



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2004

Visual Arts (93302)

National Statistics

Assessment Report

Additional Notes for Teachers

Assessment Schedule

Visual Arts, Scholarship, 2004

General Comments

The Scholarship Standard requires candidates to present an individually conceived and driven proposal in the production of distinctive and original work. Holistic programmes of work that integrated all of the Level 3 standards provided candidates with the opportunity to select evidence from the range and breadth of their material relating to specific research and explorations. The combined evidence of the best of portfolio and workbook demonstrated the individually driven proposal.

Submissions awarded Scholarship provided evidence of meeting **all** the performance criteria.

National Statistics

Number of Results	Percentage		
	Not Achieved	Scholarship	Outstanding
559	89.3%	5.9%	4.8%

Assessment Report

Assessment procedures for this standard

Candidates sent folios and workbooks to a central venue where they were assessed by a panel of ten markers, a panel leader and check marker.

Key findings

1. *Research, test, refine, evaluate and synthesise ideas, processes, procedures, materials and techniques using a systematic approach.*

Candidates were required to define the nature of the problem to be studied, establish the contextual and conceptual features of the investigation and establish the practical and theoretical activities needed to structure the investigation.

Successful candidates used the workbook to demonstrate critical thinking and creative options that fell outside the often linear direction of the portfolio. Exemplary workbooks demonstrated candidates' ongoing engagement with their work and its contexts, pursuit of specific issues and systematic and coherent outcomes. Exemplary submissions provided evidence that the candidate had thoroughly engaged with the possibilities of their question by using a critical and decisive approach.

Submissions not achieving Scholarship often selected problems or questions that lacked sufficient breadth, restricting possibilities for the testing and evaluation required for a systematic approach. Often, the workbook proposition described what a candidate intended to do, rather than advancing a line of inquiry. In these instances, rather than reveal the depth of inquiry, the workbook simply described the steps undertaken.

Submissions awarded Scholarship with outstanding performance developed from a proposal that directly engaged the candidate's own perceptual understandings and provided scope for continual reinvention.

2. *Use a critical and decisive approach to drawing in generating, analysing, clarifying and regenerating ideas in working towards and making original work.*

Candidates were expected to use drawing as a practical activity, contributing to critical engagement with ideas, materials and processes. Candidates were required to communicate their intention through procedures and practices employed in the production of work. The assessment panel looked for evidence of drawing used as an investigative tool, evaluation of options, generation of further avenues of inquiry and adjustment of practical strategies to suit the purpose.

Original work is derived from research and the ability to record and critically evaluate wide ranging and in-depth information relevant to the project. Candidates awarded Scholarship used drawing as an analytical and critical activity, facilitating independent evaluation of works of art and design and their contexts.

Many successful candidates used the influence of practitioners in a discipline other than their own. Just as successful were submissions that confined themselves to a particular art-making tradition, which intentionally used a narrow focus with detailed observation and in-depth investigation. Both approaches were capable of demonstrating the quality of thinking and decision-making necessary for the award of Scholarship.

Candidates not achieving Scholarship did not sufficiently understand the context for making work and the accurate, detailed analysis needed for regeneration towards original work. Ideas were not sufficiently evaluated and synthesised to generate further development. Candidates who submitted an entire unit of work for the *'Investigate and use ideas in the context of a drawing study in <art discipline>'* standards, either in original form or reduced on a photocopier, were not likely to achieve Scholarship, as links to the folio were only tenuously related to decisions taken later on in the development of work for the *'Produce original work within <art discipline> to show extensive knowledge of art-making methods and ideas'* standards.

Submissions awarded Scholarship with outstanding performance demonstrated a sustained use of drawing that underpinned original and distinctive outcomes.

3. Use processes, procedures, materials and techniques with understanding, fluency and clarity of purpose.

Candidates were expected to exhibit facility and control over media and technologies. For the award of Scholarship, however, this alone was not sufficient without evidence of understanding the implications of technical and procedural concerns. Purposeful manipulation of technologies needed to demonstrate familiarity with conventions associated with the production and presentation of artwork. This did not preclude some submissions from deviating from such conventions, if required by the scope and direction of the project undertaken.

Candidates awarded Scholarship demonstrated a sophisticated and intelligent use of media, technologies and techniques. There was also evidence of an implicit/explicit relationship of the material concerns to the intent and scope of the project. Submissions that maintained a sense of an over-riding concept or framework, even though individual works used quite different materials, media and processes, were able to sustain fluency and clarity of purpose. Experimental and explorative phases of work used new ideas and new synthesis. Successful workbooks often contained parallel investigations that further substantiated the decisions made within the portfolio, rather than simply reiterating those decisions.

Two common problems for submissions not achieving Scholarship were insufficiency of evidence and linear, repetitive variations around the same theme, rather than moving the project forward.

Submissions awarded Scholarship with outstanding performance acknowledged the aesthetic conventions and formal strategies used and capitalised on these to produce distinctive and original work.

4. Demonstrate critical awareness of a comprehensive range of traditional and contemporary models, examples and ideas relevant to the chosen field.

For the award of Scholarship, candidates were required to show how research informed their practice. They identified the factors influencing the development of work within the context of the candidate's individual proposal. Information or material gathered was used directly or indirectly to inform subsequent decisions. Links between research activities and subsequent work were evident and justifiable in forms relevant and appropriate to the candidate's personal interests. There were considered approaches to practical exploration and theoretical research, with one informing the other, so that candidates could substantiate their interests with authority and inventiveness.

Submissions not achieving Scholarship often misconstrued 'research' as preliminary location and discussion of as wide a variety of established models as possible, rather than understanding it as a self-reflexive critical analysis of established forms of practice. These submissions were characterised by the inappropriate addition of an artist model, selected superficially on the basis of subject matter or aesthetic similarity without understanding of intent or purpose. Citing significant influences can provide impetus to opening up conceptual or formal territory that provides a point of departure, but the artist model should not precede the question. Candidates needed to understand use of artist models as one aspect of the larger process of question formation to support the conceptual framework.

Quality of observation and analysis of artist models, own work, subject matter, media, contextual considerations and anything else that comes into the inquiry, is the basis for strong interpretation. Some submissions suggesting progress would introduce another, often distracting, artist model. This resulted in a linear development that denied candidates opportunities to synthesise and regenerate ideas.

Submissions that were awarded Scholarship with outstanding performance were those that actively demonstrated research as a productive means of informing practice.

5. Establish, reinforce and sustain links and relationships between workbook extracts and portfolio work, or equivalent.

Manual dexterity, visual acuity and strategic thinking were apparent in successful scholarship submissions, with meaningful connections contributing to a systematic and in-depth study. These connections were supportive of, and consistent with, the concepts and interests being pursued.

Successful submissions provided evidence in the workbooks of establishing, reinforcing and sustaining links and relationships, in the way work was undertaken, sequenced and cross-referenced.

Submissions awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance

In addition to meeting the criteria for Scholarship, the candidate will provide comprehensive evidence of ability to think and work laterally, and to show in their work, further options for development.

A sense of openness, inventiveness, breadth, decisiveness, sophistication, clarity of purpose, rigour and insight characterised workbook and portfolio submissions that achieved Scholarship with outstanding performance. Candidates attaining Scholarship with outstanding performance engaged in complex and successful programmes of study.

Additional Notes for Teachers

Developing the question, proposition, rationale or methodology

Candidates should consider carefully how to structure their individual questions. Just as working to a brief is an essential part of art/design methodology, candidates at this level must be able to revisit, reframe and remodel the inquiry. This process of continual negotiation of the question leads to the production of distinctive and original work.

Good practitioners maintain a balance between solving a brief or problem and challenging what that solution may be. To pre-empt decision making at the point the question is established negates the possibility of learning through discovery. A question that is open-ended, but not so broad that it is difficult to provide any traction, is the most effective. Framing a question should not predetermine specific

outcomes, nor preclude the necessity to revisit, reframe and remodel the inquiry in light of critical insights that emerge from the results and analysis of the practical activities undertaken. Questions will prove unmanageable if they are too broad or too narrow.

