NZQA
New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa

Assessment Report

On this page

[90916: Produce a body of work informed by established practice, which develops ideas, using a range of media](#) ▼

Level 1 Visual Arts 2018

90916: Produce a body of work informed by established practice, which develops ideas, using a range of media

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- operated at Level 6 of the New Zealand Curriculum across a range of art-making practices (this tended to equate to at least four completed works per panel, covering approximately 95% of the folio; production time should be approximately 120 hours of teaching, learning and making

- used a range (two or more) of media, but did not always select and use media that best suited their intended purpose

- at the higher end of the grade range, showed some control of media, but did not sustain this sufficiently across both panels of the submission

- did not build on areas of technical strength or successful media from early in the submission

- produced a body of work that developed ideas but seemed to lack a system, or identify relationships between works that would move the body of work forward

- showed awareness of the conventions of the field in which they were working

- had a thematic approach to the development of ideas

- at the lower end of the grade range, worked from a narrow proposition that limited the development of ideas

- at the lower end of the grade range, produced repetitive singular works or had a heavy reliance on tracing, which was limiting in terms of showing candidates' skills and creativity

- made reference to established practice in the form of recognisable models and / or conventions appropriate to the domain or field in which they were producing work

- made explicit reference to artist models and, in some cases, appropriated without demonstrating the candidate's own interpretation or understanding

- used artist models that were not well matched to the students in terms of media selection or techniques

- recorded accurately from subject matter

- repeated imagery, rather than using different approaches to the subject matter

- combined elements from earlier work in a simple way in order to develop new work

- showed limited understanding of size and scale of art works in relation to each other, or struggled with the change of scale when moving from small to large works

- when producing design-based submissions, showed limited understanding of text (e.g. readability, appropriate font selection and hierarchy)

- when producing design-based submissions, showed limited understanding of the conventions of the product they were designing

- when producing design-based submissions, generated some of their own source imagery

Submissions at this level often benefitted from a scaffolded programme that capitalised on student interest and level of skill.

Candidates whose work was assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- operated below New Zealand Curriculum Level 6 in their ability to use media

- did not complete or fill two folio boards (in some cases, this was half to one panel completely empty, but it also appeared in the form of works presented with excessive amounts of white space around and between them)

- presented submissions where a significant number of pieces were below NZC Level 6

- struggled with the fundamental skills required to record information

- worked from subject matter that did not allow the candidate to show an appropriate level of skill

- presented unrelated or repetitive work that failed to develop ideas

- used media that was not suited to the purpose (e.g. a majority of simple pencil drawings)

- did not show understanding of art-making tikanga (e.g. stretched photos)

- did not make reference to established practice or art-making conventions appropriate to the field in which they were working

- did not work to candidates' strengths, instead working in media with which the candidate was not confident

- produced very repetitive works, such as repeating the same subject matter from only one or two viewpoints

- relied on collage without any engagement with established collage practice

- traced images or worked over the top of photocopies, which restricted the candidate's ability to demonstrate competence at the appropriate curriculum level

- submitted a collection of 'one-off' or unrelated images, which did not develop ideas

- relied on large-scale works to cover the folio

- relied on multiple copies of prints or photographs to fill space (this was most evident in photography and design-based submissions).

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

- showed an understanding of their idea or proposition, and were able to make some of their own decisions within a scaffolded programme

- showed a personal engagement with the subject matter and proposition

- generated a range of useful possibilities at concept stages

- showed purposeful selection and arrangement of works with reference to pictorial elements, compositional devices, and ideas

- showed the ability to successfully combine conventions from previous series to create new work

- used a range of different compositions in each series of work

- coped successfully with media changes and scale shifts from smaller works to larger, more refined ones

- used compositional devices, motifs, symbolism and colour palette to provide coherency across the submission

- selected media appropriate to the conventions or field in which they were working, and used it with control

- made decisions regarding colour that supported relationships between the works and moved the body of work forward

- showed an understanding of colour theory, colour mixing and surface

- made implicit references to artist models and established practice, rather than direct representations of particular examples of models' work

- when closely referencing artist models, showed understanding of, or further reflection on, the models being used

- when producing design-based submissions, worked with their own source imagery

- when producing digital moving image submissions, investigated an idea in series or a sequence, but often revisited and repeated earlier techniques (e.g. addition of line, animation, colour adjustments) rather than moving forward with new approaches

- progressed their ideas in a systematic manner; however, this idea development was sometimes repetitive

- identified successful elements within earlier works and further explored these

- showed a clear understanding of line, shape, tonal variation and form in drawings

- at the lower end of the grade range, controlled one media more successfully than others

- presented a logical pictorial development of ideas that showed the candidate had been thinking about their next steps.

Submissions that were close to Excellence, but remained in the Merit grade range commonly: appeared to have run out of ideas in the second panel and showed a lot of repetition or rephrasing of previous ideas, rather than developing into new work; showed some fluency with media, but not consistently across both panels.

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

- began from a clear proposition that was sufficiently focused to allow depth of investigation, without being so narrow as to inhibit diverse ideas

- engaged with ideas in a way that showed strong student voice, even when working within rigid programmes

- took ownership of the ideas and subject matter with which they were working

- showed student reflection on the ideas being explored

- selected, and used with confidence, media appropriate to the ideas they were investigating

- showed consistent fluency with the range of media used

- worked in media that highlighted the individual candidate's strengths

- used colour in a sophisticated manner

- showed an understanding of the properties and limitations of the media with which they were working

- explored their subject matter from a range of viewpoints and perspectives, often moving work forward in unexpected directions

- investigated each idea thoroughly

- investigated ideas and media adventurously

- used stylistic and pictorial conventions that were appropriate to their proposition

- showed understanding of pictorial space

- referenced a range of established practice

- explored multiple outcomes for an idea and extended and refined the more successful ones

- made clear links to established practice, but developed their own interpretations rather than emulating the model's work

- demonstrated critical thinking in decisions about composition and developing ideas, building clear relationships between the works that were often innovative and interesting

- ordered their works to show a clarification of ideas, although this did not always take place at the end of the folio

- when producing design-based submissions, had understanding of designing for purpose, and successfully combined image and type to meet the brief

- showed understanding of relevant art-making tikanga or conventions of the field in which they were working and used these to advance and clarify their ideas (e.g. use of depth of field in photographic works; font selection for double-page spreads in design works)

- when producing digital moving image submissions, used appropriate transitions to aid the reading of the work

- when producing digital moving image submissions, showed clear evidence of reviewing and editing sound to aid reading of each series or sequence

- when producing photographic or video work, showed good understanding of lighting.

Programmes of teaching and learning that supported candidates to achieve at this level provided sufficient structure to give the candidate direction, but allowed them to take ownership of the visual and conceptual elements of the body of work.

Standard specific comments

Once again, schools presented a diverse and interesting range of candidate submissions for this assessment. Teacher decision-making, both for the assessment of candidate work and the guiding of students in their learning reflects a high level of competence, and the vast majority of assessment decisions were accurate.

However, it was concerning to see another significant increase in the number of Review Reports being required. In 2018, there were almost double the number from 2016, prior to which the number of reports required had been relatively consistent.

Schools are encouraged to seek the art teacher professional development that is available, and to make use of the ANZAAE and regional subject associations to help them improve programme development and assessment accuracy.

Programmes of teaching and learning that lead to successful work commonly provided a structure that gave clear guidance to learners, while, at the same time, leaving room for independent decision-making. They allowed for skill and technique development within two or three key media, reflected student voice and interests, and took into account cultural protocols and beliefs. It was evident that students had developed their conceptual and technical skills and understanding of art-making practice through a strong programme of junior art, and the folio benefitted from this multi-year grounding.

There was a small increase in digital moving image (DMI) folio submissions, but this remains a small part of the Level 1 cohort. The folios submitted for AS90916 were by and large of a good quality and accurately assessed. Successful DMI submissions use the same good practice as for traditional folio presentation. It occurs when candidates are able to learn in small bite-sized chunks, allowing time to critically reflect, select and refine, to build on ideas, and to layer nuance and sophistication through a process of learning and developing their visual ideas. Teachers and students wishing to know more about this mode of submission should consult the Level 2 Visual Arts External Assessment Report.

Teachers are reminded to ensure that candidates comply with all submission requirements. Candidate numbers (including the school number) should be the correct size and displayed on the top right-hand corner of the artwork side of the folio to ensure the correct grade is assigned to the candidate who made the work. In 2018, there was a significant increase in the number of folios that had work stuck on with only Blu-tak. This is not an acceptable adhesive, as works can detach and be lost, potentially causing the candidate to fail the standard.

The benchmark folios selected for the NZQA website from the 2017 and 2018 assessment rounds have been picked as examples of coherent and well-structured programmes. Teachers are encouraged to read the commentary and view the benchmarks from this point of view, as well as to assist them in making assessment decisions.

Visual Arts subject page

Previous years' reports

[2017 (PDF, 54KB)](#)   [2016 (PDF, 222KB)](#)

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority