

# 2023 NCEA Assessment Report

<b>Subject:</b>	Visual Arts
<b>Level:</b>	Level 3
<b>Achievement standard(s):</b>	91455, 91456, 91457, 91458, 91459

## Assessment

Candidates presented a portfolio of individual candidate-led evidence for assessment, consisting of either a three-panel portfolio (folio board) or a moving image submission, representing the requirements of the standard.

## Report on individual achievement standard(s)

### **Achievement standard 91455: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within design practice**

#### Commentary

A wide range of topics and media application continue to expand the field of design.

There was a notable rise in character-led briefs. It is important to reiterate the importance of developing a narrative and story that clearly articulates the reason ‘why’ or purpose of the characters and synopsis of the story telling arc. The issues and purpose of world building, game concept design, and dystopian futures need to be well-researched and clarified to ensure they stay in scope, with clear constraints. Often we saw candidates in these categories go off-scope and juggle too many tangents.

Design briefs anchor the candidate’s project from the start. These need editing and logical intentions that are not overly complicated. Briefs that were too lateral often drew on too many components, which sometimes created confusion. Briefs should sit within the realm of candidate experiences and interests to sustain a year’s practice. The brief should expand and open up opportunities to engage in research and design through a process of inquiry, exploration, and critical reflection.

Candidates who are heavily influenced by prior exemplars of Level 3 Visual Arts folios need to be careful that they are taking ownership of the proposition and not falling into a trap of pre-conceived ideas and outcomes from past years’ work.

The reliance on quick-grab assets and content available on the internet is unhelpful. Candidates performed better when generating their own material and taking greater ownership. We acknowledge the candidates who used drawing tactics to set up and develop ideas, i.e. their own drawings, photographs, typeface, characters, and props. When making decisions, candidates need to understand the ‘why’ behind every decision.

Printing design work on a pale grey can be a useful way for all imagery (dark and ink) to be clearly presented on a folio. Sometimes when working on a white or black background, work can be lost in printed outcomes.

Clear ordering of concepts and developing ideas is encouraged to show editing and hierarchy of ideas and decision-making towards final outcomes.

Inclusion of projects from Level 2 or internal work is discouraged. All imagery needs to be well-connected to the brief operating across the folio. Candidates who provided a separate, unrelated brief for each panel were disadvantaged from demonstrating a systematic body of work.

It was positive to see genuine exploration of media with intentionality and purpose based in a phase of exploration. All assets and format types should fit the brief. For example, is a business card actually suited to the brief? Is a billboard appropriate to the investigation? Many posters lacked communication conventions of a poster. Candidates needed to show an understanding of the media and format they were designing for.

Pinks and purples were very common, and these are often hard colours to work with. Colour must connect with the brief, rather than a candidate's idea that "this is my favourite colour". Colour should be researched and appropriate to the investigation.

It is important, within the field of design, that candidates are reflecting on up-to-date practice. Contemporary research is encouraged in parallel with being taught the skills needed to undertake a 'close read' of visual and conceptual research as some candidates fall into a space of copying. The following link to DINZ Best Awards is a great resource: <https://bestawards.co.nz/>.

The design of two- and three-dimensional objects is encouraged. This includes investigating dielines. However, objects need a purposeful connection to the brief. Application of collateral onto hats, surfboards, drink bottles, hoodies, wetsuits, buses, and food trucks was too often a slap-and-paste, and prevented candidates from developing ideas. New work needs to be created to curate and conceptualise brand and product merchandise.

Creative writing is a great tool for designers. Tagline and straplines open up conceptual pathways for candidates. Copywriting can elevate communication strategies such as humour, exaggeration, shock, data, and facts. Body copy that used the candidate's research demonstrated genuine knowledge of subject. Candidates are discouraged from repeating a limited array of singular words. Changing typeface within the development of each outcome is unnecessary as it does not aid the extension and development of ideas. Candidates are encouraged to be strategic with type and make a decision to use two to three tactically, considering the relationship of the second typeface and characteristics of serif vs sans serif fonts. Candidates exploring the conventions of graphic novel are strongly encouraged to engage in type and not avoid it.

When printing, candidates must export files. Too many did not link their Illustrator or InDesign files correctly, resulting in pixelation. This penalised some performances when too prevalent.

In the real world, a designer purchases stock imagery or employs an art director. Candidates that emulated this approach lacked the experience to integrate image, content, ideas, and context. The addition of type over stock content does not meet the standard.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- produced a sufficient amount of work that could be read systematically in a grid layout, demonstrating phases of drawing, exploration and development towards final outcomes
- showed a level of competence with handling processes and technical facilities to clearly construct message, narratives, and ideas
- wrote a clear brief with key steps focused on the formats they intended to produce, rather than discussing issues, context, and subject relevance
- drew from a range of resources, including drawing and photographic phases that related to and informed the topic
- identified and explored the conventions suitable to the brief and understood the conventions that operate within the media and genre they were working within
- revisited initial ideas to inform new work rather than being repetitive of previous work
- juggled typefaces instead of focusing on tagline or copywriting to locate new options for development
- redesigned the brand (unnecessarily) as they moved into new collateral types.

Additionally, moving images candidates commonly:

- selected briefs that were ambitious enough to create scope but were within the capabilities of the candidates
- had a project with sufficient phases to allow them to meet the requirements of the standard
- demonstrated sufficient technical expertise in their selected software to complete their submission
- focused on the links between phases rather than the need to complete a narrative
- linked the phases of production pictorially even when moving from still to moving image work.

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

- understood and applied graphic conventions that signalled they had extracted tactics from contemporary and exemplary practice
- demonstrated control over the conventions and management of media within each phase of development
- restricted work to include only that which added value to the design process and outcomes as shown in the editorial layout of the folio
- controlled colour and used a limited range of colour to signal hierarchy of information and purposefully engage the viewer's eye
- managed a set of ideas and visual strategies to communicate and connect with the brief in a clear way, showing research and ideational clarity
- showed levels of analysis through compositional organisation and made decisions to 'clean-out' ideas and develop confidence with visual elements
- applied ideas into templated formats such as websites, which may mean they peaked at panel one or two without taking any further refined and critical extensions to panel three
- generated strong ideas that were conceptual and experimental, but lacked the visual and production fluency needed to communicate these ideas at Excellence level.

Additionally, moving images candidates commonly:

- used software appropriate to the brief
- labelled work to provide clarity to the examination panel
- presented their work simply, allowing the panel to see the candidate's own work.

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

- embedded themselves in their practice and invested time to strengthen their skills and knowledge, simultaneously addressing ideas, contextual positioning, and visual language
- wrote a brief that could be sustained, considering a provocation that operated within the realm of their experience (such as social issues) that they could tangibly and believably connect with
- prioritised time for research and brainstorming at the start, selecting a suitable aesthetic that fit their brief: outcomes shown on panel one suggested they constructed assets and elements quickly to "hit the ground running"
- questioned and tested communication strategy, e.g. to educate, to be an activist, or to persuade using humour, metaphor, data, or facts
- devised a graphic treatment and set about being fluent in their execution and use of visual language to communicate and connect with their audience
- wrote their own story and edited and reviewed copywriting, thereby knowing the story well and being invested in content as well as the look and feel
- controlled and directed the media that was used within the work, e.g. acted as creative director of the photoshoot, screen printed their image, made the display typeface, and documented their ability to produce and place artwork in situ
- invented formats and outcomes underpinned by experimental phases of activity, adding value to ideas and showing the candidate's investment in the topic.

Additionally, moving images candidates commonly:

- included a brief so the candidate could quickly allow the marking panel to see how they tackled the design problem and its appropriateness for its intended purpose
- showed they were ambitious in scope but worked within the technical skills they either had or could readily acquire
- allowed the presentation of the submission to showcase the design work by not overly documenting the process
- utilised sound as another component within their submission or, when it was irrelevant to their brief, ignored it
- had enough different phases of production that allowed them to bring their new learning through
- completed sections to show the intended outcome when it was clear that they would not be able to complete their entire storyboard.

