



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

National Qualifications Framework Levels 1-3, 2006

Visual Arts

National Moderator's Report

National Moderator's Report

General Guidance for Assessors of Achievement and Unit Standards

The purpose of external moderation is twofold. The first is to provide reassurance that assessor judgements are at the national standard. The second, that the assessment activities being offered to learners are fair and valid, and provide them with the best opportunity to meet the standard.

All assessment materials are expected to:

- give the learner the opportunity to meet the requirements of the standard at all levels
- have an assessment schedule that gives evidence of appropriate learner responses and clear judgements at all levels.

The Ministry of Education contracted subject experts to write assessment resources for achievement standards. These are not pre-moderated. The intention is that they are modified to suit teaching programmes and learner needs. They do not provide “rules” but suggest different ways of assessing to the nationally registered standard.

General Overall Comment

Many schools have clearly read the instructions for the sending away of work for moderation, and send well-packaged, well-labelled work. However, there are still many schools for which there are issues. These include: work that is not bound properly (there are a number of appropriate methods that may be used, eg. Clearfile, spiral binding, stapling); work that is not clearly labelled, or not labelled at all; work sent with moderation documentation that is not filled in accurately. This slows down and hampers efficient moderation of school materials.

Incomplete Activities

Some schools have chosen to send in only formatively assessed work, and/or incomplete activities for moderation. When this occurs, moderators have little choice but to send the work back un-moderated. Only learners' work that is complete and has been submitted for final assessment should be sent in for moderation.

Digital Submissions

With the requirement that all moderation submissions include learner samples, there has been a notable increase in the amount of photocopied and digitally recorded learner material. It is particularly important that research standards be represented by reproductions of sufficient quality to enable written text to be legible. In some cases, the poor quality of reproduction impeded the reading of text, making moderation difficult or impossible. Teachers are reminded to refer to *Assessment Matters Circular A2006/025: Guidelines for Submission of Visual Arts Moderation Materials using Electronic Media*.

Copied Samples

Another issue that arises frequently during the moderation process is the copying of learner work. Well-copied samples present sufficient information for moderation, as well as providing a useful resource for schools. However, there are many schools that are still submitting poorly copied or inappropriate samples. Poor quality black and white

photocopies are particularly problematic where colour and fine surface detail are significant aspects of learner exploration.

Version Numbers

Some confusion exists about the requirement for the version number on the moderation cover sheet. This is asking for the version of the standard that learners have been assessed against. It is important to note that this is different to the version number given to resources available on the TKI website. These numbers indicate the latest version of each resource.

As a result of changes to standards resulting from the standards review process, new versions of the existing standards are registered. In fairness to all learners, schools are advised to assess against the latest version of registered standards. This year, several schools were still using draft versions of standards, even though the currently registered standard is version two.

Other errors involving versions included the use of the title and purpose statement from version one, but the assessment criteria from version 2. In 2006, schools could use either version one or version two of the level 3 achievement standards, but not a hybrid of both. Schools and departments need procedures in place that ensure they are using only currently registered standards.

Credit weighting

It is pleasing to note that many schools have recognised learner workload issues relating to the research standards in particular, and have adjusted assessment activities accordingly. There are still some schools though, that require a large amount of often repetitive work, which does not specifically relate to the evidence required for the standards. During the annual cycle of course revision, schools should review the workload requirements for each of the standards, particularly the research standards. Conversely, some schools have significantly limited the amount of work for the three drawing standards. Four to five drawings for an assessment against a five or six credit standard, do not provide sufficient opportunity for learners to meet the standard.

Level 1

90018: *Research art and artworks from Maori and European traditions and their context(s)*

Teachers are providing learners with opportunities to meet this standard by providing carefully planned programmes for them to work through. Assessor decisions are generally becoming more accurate against the national standard.

Assessors may wish to scaffold answers for learners, by providing word lists and suggested prompts for answers for example. However, in order to better meet the requirements for achievement with excellence in particular, it is important that learners are given opportunities to answer open ended questions that extend the use of their own words. A “depth of understanding” can be difficult for learners to demonstrate when the teaching and learning programme has created significant constraints on learning.

When researching art and artwork from Maori and European traditions, the work of artists from other cultures (i.e. Pasifika) may be studied, but does not replace the requirement for learners to still study Maori AND European traditions. It is important to check explanatory note 3 associated with this point.

Learners should focus on comments that specifically relate to art and artworks. Excessive writing centred on artists' biographical details are largely unnecessary. The use of templates and visual mind maps are useful tools to systematically guide learner responses when comparing and analysing art works. The selection of art and artworks that was relatively easy for the learners to understand, and captured their interest, often allowed for higher-level personal learner response.

It is positive to note that fewer providers are overloading the learners with an excessive quantity of work for assessment against this standard. Assessment tasks submitted are often much more carefully targeted to allow learners to meet the requirements of the standard. However, some samples submitted for moderation consisted of minimal amounts of work. It is important to keep in mind that the amount of teaching and learning required prior to assessment of this standard should reflect the three credit value of the standard.

More schools are teaching programmes that integrate achievement standards 90018, 90019, 90020 and 90021 in some way. This is effective as work that is analysed for 90018 can be used to inform technique, compositional convention or idea development in practical work. If this approach is followed, providers need to develop ways to clearly present work for moderation. In some successful examples, learners had used a workbook approach for 90018, 90019 and 90021, with carefully coded or labelled pages.

90019: Use drawing processes and procedures

The intent of this standard is generally well understood by assessors. The assessment activities presented for moderation indicated that many had continued to provide increased opportunities for learners to meet the requirements of the standard at all levels.

When drawing activities and conventions were related well to the subject matter being used, learner responses showed greater understanding. In particular, many assessment activities enabled learners to develop skills in recording information and developing ideas using wet and dry media. When the conventions studied were appropriate and well understood by the learners, incremental steps in learning were obvious and richer results were provided.

Learner responses indicate a wide range of programmes and approaches are being used in schools. This standard provides a good base for learning and is being well integrated with other standards. More schools are creating learner centred programmes of work, which integrate standards.

The amount of work asked for by assessors was generally appropriate, and most of the work submitted by the learners was specific to the requirements of the achievement standards. Assessors should refer back to previous years' moderator reports and the explanatory notes for more detail.

90021: *Extend ideas in media and techniques to produce new work*

Work submitted for assessment against this standard shows that learners have been provided with sufficient opportunities to extend their thinking. While it is not expected that learner work needs to be in a different media than used elsewhere in the teaching programme, many providers use this standard to assess sculpture or printmaking activities. Following the intent of the standard, it is important that learners produce new work, and not the same work or compositions, in another media.

For learners to use *a study of artists' works to evaluate, clarify and extend ideas*, it is important that assessment materials presented for moderation show the steps in the learners' thinking. This may be through a series of maquettes, sequences of drawings, print experimentations or drawing notes. Learners need to show this evidence in order to achieve with merit or excellence.

Level 2

90233, 90471, 90472, 90473, 90474: *Research and document methods and ideas in the context of a drawings study in (painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture, design)*

The requirement to *document methods and ideas* was generally well understood by schools, with a wide variety of activities being submitted that fulfilled this criterion. As well as conventional short essay responses, activities submitted included mind maps, tables, annotations, and bullet points, which provided ample opportunity for learners to develop an understanding of particular artists' techniques and conventions.

A written component is an effective method of gaining understanding about pictorial issues and is a useful way to approach artists' works in the initial activities. However, activities need to be carefully balanced to ensure that written responses are not prioritised at the expense of the second criterion, which requires learners to use materials, tools, techniques and processes in the context of a drawing study. Clear links need to be established between research and practical aspects of the programme to ensure that learners meet the first criterion. A clear and strong relationship between the research activities and practical work enhances learner understanding of the methods and ideas being studied, as well as providing greater opportunity to achieve with merit or excellence.

The requirement of the first criterion to apply methods and ideas in the context of the learners' own work continues to be a problematic area for a number of learners. A series of unrelated studies often appeared to confuse rather than enhance learner understanding of specific pictorial themes and approaches. Unrestricted or unguided learner selection of artist models can impede rather than increase a learner's ability to meet the requirements of the standard.

