

# Assessment Report

---

## On this page

[Level 1 Design and Visual Communication 2019](#) ▼

## Level 1 Design and Visual Communication 2019

---

Standards [91063](#) [91064](#) [91065](#)

91063: Produce freehand sketches that communicate design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- communicated their own design ideas
- submitted sketches that communicated either functional or aesthetic qualities of their design, but not both
- used a limited range of recognised sketching techniques
- provided some evidence of design exploration but did not explore any one area in depth
- produced appropriate sketches but did not use design briefs or contexts that provided the scope to produce anything but simplistic ideas
- showed a variety of design ideas and sketching techniques
- presented ideas about aesthetics, shape or form with no further exploration or refinement

- presented design detail that lacked clarity or that was unrelated to the design ideas.

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

- did not communicate their own design ideas in response to a design brief
- submitted photocopied, instrumental or digitally generated work
- submitted sketched drawings showing only 2-D or 3-D views, when both are required
- produced sketches that attempted to address aesthetic values, but were completely unrelated to the candidate's own design ideas
- did not use recognised sketching techniques.

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

- used a wide range of sketching 2-D and 3-D methods clearly showing an exploration of design ideas, e.g. considering a range of alternatives at the conceptual stage or refinement in the development stage
- communicated visually more than surface details and features, e.g. construction or interior components or some aspects of its use, but not with the consistent clarity required for Excellence
- included some communication of aesthetic and functional aspects of their design ideas
- showed proportion by having either dimensions, a person / human body part for scale or showed proportion between key features of their design
- rendered designs to clearly indicate materials, textures and / or surface finishes.

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

- communicated ideas relevant to the design – indicating that candidates had processed what they had learnt from their research and applied this learning into their designs
- communicated function well through sectional, detail and exploded views showing construction details, human forms such as hands interacting with design ideas and the object by showing it in use and / or context
- communicated aesthetic qualities such as form, shape, texture, surface finish that clearly indicated the materials being used

- produced a wide range of sketches, including thumbnails, showing the evolution of the design (arrows were often used to communicate a process, function or movement)
- clearly conveyed an aspect of the design through a series of related sketches, e.g. the operational sequence of a mechanical device or the evolution of an aspect of the design
- submitted work on a context that the candidate had clearly related to and that had enough scope to explore and refine design ideas to a level where a comprehensive set of sketches could communicate both aesthetic and functional details in depth
- used a combination of technical sketches (exploded / sectional / sequential) to show in-depth knowledge of their design ideas. These drawings were related to one idea and were consistent in proportion and style showing effective communication.

### **Standard specific comments**

Candidates who engaged in an authentic and thorough design process often presented their work in a logical sequence. They clearly communicated the evolution and refinement of their own ideas in greater depth, often producing a series of related sketches.

Candidates who only communicated design ideas at a concept stage or followed a highly structured or directed design process found it hard to move beyond Achievement. Candidates were hindered in some cases by the submission of responses to multiple design briefs as it held them back from reaching the required depth / body of sketches necessary for Excellence.

Candidates should explore the use, operation and context of the object they are designing. For example, if they develop the mechanism of a child's mechanical toy, they should explore the ergonomic relationship between the toy and child. Exploring the relationship between the user, object and context is a means of communicating the intent of the design.

Some design briefs limit the candidate's opportunity to generate appropriate evidence for the standard. For example, static objects with no moving parts tend not to have sufficient complexity to explore the object in depth.

Too much irrelevant work continues to be submitted (photocopied pages, research, ruled work). The explanatory notes of the standard specifically indicate that work that is digitally produced or been drawn with instruments (scanned,

photocopied, printed from an image, technical drawings, etc) is excluded from the marking process.

Attempting complicated ideation is not necessary or helpful at Level 1. It leads to designs that are too difficult to sketch and too complex for most level 1 candidates.

Candidates who submit spatial design work should use spatial design skills such as bubble diagrams, flow / movement through the space and sketches showing a range of views (interior angles, one-point perspective, etc.) to ensure drawings have enough depth / complexity.

Candidates who integrate a significant amount of research (written and digitally sourced) into their submission run the risk of losing clarity of the design process they are showing through freehand sketching. It makes the work hard to read visually and means that they often fall back on non-freehand methods of communicating functional aspects.

## **Fashion/Textiles**

Copied / traced construction diagrams from patterns do not conform to standard requirements as they are neither freehand nor the candidates own design ideas.

Some fashion projects did not have 3D views – both 2D and 3D are required

Observational drawings copied directly from fashion patterns, spatial design books, construction details or images from the internet were often unrelated to the design work.

Textiles submissions showed strength when exploring designs that allowed clear communication of design intent, for example, items that could be contained in a bag, or how a fashion product functioned on the body, e.g. fastenings, etc.

Textiles submissions were successful when pattern and construction details clearly linked to relevant design ideas. Using arrows to show where on the design these details apply contributes to the clarity and coherence of the design.