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

- did not supply a brief and relied on the marking panel to unravel an unsystematic series of outcomes over three panels
- lacked understanding of the design process and did not include evidence of steps to test and refine ideas, research, brainstorm and ideate, draw and generate, develop and clarify ideas, and refine and resolve finished outcomes

- used too much real estate on the folio, displaying early process behind the making of work, which was usually unfinished, hard to read, and acted as filler to cover gaps in development and work quantity
- overlaid an unedited range of typeface exploration onto existing stock they had gathered
- relied on photos of high-end objects and products, and applied a limited understanding of brand to these found images and work
- focused on technical filters and software tools, creating illegible outcomes, or focused on creating surfaces and textures and did not show development of ideas
- traced and coloured already established characters and design, which is neither original work nor appropriate to illustration practice.

Additionally, moving images candidates commonly:

- went over the allocated time, and, as such, the better work was not viewed by the examination panel
- went under the allocated time, and, as such did not create sufficient work
- presented work from another standard that did not demonstrate regeneration and was overly focused on software tasks
- took on a sophisticated and complex narrative brief without possessing the fundamental skills and knowledge of conventions to address it
- lacked focus through not having a brief
- submitted work that would be better read on a printed folio; often the motion or interactive component was the slide movement to show work
- spent too much of their allocated time documenting the process of making
- did not pictorially link the different phases; therefore generated but did not develop work
- considered the submission as a single entity, like a short film or a music video.

---

## **Achievement standard 91456: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within painting practice**

### Commentary

The number of candidates in this subject continues to increase, exemplifying a wide range of artistic practice and diversity of subject matter. The best forged a genuine connection with their investigation and used it as a vehicle to express themselves. Considered, innovative approaches were the outcome of processes that stemmed from a joy of making. Successful folios were part of a larger body of work. This parallel body became a site where other visual art disciplines could be explored and later fed back into their painting production.

Candidates lifted their performance through high engagement, due to their personal investment in art-making, enabling production to be sustained over the whole year. This ownership meant that they often drew upon a depth of prior knowledge, which provided rich options throughout the research / learning process.

Developmental works, often seen as sequences of smaller works, enabled candidates to find pictorial solutions efficiently. It also enabled exploration of a greater range of options to inform finished works.

Candidates were analytical in reflecting on the artists' practices. They asked why a specific approach and conceptual framework might be relevant to their making / thinking and

application. They also understood the nature of folio assessment, with their layout clearly communicating their thinking.

The ease of access to subject matter should not be underestimated: still life, landscape, and the self-portrait are all readily accessible and as relevant as any art practice.

Smaller developmental series can allow for more exploration to occur and quickly progress ideas. Such methods provide opportunities to develop the decision-making skills required in successful submissions. They can also allow more time to develop a higher finish to works. Drawing, the process of working through ideas by making, is a learned skill and comes in many forms. Candidates should be encouraged to always draw, learning how to use drawing processes and drawing tools appropriately.

A focus on increasing production should be combined with the acquisition of the layout skills needed to present an investigation as clearly as possible.

Layout is a key convention in Visual Arts for an exhibition or folio. The skills for this process must be allowed to develop alongside the work. When this occurs in an art room context, it can help identify issues earlier. Brainstorming of new ideas is central to this process and should be a long-term aspect of layouts. Authenticity issues should surface much earlier in terms of teacher-student discussions, as well an awareness around wet or insecure work prior to submission dates.

Candidates should ensure they have enough space around paintings to ensure work can be read.

Hierarchy of images helped clarify the questioning and investigative approach. Labelling of well-printed, quality photographs with sizes, dimensions, or types of performance were essential to help markers identify practice.

Ensuring work can be rearranged until very late in the process ensures the flexibility to respond to unexpected outcomes, or editing of earlier drawings that can be replaced by stronger work.

The process-driven nature of this assessment helps address concerns around artificial intelligence (AI) in art rooms, as the standard requires that candidates repurpose their ideas and images towards a regenerated outcome. AI as a drawing tool is acknowledged as it reflects contemporary practice. However, the performance required to show development across the folio submission is a strong context to assess the use of AI within. If layouts are occurring in classroom, the opportunity for the teaching / learning moment to occur when discussing the use of AI as a drawing tool is possible. This again limits authenticity issues for teachers.

It is essential to find the strength within the mode of working that best fits the candidate. Drawing in relation to thinking processes, alongside the curatorial or layout performance central to the folio format, leads to improved outcomes. Ideally, learning in the context of art gallery trips or artists visiting the school will lift thinking skills appropriately.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- engaged in a genuine attempt to advance their proposition through the investigation of relevant painting conventions, establishing a clear subject matter or idea that had meaning for them
- had more understanding of pictorial strategies being worked through alongside other painting conventions

- provided evidence of sequential work used to advance ideas
- demonstrated a lack of consideration of layout which hindered reading between phases of work
- had a narrower proposition to start with
- showed no sense of work beyond the folio, with all the evidence on the board
- presented a linear journey towards a preordained outcome; whereas more reflection or editing and ordering, in response to unexpected outcomes, would have enabled development and clarification of pictorial concerns, providing more options.

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

- engaged consistently with the proposition
- communicated a clear intention both formally / conceptually
- engaged with models and applied learning to their own production
- used well-prepared surfaces and grounds to work on, showing a very good understanding of picture-making concerns
- chose media and approaches appropriate to their skill set, resulting in a consistent quality across production
- used colour and layout to unite ideas and performance, reflecting their ownership and purposeful engagement
- had work that 'ran on the spot' (multiple, similar versions of a work), though still produced with a clear purpose across the board.

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

- demonstrated ownership and prior knowledge of subject matter from the outset of investigation, and sustained this engagement and motivation
- invested in their process from start to finish, showing a depth of investigation and an intelligent consideration of relationships between phases
- incorporated learning from explorations of other practices, such as clay, printmaking, or digital painting, back into their work, using critical reflection to show how it informed their practice, allowing it to move forward
- used an intelligent and clear layout consistently across panels to support the thinking process
- provided well-labelled, quality documentation and adequate spacing and hierarchy of size to show importance of various passages of work
- submitted a folio which appeared to be part of larger body of work
- had consistent, fluent use of media
- recognised strengths and built on these, with new and considered works being made by the integration of models in an inventive way
- used small, developmental series which were effectively integrated into the body of work, allowing for unexpected outcomes that were then critically applied in more finished paintings.

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

- lacked a clear relationship between works, with no links being developed through the investigation
- provided insufficient work to meet the folio criteria, with work spread out across the board or near empty boards

- operated below the curriculum level required to meet the skill set of conventions being explored
  - had no reference to established practice integrated into the production of work
  - showed a lack of evidence of investigating relevant conventions associated with painting, such as surface and colour
  - copied and curated a board from, e.g. Pinterest around a theme or idea, rather than establishing how these images can form part of the foundation for their own investigation.
- 

## **Achievement standard 91457: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within photography practice**

### Commentary

This year, many portfolios demonstrated strong ideas as candidates appeared genuinely engaged with their propositions, showing a strong sense of ownership. Successful candidates used the portfolio format confidently to generate, develop, and regenerate ideas with minimal or no repetitive work. Performances were also supported by evidence of critiquing and reflecting on passages of work to assist with decision-making and to further develop concepts.

Most portfolios were built on individual stylistic interests and strengths, with candidate voice clearly embedded in the work. Where this was not the case, performance could be limited and undermined by restrictions within a whole class programme. This could weaken authenticity and opportunities for deeper thinking.

Rather than mimicking established practice, most submissions demonstrated understanding of how to clarify, synthesise, and integrate aspects of several artists' works to inform decisions. These skills are fundamental to high performance in this standard and can ensure authenticity.

Candidates' technical facility appeared confident. It was pleasing to see a clearer understanding of camera handling and software use. There were, however, concerns over submissions that were dark grey and murky, which made reading challenging. Applying the correct camera settings, deciding whether to use auto or manual focus, and selecting the appropriate lighting source is important in achieving control over production. Trialling and testing when using editing software is recommended, so the editing can be seen as appropriate.

Candidates needed to consider phases of work, regarding the transition of images between one sequence and another, when undertaking a moving image submission. This is critical to the way the submission is interpreted. Sound was handled appropriately, and most candidates used a range of photographic conventions, such as different viewpoints, depth of field (soft focus and focus), and distance to their subject, including using a range of lighting sources to achieve specific effects.

Performances at Excellence level were testament to the importance of topic and the ability to deeply research content in parallel with photography conventions and processes. These portfolios presented sequences, while developmental images allowed for experimentation and exploration. This provided the opportunity to take risks and test possibilities before committing to more resolved works.

Candidates appeared increasingly engaged in topics that were relevant and reflective of their culture, including those issues pertinent to them.



## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- utilised a limited range of pictorial devices and managed systematic shifts through sequences; these were often candidates who would benefit from more research related to their topic to form more opportunities for purposeful regeneration
- presented a body of work that was technically adequate in camera and in print production
- operated very closely to the formal aesthetics of artist models and made limited decisions that broke away from their styles
- made minor shifts to advance ideas, often repositioning existing subject matter within a composition rather than forming new and varied images that offered some lighting variations
- presented a linear journey towards a preordained outcome.

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

- used research to establish a thorough proposition, investing in a number of photoshoots to present evidence of analysing and clarifying ideas
- demonstrated proficient technical skill with a variety of processes, and reflected critically to make purposeful editing and hierarchical decisions
- selected pictorial conventions to use, such as depth of field, range of viewpoints, line, and tone, that were relevant to the artist models being investigated
- used layout to sequence and unite ideas with technical capability that supported the reading of the body of work
- showed a good understanding of established practice and made informed decisions to allow independent creativity.

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

- invested time to establish rich and interesting propositions connected to their cultural milieu, using a variety of subject matter that was conceptually linked to their proposition
- employed techniques and processes with fluency to extend and refine ideas in the body of work
- prioritised options, making critical decisions to allow their work to regenerate in-depth with the support of revisiting previous work, in order to arrive at intended outcomes
- demonstrated the ability to take risks, and depart from established practice to make new, informed decisions to direct their art-making.

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

- restricted possibilities to generate ideas by starting with a single object, or a narrow and underdeveloped proposition
- presented photographs from one or two photoshoots that were insufficient to fulfil all aspects of the criteria
- displayed inconsistent levels of technical facility, often presenting images with dense and dark tones that made the readability of images difficult
- restrained their progress by repeating photographs with very little difference between sequences and without developing their own picture-making skills
- reflected a lack of engagement with their idea, as the photographs were unsystematic, with a layout that was ill-considered when making links between sequences of work

- did not consider production values, legibility, and the editing of the artwork thoroughly enough to support a systematic approach.

---

## **Achievement standard 91458: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within printmaking practice**

### Commentary

Printmaking submissions predominantly showed a high level of engagement throughout the journey of developing a three-panel submission. Most candidates selected ideas to investigate relating to their individual interests, and these proved broad enough to sustain learning throughout the year. Those who insightfully analysed and constantly reflected and built upon their strengths were most successful.

Propositions enabling plenty of opportunities for expansion included a vast range of subject matter relating to identity, whakapapa, political critique, environment, and social commentary, as well as investigations into places of significance, architectural forms, or in some submissions, a focus on purely pictorial concerns stemming from portraiture, still life, or interiors. Submissions originating from personal perspectives, beliefs, values, or humour clearly showed a genuine and authentic voice. In these submissions, candidates explored their experiences, worked from their own photographs, or employed printmaking conventions directly relating to their cultural traditions.

Examiners were impressed with the confident and often highly-refined use of printmaking skills, drawing from both traditional and contemporary conventions. Approaches spanned painterly, photographic, graphic, collage, digital, three-dimensional and illustration-based interests. As usual, those with a love of drawing flourished in this subject.

It was clear to see most candidates understood the expressive potential of plate tone, how to build up thin layers of ink, purposefully mix colour, and carefully use registration to align multiple plates. Some very successful submissions stuck to a monochromatic approach and immersed themselves deeply in a single process, while others explored multi-layered and multi-coloured prints, sometimes weaving many processes to seamlessly showcase an integrated approach across the submission.

Techniques used with flair included drypoint, monoprint, screen print, digital processes, and transfers. Although there were highly-refined examples of pronto prints, paper lithography, cyanotypes, and solar plates presented, it was also pleasing to see many submissions mastering the use of found or recycled materials to make stunning prints, such as using the inside of flattened Tetra Pak boxes for drypoint prints, or producing collagraphs made from found card and textures, to create sophisticated printmaking. These very accessible processes have the added benefit of opening up new possibilities, with the ease of cutting allowing for interesting plate shapes, thus creating new directions for candidates to explore. The use of free or found materials appears to allow for greater risk-taking and innovation. It was also encouraging to see submissions using rolled-slab monoprints in highly refined ways, showing a successful approach to printmaking when there is no access to a printing press. Embossing from flat, found objects was also well understood and added layers of complexity and subtle, textural surfaces to works.

Some candidates printed onto different surfaces relating to their proposition, making their own paper, or printing onto hand-woven harakeke, adding to their concept and opening further possibilities to develop ideas and shift the work into new directions. Well-integrated three-dimensional printmaking and installations were photographed, and again provided

regeneration options and springboards into new ways to explore and deepen the investigation.

Candidates who showed series of smaller experimental works, and at least three significant pictorial shifts per panel, were able to show greater depth and range of exploration. One large work, or only a few works on the third panel, limits development potential.

The analysis and clear sequencing of learning enabled candidates to clearly articulate the evolution and regeneration of their ideas visually. It was pleasing to see candidates bringing together elements from a range of researched artists and ideas, fostering new and innovative works, as opposed to mimicking established practices.

Effective editing and ordering of works to clearly show thinking and decision-making remains a critical component of this examination, allowing ideas to be clearly conveyed. Layout should show clear shifts across all three panels, and for circular thinkers, this will not necessarily be the order in which works were produced. It is a good idea to get fresh eyes on a layout prior to sticking down to check it reads well. Examiners suggest candidates ask someone from a different subject area, who is unfamiliar with the artworks, to discuss what the submission is about, and articulate how decisions were made to get from the top left of the first panel to the bottom right of the last panel. Ask them to spot any relationships between works or any sequences that seem repetitive. Seeking feedback from a new perspective can help inform layout decisions. To ensure clarity and show ideas developing, it is crucial to allow space around each work and avoid presenting them overlapping or touching.

There were fewer submissions showing “running on the spot” (producing multiple similar versions of a work). The folio space is precious and best used to showcase new ideas and risk-taking, rather than staying static and repeating an idea. The repeated use of a plate or the same image was detrimental to development, resulting in imagery that failed to regenerate ideas and submissions that stagnated. Candidates are strongly advised against using the same plate more than once. For candidates presenting narratives, it is important to remember submissions must also move conceptually and / or pictorially to regenerate ideas, thereby meeting the required standard.

Some whole-class programmes and prescribed layouts are still evident. This approach is discouraged, as it limits opportunities for candidates to make their own decisions, experiment, build on their own strengths, and achieve at a higher level.

Intelligent use of abstraction was seen in some submissions dealing with pictorial interests and formal picture-making. These investigations systematically progressed through an in-depth investigation from real space to flattened, abstract forms and spaces.

Reflection and analysis remain fundamental to high performance in this standard. The majority of learning presented in printmaking indicated that candidates were adept at determining strengths in their own learning. They integrated these strengths, along with ideas from established practice, to inform their thinking and develop new works. The most successful submissions showed clarity and fluency, and concluded with new shifts, building on the breadth of previous ideas to move forward, expanding and setting up further opportunities for development, even in the last works.

## Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- presented works that showed development of ideas as a linear journey
- made gradual pictorial and compositional shifts, sometimes repeating ideas or presenting less resolved works on the third panel

- ordered artworks to show some links between phases of working
- began with a narrow proposition on the first panel, which limited options
- produced large works or presented smaller works touching or overlapping, limiting space to show further shifts and regeneration opportunities
- used printmaking processes and techniques with skill to communicate ideas.

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

- established a proposition, produced related investigations, and generated a range of options and ideas across all three panels, informed by research
- gathered and combined ideas to set up a range of options
- ordered and sized images to visually emphasise strengths and show decision-making
- showed purpose and proficiency in the use of technical skills, using either a single printmaking process or combining a number of processes appropriate to their concept
- analysed own and others' art-making to inform next step
- edited and sequenced learning to emphasise development, and ensured there were spaces between works to allow artworks to be read effectively as individual pieces.

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

- set up a clear proposition and confidently used printmaking methods and techniques to explore and emphasise ideas based on own stylistic strengths
- analysed own strengths and recognised opportunities to create new possibilities to expand and extend ideas
- used colour intelligently to emphasise ideas
- presented small series of explorative works, showing a willingness to experiment, take risks, test, and be open to discovery
- edited and laid out the portfolio clearly to show thinking and decision-making, with third panel works re-forming, refining and building on earlier works, and continuing to open new possibilities
- integrated research seamlessly into own work and moved systematically between phases of work to extend, integrate, and revisit ideas.

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

- produced works without first establishing a clear thematic or conceptual idea
- used found images rather than producing own source imagery
- lacked purpose and coherent links between works, presenting unrelated images, flitting randomly from one stylistic approach to another, or mimicking artists
- relied on repeatedly reusing plates to make prints, revealing a lack of understanding of the conventions and constraints of printmaking practice
- showed technical skills below the expected curriculum level
- presented works that lacked a systematic direction and did not build on previous learning or strengths, creating interchangeable layouts and limiting the potential for development.

## **Achievement standard 91459: Produce a systematic body of work that integrates conventions and regenerates ideas within sculpture practice**

### **Commentary**

Sculpture candidates presented inventive, ākonga-driven propositions that were located within a wide range of established sculptural practice. Many candidates investigated methodologies that addressed both traditional and contemporary modes of practice.

Analysis of initial sculptural activity allowed many candidates to expand both the conceptual and formal concerns of their work. Successful candidates ensured they had clear ideas based within implicit sculptural established practice. These candidates also utilised methods and techniques that investigated materiality, repetition, scale, and site. Thematic investigations that developed personal narratives or questioned contemporary issues were open-ended and expansive. Many candidates utilised humour or idiosyncratic observations in the conceptual structure of their work.

Almost all candidates presented clear photographic documentation of sculptural work in logical sequences. It would help Examiners further assess the success of sculptural work if small contextual labels regarding dimensions, materials, and where appropriate, site or duration, were placed underneath images.

### **Grade awarding**

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- utilised a singular material or process to develop sculptural ideas
- referenced well-known established sculpture practice to drive a proposition
- presented well-ordered and -sized photographic documentation of sculptural work
- engaged in thematic investigations based in clearly established sculptural practice.

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

- submitted a body of work with a clear proposition that was expanded upon with reference to established sculptural practice
- made conceptual and formal links between phases of work
- presented well-defined sculptural activity that demonstrated an understanding of a range of sculptural conventions
- employed a logical sequence of photo documentation of work that prioritised successful work at a larger scale, to emphasise success within the body of work.

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

- presented a body of work that transcended referenced established sculptural practice to create innovative sculptural outcomes
- understood how to use video editing and digital augmentation of audio recordings to further enhance the conceptual richness of the work
- developed sculptural ideas into a wide range of complex and innovative sculptural outcomes
- displayed an ambitious attitude to scale, site, collaboration, and openness to refining processes in the production of work.

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

- made objects that had no understanding of established sculptural practice conventions and techniques
- presented images of creative play that did not develop, let alone regenerate, sculptural ideas
- failed to identify established sculptural practice from which to learn
- made very little sculptural work within a body of picture-making.