In many cases, programmes allowed learners to investigate artist models from outside the specific field of study. However, as the second criterion is field-specific, it is both

appropriate and prudent to ensure that learners explore and understand field-specific terms and conventions.

The majority of school-based tasks and activities provided ample opportunity for learners to meet the standard, although a more focused research direction would help to guide learners towards the specific discussions of relevant methods and ideas, rather than descriptions of the less relevant social aspects. It is difficult for learners to gain achievement with merit or excellence without demonstrating a clear and comprehensive exploration of the pictorial and thematic concerns of the artist/s. Thoughtfully scaffolded writing activities, where learners are directed towards the discussion of specific visual elements, have proved effective in many school submissions.

90234, 90475, 90476, 90477, 90478: *Generate and develop ideas using drawing processes and procedures in (sculpture, design, painting, photography, printmaking) practice*

The key requirement in this standard is to *develop ideas in a related series*. While in most cases the requirement to develop ideas is well understood, the aspect of having these linked and arranged in a related series is often problematic. Assessors need to ensure that tasks build upon one another to make certain that learners have sufficient opportunity to demonstrate a clear, sequential relationship within the body of work and between specific outcomes. The ordering and binding of learner samples is particularly important in providing evidence for this aspect of the criterion. Teachers need to ensure that each of the learner samples is carefully sequenced in the order the work is intended to be seen, before submitting the work for moderation.

The requirement of the first criterion that ideas be *based on established practice* is generally well understood. However, the selection of artist models needs to be undertaken with some care to ensure that related methods and concerns enhance the development of learner outcomes, rather than having unrelated models that confuse learners and prevent them from demonstrating *clarity of purpose*, and thus achieving with excellence.

In some cases, there was clear evidence of the generation of ideas, but little opportunity for learners to analyse and clarify these. Assessors need to provide tasks that encourage learners to build upon the ideas developed to ensure they have sufficient opportunity to meet the requirements for achievement with merit and achievement with excellence.

For 90475 (design), much of the learner work has been appropriately enhanced by the use of computers. However, the facility to distort, re-size or re-arrange the same elements does not constitute the critical analysis and clarification of ideas that is required for achievement with excellence. Learners need to be encouraged to carefully select and order the presentation of digital material to ensure that their ideas are developed in a genuine and meaningful way. For 90478 (printmaking), this aspect is also critical. Some samples of work submitted for moderation provided evidence of the development and resolution of several unrelated solutions, rather than ensuring that each outcome related to, and built upon, the ideas implicit in the previous work.

Assessors are reminded that explanatory note 3 clearly requires that *the body of evidence should include work belonging to the cultural milieu of the student*. This implies that, where appropriate, the use of contemporary New Zealand models, and/or the inclusion of Maori and bi-cultural traditions, be a significant aspect of the programme.

9050: Demonstrate basic black and white photography procedures and processes

Teachers need to ensure that assessment tasks relate directly to the requirements of the standard and do not include activities not specified in the elements. Assessors should refer to the 2005 and 2004 National Moderator's Reports and the special notes for the standard for further guidance and information.

Level 3

90515, 90659, 90660, 90661, 90662: Research and analyse approaches within established (design, painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture) practise.

In 2006, most teachers worked with the revised standard and there were many examples of learner work that met all levels of the standard. The new wording of the standard appears to have been interpreted well. There are still some schools working from the earlier version of the standard, which requires learners to study traditional and contemporary practice and to identify links instead of relationships. Assessment should be carried out against version 2 in 2007.

There are still many examples of work that do not meet the requirements of the standard due to research that was not linked to learners' own themes, foci of inquiry, and/or selected artist models. It is critical that the research undertaken is related to learners' own practice and informs their understanding of established practice. The research should not be an art historical end in itself. It is not productive for learners to carry out broad ranging research on a theme for which they write copious notes on various artists working in widely differing styles, and which often does not meet the requirements of the standard. As an example, large amounts of biographical information, while interesting in itself, does not contribute significantly to the evidence required for the standard. Learners need guidance to understand that there is a genre or tradition related to their theme and that they need to see relationships and influences between models and their own work in this context.

