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2-D Design Portfolio

General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring rubric for the AP portfolios contains score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak), and 1 (poor).

- Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.

- Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.

- Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.

- The descriptors are examples; it isn’t expected that all the descriptors for a score point will apply to any one particular portfolio.

- The descriptors intentionally discuss general aspects of artwork at each score point; there is no preferred (or unacceptable) content or style.

- The descriptors (taken as a whole) capture characteristics of work that merits each score.

2-D Design issues may include, but are not limited to, the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Figure/Ground Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2-D DESIGN: SELECTED WORKS (QUALITY) — SECTION I

Five works that demonstrate understanding of and engagement with 2-D design issues

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. General Use of Design Elements and Application of the Principles of 2-D Design

B. Decision Making and Intention

C. Originality, Imagination, and Invention of Composition

D. Experimentation and Risk Taking

E. Confident, Evocative Work, and Engagement of the Viewer

F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media

G. Appropriation and Student Vision

H. Overall Accomplishment

2-D design issues to consider when applying these descriptors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Unity
- Balance
- Variety
- Emphasis
- Rhythm
- Contrast
- Proportion
- Repetition
- Scale
- Figure/Ground Relationship
6  **EXCELLENT** SELECTED WORKS

6.A  In most works, there is a highly successful use of the elements of design and application of 2-D design principles.

6.B  The work exhibits excellent, well-informed decision making and intention.

6.C  The composition of the works is original, imaginative, and inventive.

6.D  The work shows successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking in most pieces.

6.E  The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).

6.F  The technical competence of the work is generally excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.

6.G  Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.

6.H  Although the five works may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

---

5  **STRONG** SELECTED WORKS

5.A  The work generally shows successful use of the elements of design and application of 2-D design principles.

5.B  The work shows evidence of thoughtful decision making and intention.

5.C  The composition of the works is generally imaginative or inventive.

5.D  The work may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking in some pieces.

5.E  Most works exhibit expressive and evocative qualities that engage the viewer and suggest confidence.

5.F  The technical competence of the work is strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.

5.G  Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision and individual transformation of the images.

5.H  Although the five works may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
GOOD SELECTED WORKS

4.A The work shows good use of the elements of design, but the application of 2-D design principles is not always successful.
4.B Some clear decision making and intention are evident.
4.C The composition of the works includes some imaginative ideas.
4.D The work may show engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking, but with uneven success.
4.E Some of the work has evocative qualities that engage the viewer, though confidence is not obvious; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.G With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the images have been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.H Although the five works may show uneven levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

MODERATE SELECTED WORKS

3.A The work shows moderately successful use of the elements of design; the application of 2-D design principles is emerging or limited in scope.
3.B Decision making and intention are questionable.
3.C In the composition of the works, some imaginative ideas appear to be emerging.
3.D The work may show attempts at experimentation and/or risk taking, but with limited success.
3.E One or two of the works may be evocative or engaging; confidence is questionable.
3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence and use of materials and media.
3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of nearly direct reproductions; even if the work is skillfully rendered, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.H Although the five works may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
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2  **WEAK** SELECTED WORKS

2.A  Some awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, but there appears to be little understanding of the application of 2-D design principles.

2.B  Intention is not clear.

2.C  The composition of the work relies heavily on unoriginal ideas and shows few signs of invention or imagination.

2.D  The work shows little attempt at experimentation or risk taking, or the experimentation has little success.

2.E  There is little about the work that is engaging; the work lacks confidence.

2.F  The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and clumsy use of materials and media.

2.G  The work appears to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average rendering skill, there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.

2.H  The five works show little evidence of accomplishment, and overall the work is at a weak level.


1  **POOR** SELECTED WORKS

1.A  Very little awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, and there appears to be minimal understanding of the application of 2-D design principles.

1.B  The work appears to be unconsidered and to lack discernible intention.

1.C  The composition of the work lacks originality or imagination.

1.D  The work shows negligible experimentation or risk taking, or the experimentation is unsuccessful.

1.E  The work does not engage the viewer; no confidence is evident.

1.F  Use of materials is naive and is lacking skill or technical competence.

1.G  The works are obviously direct, poorly rendered copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.

1.H  Overall, the five works lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
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2-D DESIGN: SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION (CONCENTRATION) — SECTION II

A sustained investigation is defined as “a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence.” In scoring sustained investigations, there are four major areas of concern.

- Coherence and/or development. Is the work presented actually a sustained investigation?
- Quality of the concept/idea represented. Is there evidence of thinking and of focus?
- Degree of development and investigation evident in the work. Is there evidence of growth and discovery in the work?
- Quality of the work in both concept and process.

Note: These four areas will necessarily appear in shifting relationships of relative strength and weakness. Where the four are not even in the level of achievement they represent, they will be considered as a whole to arrive at the score for the section.

Because this section is concerned with a process of growth and discovery, the work presented may span a range of levels of achievement. If this is the case, the higher level that is reached should be considered in the score that is given.

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. Integration of the Topic of the Sustained Investigation and the Work Presented
B. Decision Making and Discovery Through Investigation
C. Originality and Innovative Thinking
D. Evocative Theme and Engagement of the Viewer
E. Understanding and Application of 2-D Design Principles
F. Transformation and Growth
G. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
H. Appropriation and Student Vision
I. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Sustained Investigations Only)
J. Overall Accomplishment

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, and process of the work.

2-D design issues to consider when applying these descriptors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Unity
Balance
Variety
Emphasis
Rhythm
Contrast
Proportion
Repetition
Scale
Figure/Ground Relationship
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6 EXCELLENT SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

6.A The topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
6.C The sustained investigation clearly demonstrates an original vision and innovative ideas and/or risk taking.
6.D An evocative, engaging theme is sustained through most of the work.
6.E The work shows a thorough understanding and effective application of 2-D design principles.
6.F The work conveys a sense of successful transformation and growth.
6.G In general, the work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.
6.J Although the works may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 STRONG SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

5.A The topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
5.B The investigation of the topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in many works.
5.C The work for the sustained investigation generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
5.D An evocative, engaging theme is clearly present in much of the work.
5.E Overall the work shows understanding and effective application of 2-D design principles; there may be some less successful pieces.
5.F The work generally conveys a sense of transformation and growth.
5.G The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision and individual transformation of the images.
5.J Although the works may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
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4 GOOD SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

4.A The topic and the work presented are closely related.
4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the topic.
4.C The sustained investigation demonstrates some originality and some innovative thinking.
4.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernible.
4.E The work is inconsistent, but overall the understanding and application of 2-D design principles is good.
4.F Some transformation is noticeable; some growth is evident, but the work may be repetitive.
4.G The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the images have been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.J Although the works may show uneven levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

3 MODERATE SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

3.A The connection between the topic and the work is evident but erratic.
3.B Decision making is sporadic, and the work demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
3.C The sustained investigation demonstrates emerging attempts at originality and innovative thinking.
3.D A potentially engaging theme is somewhat discernible but is inadequately considered.
3.E The work demonstrates a moderate understanding and superficial application of 2-D design principles.
3.F Transformation may be discernible; growth is limited.
3.G Though uneven, the work demonstrates emerging technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of nearly direct reproductions; even if the work is skillfully rendered, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.J Although the works may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
2 WEAK SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

2.A The work conveys a sense of a sustained investigation, but integration of the topic and the work is inadequately considered.
2.B Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.
2.C The sustained investigation is unoriginal or relies mostly on appropriation.
2.D A potentially engaging theme is present but is largely unsuccessful.
2.E The work shows a weak understanding or limited application of 2-D design principles.
2.F The work is mostly repetitive; only a few pieces show slight signs of transformation or suggest growth.
2.G Overall, the work demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.
2.H The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.
2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted.
2.J Little evidence of accomplishment is demonstrated; overall the work is at a weak level.

