NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

Scholarship, 2005

Graphics
93602

National Statistics

Assessment Report

Graphics, Scholarship, 2005
93602

National Statistics

No. Scholarship Results	Results			
47	**Outstanding**	**Scholarship**	**Scholarship**	
	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort	No. Awards	% of L3 Cohort
	5	0.3%	42	2.3%

Commentary

Six criteria were developed to cover the six dimensions of graphics deemed necessary to achieve Scholarship. These required candidates to:

- clearly communicate the qualities of design and the intention of the designer
- demonstrate the skills needed to apply a wide variety of Graphics modes
- demonstrate the application of design processes and principles, integrating and synthesising Graphics knowledge with innovation
- demonstrate valid decision-making and effective generation of solutions
- articulate and justify ideas and solutions
- use high quality presentation techniques and principles to express ideas or solutions.

These criteria do not necessarily stand separately, with each requiring a specific outcome. They can also be inter-related. The nature of evidence allowed could not only be widely varied, depending on the nature of the design brief context, but could also feed towards more than one particular criterion at the same time.

Best-performing candidates

Candidates who achieved Scholarship level demonstrated higher-level critical-thinking by analysing their design ideas and progressing them through in-depth design dialogue (either drawn or annotated), and abstraction and generalisation through free exploration of initial ideas. They also showed the ability to integrate, synthesise and apply knowledge, skills, understanding and ideas within complex situations through in-depth research about the project requirements and identification of client needs.

Success was generally achieved through manageable problems that were well defined and not too broad, yet open enough to allow freedom to explore and generate ideas creatively and thoroughly. Many submissions were based on evidence generated from the negotiated brief that used a real client in a legitimate and relevant context.

Candidates who attained Scholarship demonstrated clear understanding of the design brief and were able to generate and graphically articulate their thinking effectively.

These submissions were compelling and convincing in their articulation, showing candidates' confidence and assurance in their demonstration of Graphics skills and principles.

All the top scholars were also able to clearly demonstrate, through a variety of highly effective communicative modes, a depth of analysis and clarity of thinking matched by few other scholarship candidates.

All the top scholars undertook architectural projects, supported by the media work they did for planning their presentation. Nonetheless, each of these scholars took different approaches to their respective situations and had different strengths.

These submissions were all 3D. While a strong media design could readily attain Scholarship, for Outstanding Scholarship a media project needed something additional to its inherent visual qualities, possibly something more conceptual and esoteric.

Other candidates

Candidates needed to show the necessary level of valid design decision-making and justification, along with effective communication, application of graphics modes, design processes and presentation techniques, to attain this level of performance.

The lower end of scholarship submissions did not show the necessary level of integration and synthesis with effect and innovation. While still strong submissions, these projects tended to be fairly direct and sequential, lacking analytical and reflective engagement.

The challenge for scholarship candidates is to have the skills to meet **all** the criteria at the necessary level. This means achieving a high standard of engagement, in-depth analysis, articulation, and execution of techniques. There were many instances where candidates performed very well in some of the criteria but fell down in others.

Some candidates who produced outstanding evidence of ability were disadvantaged by not having two linked Graphics areas in their submissions. Some submissions had evidence from two areas that were clearly not linked. Others comprised two related media briefs. Candidates and teachers need to be more familiar with the Assessment Specifications. In linking two areas, candidates increase their opportunities for showing evidence of integration – ie the blending or combining of a diverse range of design ideas and graphics knowledge.

Failure to provide evidence of the required range of graphics modes disadvantaged some otherwise high quality work. The Scholarship Performance Standard states that 2D and 3D sketching and instrumental drawing, along with annotation, are necessary as evidence of a range of modes. Some media projects lacked 3D drawing, although another supporting Graphics area usually compensated for this.

Candidates making submissions with a high digital emphasis, either using illustrative or CAD packages, often were unaware of the requirement for 2D and 3D sketching as supporting material. There were also submissions with high dependence on ruled lines throughout and which did not have the necessary sketching evidence.

In many instances candidates demonstrated a high level of engagement and in-depth analysis in research, but did not maintain that level for the rest of the design process.

Candidates need to recognise that the purpose of research is to inform and enhance design ideas and solutions. It is not simply be an exercise in in-depth gathering of knowledge about a topic or context relevant to the brief.

In some submissions the design stages were not linked through full justification or reason for design decision-making, which sometimes made the final solution appear in isolation to previous events. Even within particular stages of the design process there were instances of stand-alone ideas, with little flow between them. An effective design process empowers the designer to develop a highly refined and well-thought solution to the problem. Evidence of this is paramount.

The criterion most difficult to meet was the integration and synthesis of knowledge with innovation. A submission that showed a sequential process with quite discrete ideas tended not to articulate the necessary integration of ideas, elements and principles. In some cases, a linear design process may not be considered quite as helpful for generating this type of evidence. In terms of innovation, a degree of creative thinking, together with the integration of appropriate knowledge, often proved successful.

Candidates commonly expressed their ideas through extensive use of annotations. This is acceptable if there is an adequate amount of supporting graphic modes of visual communication (sketches, drawings, models etc). In cases where annotations were in essay form, candidates became overly reliant on their notes in the articulation of their ideas. Accordingly, the use of supporting drawings was lacking or poorly connected, making it difficult to ascertain the in-depth visual qualities of the ideas. Candidates should remember that visual communication is the primary mode of communication for the type of design contexts they will be working within.

When working with 3D design problems the use of appropriate pictorial modes of visual communication is important. In many instances, particularly in interior, landscape and architectural design contexts, candidates were limited in their expression of their ideas with appropriate pictorial modes, tending to restrict their evidence to an abundance of floor plans along with some elevations and sections. This was not an issue with briefs for product and industrial design and is generally not a concern in media design.

Some submissions developed a solution through an effective design process but were let down by final drawings that did not best represent the design ideas / solution. The final presentation of ideas could vary if it was appropriate to the brief. Presentation of solutions included formal drawings, artist impression sketches, PowerPoint displays, computer animations and modelling. Successful candidates in Achievement Standard 90735 generated higher quality presentations.

When working with computer software, the resolution of the final solution, especially in media design, is an important aspect of the demonstration of the accurate execution of skills. Image file size, printer settings and type, and quality of printing paper are all key ingredients to ensure success in this area.

The design brief.

The nature of the design brief/context is a key ingredient in submitting evidence for Scholarship.

Many candidates worked through quite large problems that made it more difficult for them to work to the necessary level of depth of engagement. Major problems arose when candidates attempted to cover all aspects with broad yet superficial strokes, rather than focus on one particular area.

It is important to recognise the capabilities of scholarship candidates and the timeframe available in determining the brief context that they will be working within. Likewise, a brief cannot be too simple or constrained, and thereby allow little scope for candidates to explore and extend their design ideas.

Candidates who engaged successfully with Achievement Standard 90734 frequently performed well in Scholarship.

Candidates who were able to effectively engage in ongoing negotiation with a real client frequently generated highly in-depth and relevant work. The client often encouraged vibrant discussion and further exploration of the situation, which helped candidates towards firm decisions in cases where they submitted a variety of ideas.

It was apparent that some schools should do fewer units of work and, instead, challenge their scholarship candidates with relevant contexts of learning and by focusing them on producing quality work of greater depth and detail. For Scholarship, one Graphics area is of primary concern for providing the necessary depth of evidence. A secondary supporting area adds some breadth to that evidence.

Quality rather than quantity is important to achieving scholarship success. This is in keeping with the notion of in-depth engagement being more beneficial than broad, superficial strokes. By its very nature, in-depth engagement will generate the necessary quantity.

Performance of the 2005 cohort

Candidates need to be familiar with the details of the scholarship standard and the Assessment Specifications to optimise their opportunities for success.

Success in the NCEA Level 3 achievement standards can provide an excellent springboard for the development of successful scholarship material.

Schools need to continue to develop students' skills in visual communication as a key element in describing design ideas and showing design development. The ability to confidently and clearly articulate ideas using sketching, instrumental drawing and annotation is essential for attaining Scholarship.

Schools need to review the skills and student engagement necessary for a higher standard of achievement in Scholarship. This is particularly important in terms of building ways of developing thinking and interactive dialogue that support a depth of purpose and design meaning associated with authentic projects.

Given the breadth of design, candidates should be encouraged to work to their strengths and to have the opportunity to present their own voice. The 2005 assessment process showed that no single method or approach will ensure success. Many of the candidates who gained Scholarship, and in particular the top scholars, were able to articulate their own voice confidently and emphatically, with superb results.