

Scholarship

2009 Assessment Report

Graphics

COMMENTARY

For the first time since the introduction of NCEA, there was a decrease in the number of Scholarship submissions, but the general standard in the quality of work being submitted was the highest ever.

At the top end, the highest quality of Outstanding Scholarship submissions varied in their approach and demonstrated strengths in a number of different ways to show that there is no single approach in attaining outstanding success.

In terms of presentation, candidates should have been aware of the need to ensure digital material was submitted in a readable format. There were many submissions that did not adhere to the Assessment Specification guidelines for acceptable digital formats, where the conventions and qualities associated with formal drawing are also applied to digital media, including the resolution of images and the communication and presentation of ideas. There were examples of poor quality computer-generated drawings or inappropriate software being employed in providing the evidence for presentation.

While many candidates used A3 presentation sheets to display design work, some did not demonstrate a fully articulated and well-detailed design process, having no evidence of thinking and ideas that would have shown a coherent and in-depth process.

Many submissions of this type showed excessive use of annotation, employed at the expense of the sufficient visual communication of ideas. Some such evidence looked polished, but lacked the detail and full consideration the candidate may have given to the project. Candidates who effectively employed visual diaries had greater success in terms of expressing a fuller range of ideas and a more in-depth and coherent design thinking. The more successful submissions used visual modes of communication (sketching, drawing, modelling, etc.) extensively in expressing design thinking.

In general, the successful candidates engaged with manageable problems that were well-defined, not too large-scale, yet open enough to allow the freedom to explore and generate ideas creatively and thoroughly. Projects that were of a substantial scale or complexity suffered from a lack of depth in design thinking. Some candidates addressed a broad range of aspects in a superficial and basic level rather than particular aspects in an in-depth manner. Hence some solutions were not adequately resolved. Some projects were too tightly defined, and followed a restricted and predictable fashion, making it quite difficult for these candidates to explore their own ideas and thinking in an imaginative fashion.

Candidates who attained Scholarship demonstrated a clear understanding of the design brief and were able to generate and graphically articulate their thinking in a relevant and integrative manner. These submissions proved compelling and convincing in their articulation, showing a confidence and assurance in their demonstration of skills and principles, and a clear understanding of the problem, its associated design considerations, and the skills and knowledge required to develop a well-defined solution.

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- articulated ideas that were imaginative and very well considered

- expressed design thinking that showed a thorough grasp of the brief situation and approached it in a lateral and creative manner
- applied a highly cohesive design process that synthesised design thinking and visual communication techniques
- explored design ideas in ways that were either quite divergent or exceptionally well considered
- articulated design ideas and thinking convincingly, with proficient visual communication skills that were highly assured and purposeful
- employed presentation techniques with a visual impact that was convincing and left a lasting impression.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- worked with an appropriate brief, thoroughly understanding and identifying with the nature, scope and details of the brief
- applied a cohesive design process demonstrating a coherent and integrative approach which explored a range of ideas and allowed the creative and innovative development of ideas in leading to a well-considered design outcome
- employed research material in a focused and informative manner that integrated effectively with the generation and refinement of ideas
- used research and inspirational models to underpin their design process, and to formulate a personal and unique solution as a result
- made good use of the study of existing practitioners' work to help with initial thinking and to guide thinking throughout the design process
- articulated ideas and design thinking confidently and emphatically, working in a way that reflected their own strengths and interests
- articulated confidently, the clear communication of ideas using suitable sketching, model-making and/or formal drawing (digital and/or manual) techniques
- explored design ideas from a variety of angles with sketches that, in many cases, communicated design development in an in-depth and detailed fashion, requiring little or no written annotation to explain the full intent of the idea or thinking
- used advanced drawing skills as a thinking tool as well as a communicating tool, best shown through the use of exploratory design sketching
- utilised presentation skills and techniques appropriately and with a high degree of proficiency and quality of application.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly:

- lacked the depth required at these levels; some submitted up to three units of work that were all comparable and lacked any indication of which was the primary unit for scholarship
- lacked a suitable brief, some being excessively prescriptive, some too simplistic, and some far too broad and complex
- applied a design process that was difficult to follow
- used a basic design process that had been worked through in a linear way, without showing the necessary depth of thinking

- showed examples of design thinking and processes that were disjointed and did not visually communicate effectively
- did not demonstrate any ability to research effectively, and showed a lack of purposeful connection between research and the development of a suitable outcome
- showed a considerable amount of research that was not used to inform the exploring and refining of their design ideas in any way
- did not demonstrate any design development towards a refined solution, in most cases due to a lack of detail consideration, lack of idea selection and refinement, or lack of directed exploration and experimentation
- showed details of the design explored independently without making connection to the overall design
- used development to explain how the design idea functioned rather than exploring the idea
- did not produce a well considered or resolved design solution (e.g. a predetermined solution was presented without consideration or influence of alternatives)
- did not adequately use visual communication as a key element in describing and developing design ideas, or in the production of refined outcomes
- used too many notes, to the detriment of effective visual communication, making it difficult to ascertain the visual qualities of their ideas
- did not demonstrate understanding of the principles associated with composition, layout and visual communication, nor show high level skills in the application of graphic modes and media techniques.