

# **Scholarship**

## **2010 Assessment Report**

### **Visual Arts: Sculpture**

## COMMENTARY

The Sculpture Scholarship cohort firmly established itself within the requirements of this particular discipline. Successful Scholarship submissions capably engaged in systematic and innovative visual inquiry to do with both sculpture and contemporary practice in the Visual Arts.

In general the submissions that gained scholarships had an obvious ownership around the direction of the work undertaken. This was apparent in the way that the premise for the portfolios was often established early in the first panel and therefore ideas and approaches to exploration were allowed to develop in an interesting and ultimately complex manner.

Successful submissions in Scholarship Sculpture operated at a high level of understanding. A broad range of sculptural approaches were used and ideas and modes of practice that allowed for imaginative and discursive sculptural investigations were experimented with. Many candidates undertook ambitious projects where technical and durational challenges were met with a great deal of success. Often complex ideas were articulated intelligently using a multitude of strategies towards research and the production of work. Some candidates showed understanding of technical constraints that they then pushed towards surprising and unexpected sculptural outcomes.

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship Sculpture utilised the workbook for evidence of ‘critical’ thinking and creative options that fell outside the often-linear direction of the portfolio. Workbooks manifested candidate’s individualised approach and ongoing engagement with sculpture and the contexts in which their work derived meaning.

A number of candidates successfully used art historical or cultural references to inform and contextualise their own work. Often they employed a playful and intuitive response to linking ideas that gave rise to using materials and modes of practice that created astonishing and humorous resolutions.

Overall, the ambition of many candidates to take work beyond the constraints of the examination in terms of commitment to successful projects in the public domain, gave the work currency over and above what appeared as documentation in the workbook and portfolio submissions. These candidates clearly demonstrated the ability to articulate poignant and powerful works in the world outside the classroom.

In the awarding of Scholarship, the workbook is seen in relation to the portfolio and not as a separate entity. The workbook operates in many ways to help the viewer ‘understand’ the portfolio. For candidates with obvious ability at level 3, the addition of a workbook and the entering into the Scholarship examination extends and enhances learning.

## SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- identified sculptural propositions that enabled sustained, complex and insightful investigations
- employed a multitude of strategies within research, and extrapolated options through the careful evaluation of the ideas generated
- synthesised contextual/conceptual and/or formal modes of working from established practice into an individually conceived body of work
- utilised techniques and processes in keeping with the aesthetic logic and material understanding of the sculptural proposition

- integrated workbook and portfolio completely to link ideas of research, established practice and candidate's own ambitions within the subject
- understood the various means by which drawing operates within a sculptural proposition and employed this understanding appropriately within the production of work with sensitivity and accuracy
- demonstrated strategic approaches to practical exploration and theoretical research with one informing the other, thereby substantiating interests with authority and inventiveness
- understood the value of producing outcomes in order to move forward; reflecting a critical and decisive approach to practice that enabled work to communicate a clear and distinctive point of view.

## **SCHOLARSHIP**

### **Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- demonstrated a clear understanding of the parameters of an investigation, by utilising visual and material strategies located in contemporary practice to develop and extend an individually conceived sculptural investigation
- extended simple sculptural propositions with appropriate use of technology, site and scale
- set up a range of challenges in terms of technical and physical scale of projects to allow for complex and comprehensive sculptural installation
- used three dimensional materials and processes fluently in keeping with the aesthetic sensibilities of the sculptural investigation in order to achieve purposeful resolutions
- produced work that was both elegant and sophisticated in its execution, demonstrating a high level understanding of sculptural conventions
- used technologies, materials and processes fluently in keeping with the aesthetic sensibilities of the sculptural proposition in order to achieve purposeful resolutions
- expanded an enquiry beyond a derivative, descriptive superficial understanding of artistic influences
- sustained a constructive and informative relationship between the workbook and the portfolio
- employed purposeful strategies for the layout, ordering, sequencing and editing on the portfolio and workbook that were appropriate to conceptual requirements
- operated with a comprehensive sense of ownership and purpose throughout the enquiry and were able to communicate visually complex ideas in a succinct manner.

## **OTHER CANDIDATES**

### **Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:**

- misunderstood what was appropriate and realistic in established sculptural practice at this level of study
- did not identify a proposition with sufficient scope and depth to enable a sustained investigation of sculptural ideas
- failed to adequately grasp, select, draw together a range of experiments with materials and sculptural conventions into a coherent inquiry
- utilised artist models haphazardly in order to justify changes in work or as a reference list to establish subject matter
- wrote lengthy descriptions about “concepts”, “symbolism”, “meaning” behind works that were not visually manifest within the work

- used written language to describe sculptural intentions when the visual work was unable to communicate these ideas formally and/or conceptually
- presented work that was not technically competent for the required level of performance
- failed to elucidate and sustain a purposeful and structural relationship or connection between the workbook and the portfolio
- replicated or re-presented the same images from the portfolio in the workbook which offered little additional evidence and did not advance the argument or understanding in a meaningful way
- used the workbook to descriptively record step-by-step the process rather than as a critical analysis of the ‘journey’ undertaken
- appended a “further developments” or “extensions” section in the workbook, which amounted to a superficial ‘add on’ or tangent that did not advance or contribute to the overall thrust of the inquiry.