understanding of form and proportion and, at times, struggled to consistently show correct proportions when representing objects
- showed reasonable understanding of shape, presenting recognisable objects when recording from subject matter
- showed some understanding of composition, using space and scale, however compositions were often arranged without significant intention or consideration
- at the higher end of the grade range, showed some control of media, but did not sustain this sufficiently across both panels of the submission
- did not build on areas of technical strength or successful media from early in the submission
- used a thematic approach to the development of ideas
- produced a body of work which developed ideas but often seemed to lack a system, or identify relationships between works which would move the body of work forward

- relied heavily on guidance provided by the class programme to move the body of work forward, and create relationships between works
- referenced established practice, in the form of recognisable models and/or conventions appropriate to the domain or field they were producing work in. However, at times this was done without showing understanding of the model, instead just replicating aesthetic elements
- at the lower end of the grade range, worked from a narrow proposition that limited the development of ideas
- combined elements from earlier work in a simple way in order develop new work
- at the lower end of the grade range, produced repetitive singular works or had a heavy reliance on tracing, which was limiting in terms of showing candidates' skills and creativity
- made new iterations of compositions or repeated imagery, rather than developing or adding new ideas, or reused motifs rather than building upon them
- had a strong emphasis on pattern making and flat space
- produced final works that often appeared rushed
- appeared to have been challenged by the move from smaller developmental works to larger-scale final compositions
- when producing a design-based submission, showed a limited understanding of basic design conventions such as layout and typography
- when producing a design-based submission, showed some understanding of text (i.e. legibility, appropriate font selection and hierarchy)
- when producing a design-based submission, showed limited understanding of the conventions of the product they were designing
- when producing a design-based submission, generated some of their own source imagery, rather than relying heavily on stock imagery
- when producing a photographic submission, showed some understanding of colour balance, and struggled with density of shadows and highlights
- when producing a photographic submission, showed conceptual development, but showed limited technical proficiency
- when producing a photographic submission, used a limited range of viewpoints of subject matter, often repeating centralised compositions.

Candidates who were awarded **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not complete or fill two folio boards, or presented works with excessive amounts of white space around them
- presented submissions where a significant number of works were below NZC Level 6 in their ability to use media or develop ideas
- worked from subject matter that did not give good opportunity for the candidate to show an appropriate level of skill
- at higher end of this grade range, submissions began with works that were at the curriculum level, but the level declined for final works on the second panel

- struggled with the fundamental skills required to record information, or represent shapes and forms
- did not show the ability to render a tonal range when using wet or dry media
- used media that was not appropriate for the convention or artist model chosen
- relied heavily on line drawings or outlining of objects with paint pens or markers
- presented no obvious visual links or connections between the works (e.g. colour palette, technique, subject matter or pictorial approach)
- used media that was not suited to the purpose (e.g. a majority of simple pencil or pen drawings)
- did not show understanding of art making tikanga (e.g. stretched photos)
- did not show evidence of considered decision making about artwork placement (e.g. works placed on the submission on the wrong orientation)
- did not reference established practice or art-making conventions appropriate to the field they were working in
- showed limited understanding of pictorial conventions, such scale and composition
- used media that the candidate was not confident in
- produced repetitive works (e.g. repeated subject matter from only one or two viewpoints, or multiple versions of the same digital or print work, with only colour change)
- relied on collage without any engagement with established collage practice
- traced images, working over the top of photocopies or photographs, restricting their ability to explore their own compositions, or to demonstrate competence at the appropriate curriculum level, or
- relied on large-scale works to cover the folio
- relied on multiple copies of prints or photographs to fill space, (photography and design)
- used 'filler' works that could have occupied a smaller space (e.g. unedited appropriated imagery or large areas of surface exploration)
- when producing a photographic submission, presented poorly exposed images, or showed poor understanding of photographic techniques and conventions.

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

- understood 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
- generated a range of useful possibilities at concept stages
- presented a clearly identified system, using approaches such as a particular colour palette and selection of subject matter
- progressed their ideas in a systematic manner, however, at the lower end of the grade range, idea development was sometimes repetitive
- identified successful elements in earlier works and further explored these
- showed a clear understanding of line, shape, tonal variation, and form in drawings

- at the lower end of the grade range, controlled one media more successfully than others
- presented some works that were at a less accomplished level. This was generally done earlier on in the submission
- 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, however, in some cases did not choose their best works to extend and resolve
- showed the ability to successfully combine conventions from previous series to create new work however, at the lower end of the grade range, it was not always evident that the series of works had been reflected and built upon
- used a range of different compositions in each series of work
- coped successfully with media changes, and scale shifts 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, colour mixing and surface
- made implicit references to artist models and established practice, rather than direct representations of examples of models' work
- reference multiple artist models
- when closely referencing artist models, showed understanding of or further reflection on the models being used
- when producing design-based submissions, worked with their own source imagery
- when producing photography-based submissions, did not repeat photographs.

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement 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
- took ownership of the ideas and subject matter they were working with, and engaged with ideas in a way that showed strong student voice
- used a purposeful system to explore multiple outcomes that further developed the proposition
- accurately recorded perspective, tone, space, texture, shape, and form
- took an experimental approach when making generative studies to explore multiple options before clarification
- showed student reflection on the ideas that were being explored

- showed student voice in the clarification of ideas, presenting a strong understanding of reflective evaluation
- 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 and conventions which highlighted the individual candidate's strengths, and were well matched to the candidate's proposition
- used colour in a sophisticated manner
- explored their subject matter from a range of viewpoints and perspectives, often moving work forward in unexpected directions
- used stylistic and pictorial conventions that were appropriate to their proposition
- used a range of compositional devices which were appropriate to their intended purpose
- showed understanding of pictorial space
- explored multiple outcomes for an idea, extending and refining 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
- presented more than one clarification, with several threads of investigation taking place and then woven together
- presented a final sequence that was open-ended enough to leave the viewer wanting more
- referenced a range of established practice
- made clear links to established practice, used this to invigorate their own work, and to match the selection of artist models to the candidate's intended purpose
- when producing a combined design- and photography-based submission, were able to integrate conventions from both fields successfully
- showed understanding of relevant art making tikanga or conventions of the field in which they were working, using 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)
- when producing a design-based submission, showed an understanding of designing for purpose, successfully combining image and type to meet the brief
- when producing a design-based submission, showed a sophisticated understanding of hierarchy of font across multiple briefs
- when producing photographic or video work, showed good understanding of lighting.