

# Assessment Report

## Level 1 Design and Visual Communication 2016

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

### 91063: Produce freehand sketches that communicate design ideas

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- submitted sketches that communicated either functional or aesthetic qualities of their design, but not both
- used a limited range of recognised sketching techniques
- demonstrated some evidence of design exploration but did not explore any area in depth
- produced appropriate sketches using design briefs or contexts that did not provide the scope for candidates to produce anything other than simplistic ideas. Opportunities that would focus on deeper development of ideas would help candidates to improve their grades.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not communicate their own design ideas in response to a design brief
- submitted instrumental or digitally generated work
- produced sketches that showed only 2-D or 3-D views, when both were required
- attempted to address aesthetic values, but sketches were completely unrelated to the candidate's 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 which clearly showed an exploration of design ideas, e.g. considering a range of alternatives at the conceptual stage or showing refinement in the development stage
- showed more than surface details and features, such as construction or interior components
- submitted sketches containing evidence (often linked) from both product and spatial design contexts. As they could show more detail across the two contexts, these candidates were more likely to gain Merit grades, or higher

- showed proportion by having either dimensions, a person/human body part in their design, or the object in use.

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

- included drawings that utilised a variety of sketching techniques relevant to the design subject, some clearly showing ideation strategies
- 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
- submitted work on a context that the candidate has clearly related to and had enough scope to explore and refine design ideas to a level where a comprehensive set of sketches could communicate both functional and aesthetic details in depth.

### Standard-specific comments

Candidates who engaged in a thorough design process tended to present their work logically, communicating the evolution and refinement of their own ideas with greater success.

Design development sketches allowed candidates to examine the object in greater detail and use a wider range of techniques. Candidates who only communicated design ideas at a concept stage found it hard to move beyond Achievement.

Including evidence from both the product and spatial contexts allows students to demonstrate a wider range of skills and techniques.

Freehand drawing needs to encompass the user of the object, or the object in context in some way, to show proportion more appropriately.

Some design briefs limit the candidate's opportunity to generate appropriate evidence for the standard. For example, static objects with no moving parts tend to have insufficient scale and a lack of complexity to be able to explore the object in depth.

Some submissions showed evidence of the types of sketches listed as examples in the Excellence criteria of the schedule but did not achieve at that level because the sketches were not directly contributing to the evolution or refinement of the design.

Although it is sound pedagogy to scaffold students to higher levels – for example, ideation strategies – candidates must still demonstrate the skills required for this standard. A predominance of ideation sketching in a portfolio at this level can preclude the candidate from achieving at either Merit or Excellence, where consideration of both aesthetic and functional properties of a design are required.

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- produced at least two views using projection, including some common conventions, such as title, orthographic symbol, labelled reference lines, and drawing title
- produced CAD drawings with some correct setting of line types and conventions
- drew clearly detailed drawings showing complex shape or form but did not draw to an indicated scale, verified by dimensioning.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- did not show candidate's own individual design ideas, such as class exercises
- selected a design of inadequate complexity – for example, simple furniture, letterboxes
- showed no evidence of projection between views – for example, plans and elevations each on separate sheets or pages
- provided insufficient evidence of multi-view instrumental drawing knowledge and conventions.

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

- projected views accurately, including a sectional view or hidden detail that communicated more information than the main views
- produced drawings based on more complex forms that used appropriate construction techniques
- used appropriate conventions consistently – for example: title, labelling, correct differentiation between line types
- used CAD with settings correctly applied to produce neat, accurate construction and correctly applied conventions.

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

- produced drawings that showed a high level of construction skills
- produced multiple drawings that clearly showed adequate details without excessive detailing within the drawing that reduced the overall clarity
- used CAD programmes effectively to present high-quality drawings of internal and external detailing, showing the accuracy of construction and correct application of conventions.

### Standard-specific comments

The submission of CAD drawings has become more common. There is a wide range of achievement from these drawings, primarily influenced by the candidate and teacher's understanding and ability to set correct line types, conventions, and print parameters.

The correct application of conventions is not limited to CAD drawings. There is a general decline in the correct use of title block, labelling and dimensioning conventions.

Candidates should ensure that evidence produced using architectural drawing or 3-D modelling software, employ the principles of orthographic projection.

Apart from construction and presentation quality, success is influenced by the design ideas in this standard. Simple design ideas that lack internal components may limit the candidate's ability to achieve at higher levels.

Conversely, designs that are too complex in detail or form may also limit the candidate's ability to clearly show internal detail, or show construction, or complex shape or form.

---

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

Candidates who were awarded **Achievement** commonly:

- submitted constructed drawings that communicated only exterior form
- produced work with only one view constructed
- submitting two or more drawings that did not relate to each other
- showed limited detail of internal components
- used CAD or 3-D modelling programmes to produce multiple drawings that did not add any further detail.

Candidates who were assessed as **Not Achieved** commonly:

- had minimal design ideas
- submitted evidence where a substantial part of the drawing was of a generic design common to the class and included minimal candidate-generated response to a design brief
- included rendering in their drawings which obscured any evidence of construction and line-work
- contained work drawn in perspective, which is not a parallel line pictorial method.

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

- outlined details of internal parts of their design by drawing exploded views
- enhanced their drawings by producing additional views to show further details of their design ideas
- produced drawings that were accurate and complete, using appropriate line weighting
- produced complex form that was effectively communicated using CAD but did not control hidden detail, producing wireframe drawings that cause visual confusion.

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

- constructed accurately drawn, high-quality drawings, which showed design ideas from multiple viewpoints, for example; internal detailing and/or design features shown through a series of related drawings, rather than a singular drawing
- contained a series of views which showed detailing through accurately constructed drawings – for example: sectioned, exploded and/or cut-away views
- produced a single, exploded view that communicated all design features of the object
- produced CAD drawings of their final design, which showed appropriate detail – for example: exploded, sequence and/or sectional views.

### **Standard-specific comments**

Drawings that included geometric construction of complex shape to a general complex form, often achieved at higher levels.

Some candidates who used CAD did not enter this standard, even though they entered the orthographic drawing standard; however, many who entered the paraline drawing standard also entered the orthographic standard.

Drawings created in CAD and modelling programmes can include substantial amounts of hidden detail. If too much is included, the drawing can become difficult to read and therefore do not meet the criterion for effectively communicating in-depth information.

Output from drawing or modelling programmes in bitmap form pixelates when printed at large sizes, and therefore cannot meet the 'clear and precise line-work' criterion for Achievement with Excellence.

Some candidates submitted multiple views of the same object drawn using different methods with the same view point that did not communicate any additional information. Related drawings are two or more drawings of the same object where each drawing communicates information not visible in the other drawing(s).

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

---

Copyright © New Zealand Qualifications Authority