When this standard has been assessed through a whole year programme, with the visual diary at the core, it appears to have been relevant and meaningful for learners. Teachers can subsequently notate evidence in the diary that contributes towards each standard, when samples of this work are required for moderation.

This standard has been assessed in varying ways as part of schools' programmes. For some it was assessed against first and framed subsequent drawing investigations. For others, it was assessed against immediately prior to preparing a portfolio for external assessment and helped provide understanding of the models for the portfolio. One way of working was to assess against this standard concurrently with other standards.

It was also apparent in some school samples that a number of learners are using the same artist models and generating similar notes to each other, often describing the work instead of investigating ideas and methods to inform their drawing studies. Learners need to be developing their own themes and areas for research.

A common flaw in some assessment activities was the lack of opportunity for learners to meet the requirements of the third assessment criterion. Part of the assessment activity must require learners to identify relationships between their selected approaches. The activity should include focused questions that direct learners to research and analyse selected approaches purposefully, to make connections between works and to demonstrate their understanding of the relationships that exist. This is essential for the critical analysis required for achievement with excellence.

Learners' practical investigations need to be relevant to the research undertaken. In some cases, it was apparent that assessors had placed considerable weighting on learners' levels of practical work, and tended to overvalue the work overall when allocating grades.

90516, 90663, 90664, 90665, 90666: Investigate and use ideas and methods in the context of a drawing study in (design, painting, photography, printmaking, sculpture).

The intention of this standard is generally well understood by most of the teaching sector, and assessment activities presented for moderation are well constructed, with many being learner centred. The changes to the standard for 2006 have been well implemented. Schools that elected to assess against version 1 should be aware that from 2007, version 2 should be used.

Some issues did arise with some assessment activities that had provided insufficient opportunity for learners to *clarify specific options* or to *analyse and evaluate ideas and methods* for achievement with excellence. The title of the standard is quite explicit: the expectation is that this investigation and use of ideas and methods will take the form of drawing. Notation of drawings and writing are important strategies to facilitate this, but they should not replace the drawings themselves.

Overall, there was evidence of more examples of sequences of work that demonstrated the requirements of the standard. In addition, many learners are being encouraged to make some individual selection of artist models.

Most assessors are developing activities that provide opportunities for learners to generate ideas but, in some cases, clearer instructions needed to be provided to enable learners to analyse, clarify and synthesise these ideas. Activities that are too brief, with bullet point lists, did not give enough guidance for learners to understand and work through the art making process required. Unless expectations are set and clear instructions provided to direct learners specifically to analyse, clarify, evaluate and work systematically, then learners may be disadvantaged and struggle to achieve at the higher levels.

Assessors should ensure that they are familiar with the revised criteria of the standard. The old version of the standard contained the term *particular* in the first criterion, which could be seen to have worked against the need to *provide options*. This word has been removed from the revised standard.

Assessors should also refer to the explanatory notes for explanations of terms. It is worth noting that the new version of the standard has more detailed definitions of terms, such as *synthesise*. To *clarify* ideas learners, need to *specify parameters for investigation*, and to recognise and use drawing as a thinking and working process. It is important that the process of synthesis followed is purposeful and that the decisions being made by learners are clear and informed, otherwise their work may become repetitive and represent creative play that fails to move forward and is not based on an understanding of established practice.

If there is minimal evidence of the investigation of ideas, then it is difficult for learners to develop and clarify options, particularly for achievement with merit and excellence. Some schools appear to have difficulty interpreting the excellence criterion, *synthesise ideas to extend understanding*, and there is often insufficient analysis and evaluation of ideas in learners' work to achieve with excellence.

Some activities still require too much research for this standard. While learners do need to provide evidence of established practice, this should not include evidence that fulfils requirements for 3.1, unless the two standards are being assessed together. If this is the case, then the research work should be clearly identified. In this standard, the study of artist models, techniques and methods and learners own practice should weave together as learners progress.