1 POOR SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

1.A There is very little or no evidence of a topic in the work presented, or there is not enough work to represent a sustained investigation.
1.B The work shows little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.
1.C The sustained investigation comprises trite or simplistic solutions that are poorly executed.
1.D A theme that could engage the viewer with the work is absent.
1.E The work shows very little or no understanding of 2-D design principles or their application.
1.F Overall, the work shows negligible transformation or growth.
1.G The work shows very little technical competence; it is naïve and lacks skill.
1.H The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.
1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted.
1.J Overall, the works lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
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2-D DESIGN: RANGE OF APPROACHES (BREADTH) — SECTION III

A variety of works demonstrating understanding of 2-D design issues
Look for engagement with a range of 2-D design principles such as the following:

Unity                                Balance
Variety                              Emphasis
Rhythm                               Contrast
Proportion                           Repetition
Scale                                Figure/Ground Relationship

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. Integration of 2-D Design Principles with a Broad Range of Design Problems
B. Originality and Innovative Thinking
C. Range of Intentions or Approaches
D. Confident, Evocative Work that Engages the Viewer
E. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
F. Appropriation and Student Vision
G. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Range of Approaches sections only)
H. Overall Accomplishment

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, and process of the work.
6  **EXCELLENT** RANGE OF APPROACHES

6.A The work shows an excellent application of 2-D design principles to a broad range of design problems.
6.B The work clearly demonstrates original vision, a variety of innovative ideas and/or risk taking, and inventive articulation of a broad range of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
6.C The work clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or approaches.
6.D The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, verve or nuanced subtlety).
6.E The work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
6.F Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.
6.H The work may show a varying range of accomplishment, but overall it is at an excellent level.

5  **STRONG** RANGE OF APPROACHES

5.A The work shows strong application of 2-D design principles to a range of design problems.
5.B The work demonstrates a range of original, innovative ideas and effective manipulation of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
5.C The work demonstrates a variety of intentions or approaches.
5.D Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence.
5.E The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
5.F Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision and individual transformation of the images.
5.H The work may show varying levels of accomplishment, but overall it is at a strong level.
4 **GOOD** RANGE OF APPROACHES

4.A The work shows good application of 2-D design principles to an acceptable range of design problems.
4.B The work demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking, and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
4.C The work shows a variety of intentions or approaches, although not all are successfully articulated.
4.D Some of the work has discernible evocative or engaging qualities, though confidence is not strongly apparent; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
4.E The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.F Within the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the images have been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.H The work may show uneven levels of accomplishment, but overall it is at a good level.

3 **MODERATE** RANGE OF APPROACHES

3.A The work shows superficial application of 2-D principles to a limited range of design problems.
3.B Some original ideas seem to be emerging or some attempt at innovation with the elements and principles of 2-D design is evident.
3.C The work shows a limited variety of intentions or approaches.
3.D The work is emerging in terms of potentially engaging qualities; confidence is questionable.
3.E The work demonstrates moderate technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
3.F If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of nearly direct reproductions; even if the work is skillfully rendered, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.H Although the work may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
2 **WEAK** RANGE OF APPROACHES

2.A The work shows a weak application of 2-D design principles to a very limited range of design problems.
2.B The ideas in the work are unoriginal; the work does not show inventive use of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
2.C The work does not clearly demonstrate a variety of intentions or approaches.
2.D There is little about the work that engages the viewer; the work does not convey much confidence.
2.E The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.
2.F The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.
2.G The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted.
2.H The work shows little evidence of accomplishment; overall the work is at a weak level.

1 **POOR** RANGE OF APPROACHES

1.A The work shows little or no useful application of 2-D design principles, regardless of the number of problem-solving attempts.
1.B There is no original or imaginative ideation in the work in regard to the elements and principles of 2-D design; the work comprises trite or simplistic solutions.
1.C The work does not demonstrate a variety of intentions or approaches.
1.D The work does not engage the viewer and does not convey a sense of confidence.
1.E Use of materials and media is naive and lacks skill or technical competence.
1.F The work appears as direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.
1.G The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; there may be too few images to constitute a range of approaches.
1.H Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.
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3-D Design Portfolio

General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring rubric for the AP portfolios contains score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak), and 1 (poor).

- Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.

- Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.

- Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.