Pattern pieces should be drawn in proportion to one another and suggest a sequence of construction.

---

## 91064: Produce instrumental, multi-view orthographic drawings that communicate technical features of design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- showed basic design ideas with two or more aligned views
- labelled views either in writing or with correctly labelled reference lines
- used correct line weights for construction and lining in
- used squares and compasses to construct instrument drawings appropriately
- showed basic scale and dimensioning skills.

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

- did not use a compass to construct circle work, using freehand lining instead
- presented views that were not aligned
- one view on a sheet
- gave no indication of scale or dimensions
- presented views that were not labelled in writing or with correctly labelled reference lines
- presented very basic geometric shapes with no design features
- submitted class exercises with no or very little design input.

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

- used and indicated scale that was correctly verified by full size dimensions
- showed detail not visible with hidden detail and or section view
- used correct conventions for sections, dimensioning and labelling. Most CAD submission had settings configured to NZ standards this year
- presented fewer drawings, but those drawings showed complex shape and form.

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

- verified scale with dimensions accurately
- used a recommended scale to construct drawings

- showed in depth information of parts and assembly methods
- had all CAD settings configured to appropriate conventions
- showed details that provided more information not already clear.

### Standard specific comments

CAD drawings of buildings not showing detail in sections or not using conventions for concrete and cut timber, etc., often did not move beyond Achievement, as they were not clearly detailed.

Teacher directed templates with very little candidate design input, and detail drawings that were very similar made it difficult for candidates to clearly communicate technical design features.

It was pleasing to see evidence of a better understanding of scale and dimensioning, and the use of clear sectional views in candidate work.

---

## 91065: Produce instrumental paraline drawings to communicate design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- presented one drawing only using a paraline method with no other supporting drawings to communicate additional detail
- presented drawings that lacked complex form
- presented multiple drawings using different paraline methods, but the drawings were not linked to a common design or context
- communicated limited design features. Some design ideas had complex form but failed to clearly communicate detailed features of the design
- presented quality drawings but failed to communicate features not visible in the external outline. For example, an open drawer on a desk / workstation or a basic exploded drawing (no joint or fastening detail) does not communicate any additional information
- presented the same drawing using different paraline methods.

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

- completed most drawings freehand. Instruments may have only been used for crating
- did not communicate a design idea (none or minimal design features described)
- did not present a paraline drawing, including a perspective (non-paraline) drawing instead
- presented a class exercise where only design detail had been added
- presented incomplete drawings
- presented a drawing that was very basic / simplistic which made it difficult to see any design idea.

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

- showed design detail features
- presented supporting drawings that revealed other information about the design that was not visible in the external outline
- communicated information clearly with design detail drawn to appropriate size
- presented drawings that had a degree of complexity.

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

- presented drawings of a high quality with precise line work, e.g. circles were seamless, line weights were clear and did not detract from the information the drawings were communicating
- used an appropriate scale to draw details
- submitted a body of related supporting drawings that communicated further in-depth detail / features / information, e.g. joints, fittings, fastenings, sequential operation, construction details
- submitted drawings (including sectional drawings) that each communicated other / new information about the design
- submitted product design contexts (including furniture) that often gave the scope for candidates to achieve at higher levels, as the submissions communicated things such as operation, assembly, different parts using related drawings.

## Standard specific comments

The choice of brief or context is critical. If the context is too simplistic or limited there is no real scope for candidates to explore a design idea in any depth or with any detail.

Using rendering in CAD can hide detail, affect precision, accuracy and clarity.

Detailed features need to be drawn to a suitable scale or size. In some cases, an enlarged drawing was used to assist in the communication of additional detail. It was good to see some candidates adding dimensions to their drawings when a scale was shown.

When drawing a design around a standard component, the redrawn component cannot be considered as a design idea for assessment, e.g. light fittings used in a lamp design.

For architectural contexts or briefs candidates must show other detail such as construction, framing of walls, roof etc to achieve at a merit or excellence level.

This standard is about presenting and communicating a body of work for a design idea using paraline drawing methods to present work that is accurate, of high quality and that communicates information about the design idea. It is not about showing a design idea using different paraline methods, e.g. the same drawing using three different paraline methods.

Many architectural CAD drawings communicated the outside of a building then supported this by another drawing with the roof removed to communicate internal features (mainly walls or rooms). However, it should be noted that to communicate in-depth detail (construction detail) the face walls and roof needs to be removed. There was also a noticeable amount of library dumping of furniture, fittings and other items. These are not design ideas or technical features. It would be better to communicate more detail of the building such as construction or structural details.

CAD drawings showing too many lines in a wire frame drawing resulted in the drawing became confusing and lacking in clarity.

# [Design and Visual Communication subject page](#)

## **Previous years' reports**

[2016 \(PDF, 220KB\)](#)

[2017 \(PDF, 54KB\)](#)

[2018 \(PDF, 111KB\)](#)

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority