2024 NCEA Assessment Report

Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Subject: Design and Visual Communication

Level: 3

Achievement standard(s): 91627, 91631

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 91627: Initiate design ideas through exploration

Assessment

Candidates are required to demonstrate that they can use a starting experience to generate ideas, and by using visual communication strategies, transform these ideas in a way that enables the formation of design ideas.

Evidence, submitted as a portfolio, can be produced either manually and/or digitally and in a range of modes and visual communication strategies. The portfolio submitted is expected to communicate the candidate's knowledge, understanding, and skills relevant to the standard.

Commentary

Interpretation of the standard continues to be crucial, with some teaching practice evident that encourages exciting individual design thinking – expressing the importance of idea generation/"driving ideas" to advance original and inspired/engaging design thinking.

Choice of design brief played an important part in candidate success; some projects that were too large tended to be difficult for candidates to manage. Product and fashion projects 'starting experiences' that had broad thematic connections, tended to offer greater opportunity. Nature-inspired influences continue to be common.

Candidates who used purposeful starting points and regeneration strategies (to open up new and unique design ideas) generally achieved at higher levels.

Candidates who experienced success in the standard demonstrated an exploration of design ideas and divergent thinking. Design ideas that were predetermined, bound to convention, or ignored creative themes, were not suitable for this standard.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- used and engaged in visual communication strategies
- showed connection to context and visual analysis/interpretation
- experimented with design thinking exploration, a series of starting ideas and approaches
- regenerated design ideas from starting ideas/sources, typically with aesthetic qualities as opposed to functional qualities
- used ideation to come up with design ideas, but did not reinterpret or extend design ideas further
- relied heavily on research to determine design ideas, materials, and/or function.

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

- remained focused throughout the portfolio on specific themes and purposeful contexts
- consistently adapted design ideas through purposeful exploration – reinterpreting or revisiting design characteristics / elements to progress ideas / approaches
- used visual communication strategies to "grow" thinking and ideas
- revisited their starting point throughout the development of their chosen design ideas
- used research and / or starting ideation specifically to improve their design ideas.

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

- explored and closely interrogated initial ideas, specific features, or details of the design
- extensively expanded upon functional aspects / purpose of their design projects, beyond aesthetic and 'styling'
- articulated design ideas through the use of sophisticated visual techniques and detailed views
- re-examined the purpose of their product or space throughout their project
- used human interactions to improve or further develop their design
- presented a coherent project that had a clear and effective design narrative.

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

- did not show the visual links between ideation and their own design project and purpose
- produced too many starting experiences or influences, which confused ideation
- produced technological practice projects rather than a design thinking practice
- produced significant amounts of ideation but did not produce any functional design ideas
- used mood boards or starting experiences too literally and did not further ideas with visual interrogation
- produced ideation pages and did not complete a design project
- did not include ideation or starting point reference – the project just started with initial ideas.

Achievement standard 91631: Produce working drawings to communicate production details for a complex design

Assessment

Candidates were required to produce a set of related drawings that utilised 2D and 3D modes, instrumentally constructed / modelled using either traditional drafting equipment or computer applications. Evidence for this standard involved the selection of views and modes, informed by accepted design and visual communication practice and convention. The drawings were required to communicate the candidate's knowledge, understanding, and skills, and convey the design requirements of the standard.

Commentary

Spatial design continues as the most common type of submission and CAD was the most used graphic mode. This growing media choice is enabling candidates to produce complex designs that are directly related and accurately executed, however, candidates must also understand projection, conventions, and standard drawing practices used in New Zealand and in the explanatory notes of the standard. Conventions include those which are commonly applied within a community of practice, e.g., engineering (SAA/SNZ HB1:1994), or architecture – building and landscaping (NZS/AS

1100.101:1992) Technical drawing – General principles; (NZS/AS 1100.301:1985) Technical drawing – Architectural drawing.

Candidates must use standard accepted scales. When using CAD, fit to page can produce unrecognised scales. It is important that details relate to the area they are explaining (detailing), i.e., the same materials and orientation as the cross-section or area they are explaining. Candidates also need to understand and use scales correctly. Issues with scale can prevent candidates from advancing beyond Achievement level.

Candidates must understand the importance of referencing drawings, especially when detailing. A well-produced detail drawing will not gain higher grades if it is not referenced back to the area it is trying to explain or related to.

It is pleasing to see submissions that are still being produced by conventional drawing methods. Drawing board submissions are still achieving high grades.

Candidates producing work digitally are encouraged to submit digitally.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- selected a design of adequate complexity
- included views and modes that would conventionally be used as a set of working drawings, including site plans, floor plans, elevations, cross-sectional views, assembly views, detail views, material information
- included exterior and interior detail related to their construction and/or assembly
- showed some proficiency in drawing conventions
- indicated the relationship of one drawing to another using recognised conventions
- identified materials using appropriate hatching, colouring, or symbolic reference of material types, and/or used labels.

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

- showed precise measurement and dimensioning, accurate line-work, and good application of drawing conventions
- produced a complete set of linked drawings with the exterior and interior detailing, explaining the construction and assembly of the design with accuracy
- presented drawings that were the outcome of considered design thinking and represented a solution to a design problem.

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

- showed excellent and consistent use of drawing conventions and standards
- included all relevant drawings to clearly communicate detailed construction and assembly information, using carefully selected series of plans, elevations, section views, assembly views, and enlarged detail views
- included three-dimensional drawings, pictorial views, and/or CAD models or animations to clearly communicate assembly and construction. The animations offered sequential information that clearly communicated assembly and rotational views that explained 3D design details.

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

- did not submit a set of formal working drawings
- selected a design of inadequate complexity
- produced working drawings of the exterior or interior (by using cross-sections) but not both

- did not communicate construction or assembly of their designs using appropriate detailed drawings
- did not communicate materials or components/parts adequately
- did not show an understanding of drawing conventions
- produced drawings that were not linked and/or related to each other
- included drawings with contradictory information, e.g., different measurements for the same item
- presented drawings that were not to scale, or did not have dimensions to enable scale to be verified, or view labelling was missing.