- The descriptors are examples; it isn’t expected that all the descriptors for a score point will apply to any one particular portfolio.

- The descriptors intentionally discuss general aspects of artwork at each score point; there is no preferred (or unacceptable) content or style.

- The descriptors (taken as a whole) capture characteristics of work that merits each score.

3-D design issues may include but are not limited to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>Rhythm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Occupied/Unoccupied Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3-D DESIGN: SELECTED WORKS (QUALITY) — SECTION I

Digital images of five works (two views of each) that demonstrate understanding of and engagement with 3-D design issues

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. General Use of Design Elements and Application of the Principles of 3-D Design
B. Decision Making and Intention
C. Originality, Imagination, and Invention of Composition
D. Experimentation and Risk Taking
E. Confident, Evocative Work and Engagement of the Viewer
F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
G. Understanding and Use of Digital Processes, and Documentation of Virtual or Time-Based Works
H. Appropriation and Student Vision
I. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Sections Only)
J. Overall Accomplishment

3-D design issues to consider when applying these descriptors may include but are not limited to:

Unity
Variety
Balance
Emphasis
Contrast

Rhythm
Repetition
Proportion
Scale
Occupied/Unoccupied Space
Time
**EXCELLENT SELECTED WORKS**

6.A In most works, there is a highly successful use of the elements of design and application of 3-D design principles.

6.B The work exhibits excellent, well-informed decision making and intention.

6.C The composition of the works is original, imaginative, and inventive.

6.D The work shows successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking in most pieces.

6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).

6.F The technical competence of the work is excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.

6.G When digital processes are used or the work is virtual or time-based, it demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of 3-D design issues.

6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.

6.J Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

**STRONG SELECTED WORKS**

5.A There is a generally successful use of the elements of design and application of 3-D design principles.

5.B The work shows evidence of thoughtful decision making and intention.

5.C The composition of the works is generally imaginative or inventive.

5.D The work may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking in some pieces.

5.E Most works exhibit expressive and evocative qualities that engage the viewer and suggest confidence.

5.F The technical competence of the work is strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.

5.G When digital processes are used or the work is virtual or time-based, it demonstrates a generally strong understanding of 3-D design issues.

5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision and individual transformation of the work.

5.J Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
GOOD SELECTED WORKS

4.A There is good use of the elements of design, but the application of 3-D design principles is not always successful.
4.B Some clear decision making and intention are evident.
4.C The composition of the works includes some imaginative ideas.
4.D The work may show engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking, but with uneven success.
4.E Some of the work has evocative qualities that engage the viewer, though confidence is not strongly perceptible; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas may not always work together.
4.G When digital processes are used or the work is virtual or time-based, it demonstrates a good understanding of 3-D design issues.
4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the work has been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.J Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

MODERATE SELECTED WORKS

3.A There is moderately successful use of the elements of design; the application of 3-D design principles is emerging or limited in scope.
3.B Decision making and intention are questionable.
3.C In the composition of the works, some imaginative ideas seem to be emerging.
3.D The work may show an attempt at experimentation and/or risk taking, but with limited success.
3.E There may be one or two evocative, engaging works; confidence is questionable.
3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence and use of materials and media.
3.G When digital processes are used or the work is virtual or time-based, it demonstrates a moderate understanding of 3-D design issues.
3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work submitted appears to be directly copied; even if the student has skillfully duplicated a work, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the work are minimal.
3.J Although the five works may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
2** WEAK SELECTED WORKS**

2.A Some awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, but there appears to be little understanding of the application of 3-D design principles.

2.B Intention is not clear.

2.C The composition of the works relies heavily on unoriginal ideas and shows few signs of invention or imagination.

2.D The work shows little attempt at experimentation or risk taking, or the experimentation has little success.

2.E There is little about the work that is engaging; the work lacks confidence.

2.F The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and clumsy use of materials and media.

2.G When digital processes are used or the work is virtual or time-based, it demonstrates limited understanding of 3-D design issues.

2.H The works appear to be direct fabrications of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average skill, they show little discernible student vision or individual transformation.

2.I The images are difficult to see because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; the two views convey basically the same information, or only one view is provided.