Useful approaches to the workbook

Candidates achieving Scholarship tended to use the workbook as a 'working document' in conjunction with the production of the portfolio. They used the workbook to document related activities that did not fit well into the portfolio and large scale projects. Workbooks were also used to photographically record ephemeral and time-based works, evidence of thinking laterally and developing further options.

Not so useful approaches to the workbook

Candidates should be made aware of the assessment specifications for the Scholarship standard, that stipulate that the workbook should consist of no more than eight single sided A3 pages. In cases where workbooks contained more than eight pages, the marking panel assessed the first eight pages only.

In some instances, workbooks resorted to rudimentary two pages of work for the '*Research an art-making tradition and discuss its links to relevant recent design practice*' standard, two pages of work for the '*Investigate and use ideas in the context of a drawing study in <art discipline>*' standards, and two pages entitled '*Further development*'. This approach is highly unlikely to meet the criteria for the award of Scholarship as it can fail to demonstrate the necessary coherence demanded of a systematic approach and sustain the links and relationships to the portfolio that would indicate a critical and decisive approach.

Candidates should understand the nature of the proposal as being a creative and intellectual critical structure, allowing them to generate and sustain a body of work that can shift and change when necessary. It is a framework that can help the candidate select evidence for the workbook. The misinterpretation of the workbook as a written post-analysis and evaluation of a programme of study disadvantaged students whose non-visual communication skills were not strong.

Passages of repetition that either overstated particular strategies, or overstated references to established practice, compromised the capacity of the workbook to provide sufficient evidence to meet the Scholarship criteria. Extensive communication of biographical information on artists was of little relevance to examiners. Likewise, lengthy explanations of literal processes about 'how to do' were of limited use in conveying critical underpinnings of the portfolio.

Workbooks constructed after the event of work for the '*Produce original work within <art discipline> to show extensive knowledge of art-making methods and ideas*' standards, or explanatory workbooks on planning the layout of a portfolio, were unlikely to demonstrate the body of work necessary to satisfy the criteria for Scholarship.

Some candidates produced an entirely visual workbook. This practice ran the risk of not being able to fully demonstrate all the criteria necessary for the award of Scholarship.

The workbook that operates as a fourth panel lacked clarification and synthesis. New options were required and simply adding a new outcome did not engage with the standard. In some instances, a new outcome detracted from the portfolio and took a superficial or backward step. This approach can fail to provide the connections needed to sustain the level of critical thinking and drawing already presented on the portfolio.

Extra 'stand alone' whole page artworks were a waste of space, especially if they were obviously rejects from the portfolio. Selection between portfolio and workbook needs to be carefully managed to offer access to thinking, rather than replication or poorer examples of what else has occurred. The focus needs to be in the portfolio as evidence of final outcomes, criticality, analysis and reflection. The workbook does offer these same opportunities, but its main focus is one of extrapolation, reinforcement and substantiation.

Assessment Schedule

Scholarship Visual Arts (93302)

Evidence Statement

Outcome description

The candidate will demonstrate the ability to think and work critically, fluently and comprehensively in the production of distinctive, original work to be presented as portfolio and workbook extracts. The work will provide evidence of research, analysis and understanding of strategies that critically underpin an individually conceived and driven proposal for Design, Painting, Photography, Printmaking or Sculpture.

Scholarship Criteria

The candidate will:

- research, test, refine, evaluate and synthesise ideas, processes, procedures, materials and techniques using a systematic approach
- use a critical and decisive approach to drawing in generating, analysing, clarifying and regenerating ideas in working towards and making original work
- use processes, procedures, materials and techniques with understanding, fluency and clarity of purpose
- demonstrate critical awareness of a comprehensive range of traditional and contemporary models, examples and ideas relevant to the chosen field
- establish, reinforce and sustain links and relationships between workbook extracts and portfolio work, or equivalent.

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance Criteria

In addition to meeting the criteria for Scholarship, the candidate will:

- provide comprehensive evidence of ability to think and work laterally, and to show in their work further options for development.