2025 NCEA Assessment Report

Mana Tohu Mātauranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Qualifications Authority

Subject: Design and Visual Communication

Level: 1

Achievement standard(s): 92002, 92003

Report on individual achievement standard(s)

Achievement standard 92002: Develop product or spatial design ideas informed by the consideration of people

Commentary

A wide range of design work was submitted for this standard in 2025, including product design, spatial design, fashion design, and landscape design. The most successful projects were generally from candidates whose context was meaningful to a student of their age and experience, manageable in terms of size and scope, and broad enough to allow for interesting designs to be developed.

There was a lot of work that used minimal visual communication to explore, develop, and communicate candidate ideas and instead relied on written commentary. This was disappointing to see in a subject that is all about visual communication. Brief notes should be used to clarify ideas and thinking but should not be the main component of a design.

Many candidates submitted work that had been produced for internal achievement standard 92000, but this often was unsuccessful as the submissions contained too much research and broad ideation and not enough development and consideration of people. Candidates need to curate their submissions thoughtfully to ensure that they are presenting only work that is relevant for the standard that is being assessed.

Smaller design projects were generally far more successful than larger ones. House and cabin designs were often too ambitious, and when candidates attempted development, the work was frequently reduced to simply placing furniture in a room with little consideration of people and functionality. A more effective approach would be for candidates to focus on one specific aspect of a house design and explore that thoroughly.

The use of stock CAD warehouse designs was prevalent in many spatial design projects, and instead of thoughtfully progressing a design to improve the user experience, the work became less and less candidate-generated.

Many candidates presented research into existing outcomes related to their design context, and in turn generated ideas that were very similar to the researched designs. It is important that candidates are generating their own design ideas rather than relying on existing designs.

The work submitted showed a balanced mix of freehand sketching and digitally produced designs. Unfortunately, there was a decline in the fundamental sketching techniques (crating, 2D/3D, rendering to show form, etc) which impacted the overall effectiveness of the visual communication of a design.

There are many existing, engaging and innovative design briefs being used by schools across the country and it was inspiring to see the varying ways candidates interpreted and asserted their own personality and design vision into what they were given.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated some design ideas that related to a context and people
- used freehand sketches and/or CAD programs to show design ideas
- made some simple decisions about their designs
- showed a final design outcome
- made no changes to their initial concept idea, showing no progression of the idea
- submitted work where the majority of pages were not relevant for the standard.

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

- visually communicated change and progression of their design, most commonly in terms of aesthetics; functional progression was typically less evident or at a more basic level
- made changes that were often basic and did not improve the user experience
- made decisions about their design that related to the context and the user, but were not visually communicated clearly
- visually showed people interacting with the design at some stages
- presented visuals that lacked detail about how the design worked or how it was used by people.

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

- used clear visual communication techniques that showed functional and aesthetic features and details of the design
- made decisions that were effectively informed by what would improve and enhance the user experience, and visually showed this user experience
- progressed the design both aesthetically and functionally
- presented a convincing final outcome that showed the design in context, with people
- added and developed features and details that were relevant and meaningful to the context and users
- were given a design brief that was manageable and meaningful for a Level 1 candidate.

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

- presented only one design idea
- presented work that did not communicate what was being designed
- did not show any connection to people or a context
- did not make clear design decisions.

Achievement standard 92003: Use instrumental drawing techniques to communicate own product or spatial design outcome

Assessment

This standard requires candidates to communicate their own design outcome and then apply that information in a technical drawing that shows both orthographic views and paraline ability. Candidates need to have worked out size and possibly the assembly of their design to complete this

standard. Candidates need to select and produce orthographic and paraline views that show useful information about their design. They are able to use manual instruments or CAD systems to produce drawings for this standard, with either method allowing candidates to achieve the full range of grades. It is expected that candidates have a firm understanding of technical drawing conventions that relate to orthographic and paraline construction.

This standard allows presentation of design outcomes generated within a range of contexts. Both product design and spatial design contexts can be used successfully. For higher than Achievement, candidates needed to select and present views which best showed their understanding of their design.

Submissions should show context of design work and be ordered in a suitable manner. At least one page of work should accompany the submission to demonstrate the candidate's own work as well as understanding of their design. This does not have to be a final submission page, it is preferably a development page which shows the most thinking behind the function and ergonomics of the design.

Commentary

There was a wide variety of submission styles for 92003. There was a general decline in adherence to correct drawing conventions, which needs to be addressed in 2026.

Candidates are encouraged to select the views that will best show evidence of their understanding rather than submit a range of views that potentially show a lack of understanding about the design make-up.

Orthographic submissions often lacked correct conventions, including appropriate third angle projection, lettering, clear and accurate line weights, consistent hatching of sections, suitable dimensions, and scale. Title blocks and size of imagery need to be appropriate for the type of drawing submitted. Generic CAD sections often did not show candidate understanding of construction, and imported details are not part of this standard. Hand-drawn work was easier to assess for quality as a physical submission.

Paraline drawing techniques were generally used well by candidates. Many submissions contained exploded or cutaway views which showed the interior aspects of their designs. Understanding of different paraline drawing types may have helped to show interior aspects more clearly. CAD submissions often had inconsistent line quality which impacted grades. Hand-drawn submissions showed a variety of line quality also. CAD layers need to be correctly applied, as inconsistency can show candidates' lack understanding of the program and the construction of their design.

Grade awarding

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed 2D orthographic views and 3D paraline drawings that communicated external features of the same design
- used either CAD or manual instruments to produce the drawings
- included some main dimensions or used a scale correctly to show size
- included view titles
- showed form and surface features of their design
- included some exploded parts or cutaway views but these did not show further information beyond surface detail.

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

- used 2D orthographic views and 3D paraline drawings to communicate features of their design outcome

- used hidden detail lines, section views, or internal views (cutaway or exploded) to show further information about their design that could not be seen on the surface
- used view labels, an appropriate scale, and showed some main dimensions
- included exploded parts or cutaway views but were inconsistent between views or did not give clear information about parts of their design and how they fitted together (in the case of architectural submissions, these may have had exploded or cutaway views which were unclear because the chosen paraline angle made the internal layout hard to understand, the drawings lacked detail due to their size or quality, had missing lines in key areas, or the design was unclear because of the building's large scale).

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

- submitted 2D orthographic views and 3D paraline drawings that clearly communicated information about their design outcome, including interior parts
- clearly showed how different parts fitted together or clearly showed internal spatial relationships
- used accurate, clear linework so that details could be easily read
- used view labels, a scale, and showed some main dimensions
- used a scale that clearly communicated the details of the design
- used exploded parts or cutaway sections to explain their outcome and show clear information about the parts of their design and how they fitted together
- placed the section plane in a position that revealed useful information about the design where section views were shown
- used detailed views to clarify aspects of the design.

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

- produced only 2D views or 3D drawings, but not both OR produced two drawings but not of the same object
- showed no scale or measurement within any drawings
- submitted perspective drawings rather than paraline drawings
- submitted orthographic views that did not line up or relate to each other
- used freehand sketches or large amounts of freehand work within an instrumental drawing
- did not use construction methods for manually produced paraline drawings
- showed drawings that did not communicate what the design outcome was in any way
- screen captured images of a final design within a CAD program rather than using CAD to produce a formal 2D or paraline drawing.