2.J The five works show little evidence of accomplishment, and overall the work is at a weak level.

---

1** POOR SELECTED WORKS**

1.A Very little awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, and there appears to be minimal understanding of the application of 3-D design principles.

1.B The work appears to be unconsidered and to lack discernible intention.

1.C The composition of the works lacks originality or imagination.

1.D The work shows negligible experimentation or risk taking, or the experimentation is unsuccessful.

1.E The work does not engage the viewer; no confidence is evident.

1.F Use of materials and media is naïve and is lacking skill or technical competence.

1.G When digital processes are used or the work is virtual or time-based, it demonstrates minimal understanding of 3-D design issues.

1.H The works are obviously direct, poorly fabricated copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.

1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; two views may be lacking.

1.J Overall, the five works lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
3-D DESIGN: SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION (CONCENTRATION)—SECTION II

A sustained investigation is defined as “a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence.” In scoring sustained investigations, there are four major areas of concern.

- **Coherence and/or development.** Is the work presented actually a sustained investigation?
- **Quality of the concept/idea represented.** Is there evidence of thinking and of focus?
- **Degree of development and investigation that is evident in the work.** Is there evidence of growth and discovery in the work?
- **Quality of the work in both concept and process.**

**Note:** These four areas will necessarily appear in shifting relationships of relative strength and weakness. Where the four are not even in the level of achievement they represent, they will be considered as a whole to arrive at the score for the section.

Because this section is concerned with a process of growth and discovery, the work presented may span a range of levels of achievement. If this is the case, the higher level that is reached should be considered in the score that is given.

---

**Key Scoring Descriptors**

A. Integration of the Topic of the Sustained Investigation and the Work Presented  
B. Decision Making and Discovery Through Investigation  
C. Originality and Innovative Thinking  
D. Evocative Theme and Engagement of the Viewer  
E. Activation of Physical Space Through Understanding and Application of 3-D Design Principles  
F. Transformation and Growth  
G. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media  
H. Appropriation and Student Vision  
I. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Sustained Investigations Only)  
J. Overall Accomplishment

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, and process of the work. 3-D design issues to consider when applying these descriptors may include but are not limited to:

- **Unity**  
- **Variety**  
- **Balance**  
- **Emphasis**  
- **Contrast**  
- **Rhythm**  
- **Repetition**  
- **Proportion**  
- **Scale**  
- **Occupied/Unoccupied Space**  
- **Time**
6  EXCELLENT SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

6.A The topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
6.C The sustained investigation clearly demonstrates an original vision and innovative ideas and/or risk taking.
6.D An evocative, engaging theme is sustained through most of the work.
6.E The work shows a thorough understanding and effective application of 3-D design principles.
6.F The work conveys a sense of successful transformation and growth.
6.G In general, the work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas, and the work clearly demonstrates expertise with most needed skills.
6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.
6.J Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5  STRONG SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

5.A The topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
5.B The investigation of the topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in some works.
5.C The work for the sustained investigation generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
5.D An evocative, engaging theme is clearly present in much of the work.
5.E Overall the work shows a strong understanding and effective application of 3-D design principles; some pieces may be less successful.
5.F The work generally conveys a sense of transformation and growth.
5.G In general, the work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas, and expertise with some skills is evident.
5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision and individual transformation of the work.
5.J Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
4  GOOD SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

4.A The topic and the work presented are closely related.
4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the topic.
4.C The sustained investigation demonstrates some originality and some innovative thinking.
4.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernible.
4.E The work is inconsistent, but overall the understanding and application of 3-D design principles are good.
4.F Some transformation is noticeable; some growth is evident, but the work may be repetitive.
4.G The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media, as well as a developing expertise with skills; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the work has been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.J Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

3  MODERATE SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

3.A The connection between the topic and the work is evident but erratic.
3.B Decision making is sporadic, and the work of the sustained investigation demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
3.C The sustained investigation demonstrates emerging attempts at originality and innovative thinking.
3.D A potentially engaging theme is somewhat discernible, but it is inadequately considered.
3.E The work demonstrates a moderate understanding and superficial application of 3-D design principles.
3.F Transformation may be discernible; growth is limited.
3.G Though uneven, the work demonstrates emerging technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work submitted appears to be directly copied fabrications; even if the student has skillfully duplicated a work, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the work are minimal.
3.J Although the work may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
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2  WEAK  SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

2.A There is a sense of a sustained investigation, but integration of the topic and the work is inadequately considered.
2.B Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.
2.C The sustained investigation is unoriginal or relies mostly on appropriation.
2.D A potentially engaging theme is present but is largely unsuccessful.
2.E The work shows a weak understanding or limited application of 3-D design principles.
2.F The work is mostly repetitive; only a few pieces suggest growth or show slight signs of transformation.
2.G Overall the work demonstrates marginal technical competence, awkward use of materials and media, and minimal skills.
2.H The works appear to be direct fabrications of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are of average skill; there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.
2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; any details provide no useful information about the objects or installations.
2.J The work shows little evidence of accomplishment, and overall it is of weak quality.

1  POOR  SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

1.A There is very little or no evidence of a topic in the work presented, or there is not enough work to represent a sustained investigation.
1.B There is little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.
1.C The sustained investigation comprises trite or simplistic solutions that are poorly executed.
1.D A theme that could engage the viewer with the work in relation to the sustained investigation is absent.
1.E The work shows very little or no understanding of 3-D design principles or their application.
1.F Overall the work shows no indication of growth or transformation.
1.G The work shows very little technical competence; it is naïve and lacks skill.
1.H The works are apparently direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are poorly fabricated; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.
1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; any details provide no additional information about the objects or installations.
1.J Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor quality.
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3-D DESIGN: RANGE OF APPROACHES (BREADTH) — SECTION III

A variety of works demonstrating understanding of and engagement with 3-D design issues. Look for engagement with a range of 3-D design issues such as the following:

Unity
Variety
Balance
Emphasis
Contrast

Rhythm
Repetition
Proportion
Scale
Occupied/Unoccupied Space
Time

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. Integration of 3-D Design Principles into a Broad Range of Design Problems
B. Originality and Innovative Thinking
C. Range of Intentions or Approaches
D. Confident, Evocative Work that Engages the Viewer
E. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
F. Appropriation and Student Vision
G. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Range of Approaches Sections Only)
H. Overall Accomplishment
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6   **EXCELLENT** RANGE OF APPROACHES

6.A The work shows an excellent application of 3-D design principles to a broad range of design problems.
6.B The work clearly demonstrates original vision, a variety of innovative ideas and/or risk taking, and inventive articulation of a broad range of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
6.C The work clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or approaches.
6.D The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
6.E The work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
6.F Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.
6.H Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5   **STRONG** RANGE OF APPROACHES

5.A The work shows strong application of 3-D design principles to a range of design problems.
5.B The work demonstrates a range of original and innovative ideas, and effective manipulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
5.C The work demonstrates a variety of intentions or approaches.
5.D Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence.
5.E The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
5.F Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision and individual transformation of the work.
5.H Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
4 **GOOD RANGE OF APPROACHES**

4.A The work shows good application of 3-D design principles to an acceptable range of design problems.

4.B The work demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking, and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design.

4.C The work shows a variety of intentions or approaches, although not all are successfully articulated.

4.D Some of the work has discernible evocative or engaging qualities, though confidence is not strongly apparent; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.

4.E The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.

4.F With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the work has been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.

4.H Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

3 **MODERATE RANGE OF APPROACHES**

3.A The work shows superficial application of 3-D design principles to a limited range of design problems.

3.B Some original ideas seem to be emerging, or some attempt at innovation with the elements and principles of 3-D design is evident.

3.C The work shows a limited variety of intentions or approaches.

3.D The work is beginning to emerge in terms of potentially engaging qualities; confidence is questionable.

3.E The work demonstrates moderate technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.

3.F If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of similar fabrications; although the work has been skillfully duplicated, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the work are minimal.

3.H Although the work may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
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2 WEAK RANGE OF APPROACHES

2.A The work shows a weak application of 3-D design principles to a very limited range of design problems.

2.B The ideas in the work are unoriginal; the work does not show inventive use of the elements and principles of 3-D design.

2.C The work does not clearly demonstrate a variety of intentions or approaches.

2.D There is little about the work that engages the viewer; the work lacks confidence.

2.E The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.

2.F The works appear to be direct fabrications of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are of average skill; there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.

2.G The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; the two views convey basically the same information, or only one view is provided.

2.H The work shows little evidence of accomplishment, and overall it is at a weak level.

1 POOR RANGE OF APPROACHES

1.A The work shows very little or no useful application of 3-D design principles, regardless of the number of problem-solving attempts.

1.B There is little original or imaginative ideation in the work in regard to the elements and principles of three dimensional design; the work comprises trite or simplistic solutions.

1.C The work does not demonstrate a variety of intentions or approaches.

1.D The work does not engage the viewer; there is no confidence evident in the work.

1.E Use of materials and media is naive and lacks skill or technical competence.

1.F The works are apparently direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are poorly fabricated; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.

1.G The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; the set of images may be incomplete.

1.H Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.
AP® STUDIO ART
2017 SCORING GUIDELINES

Drawing Portfolio

General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring rubric for the AP portfolios contains score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak), and 1 (poor).
- Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.
- Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.
- Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.
- The descriptors are examples; it isn’t expected that all the descriptors for a score point will apply to any one particular portfolio.
- The descriptors intentionally discuss general aspects of artwork at each score point; there is no preferred (or unacceptable) content or style.
- The descriptors (taken as a whole) capture characteristics of work that merits each score.

DRAWING issues include, but are not limited to, the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Quality</th>
<th>Surface Manipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light and Shade</td>
<td>The Illusion of Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering of Form</td>
<td>Mark Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DRAWING: SELECTED WORKS (QUALITY) — SECTION I

Five actual works that demonstrate understanding of and engagement with drawing issues

---

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. Understanding of Composition, Concept, and Execution

B. Decision Making and Intention

C. Originality, Imagination, and Invention

D. Experimentation and Risk Taking

E. Confident, Evocative Work that Engages the Viewer

F. Technical Competence and Skill with Drawing Materials and Media

G. Understanding and Use of Digital or Photographic Media

H. Appropriation and Student Vision

I. Overall Accomplishment

DRAWING issues to consider when applying these descriptors include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Line Quality
- Light and Shade
- Rendering of Form
- Composition

- Surface Manipulation
- The Illusion of Depth
- Mark Making

© 2017 The College Board.
Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.org.
6  EXCELLENT SELECTED WORKS

6.A  The work demonstrates excellent understanding of drawing through advanced visual
concepts, resolved composition, and generally excellent execution.
6.B  The work exhibits well-informed decision making and intention.
6.C  The work clearly displays imaginative ideas and successful, inventive articulation of drawing
issues.
6.D  The work shows successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking in most
pieces.
6.E  The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities
(for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
6.F  The technical competence of the work is consistently excellent; drawing materials and media
are used effectively to express ideas.
6.G  When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a sophisticated
understanding of analog drawing issues.
6.H  Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists
clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal
vision.
6.I  Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an
excellent level.

5  STRONG SELECTED WORKS

5.A  The work demonstrates strong understanding of drawing through involved visual concepts,
well-structured composition, and generally successful execution.
5.B  The work shows evidence of thoughtful decision making and intention.
5.C  The work shows imaginative ideas and effective manipulation of the principles of design in
the drawing compositions.
5.D  The work may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking in
some pieces.
5.E  Most works exhibit expressive and evocative qualities that engage the viewer and suggest
confidence.
5.F  The technical competence of the work is strong; materials and media are used well to express
ideas.
5.G  When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a strong
understanding of analog drawing issues.
5.H  Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists
clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal
vision in which the student’s vision is prominent.
5.I  Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
4 GOOD SELECTED WORKS

4.A The work demonstrates a good understanding of drawing through basic visual concepts, thoughtful composition, and good execution.
4.B Some clear decision making and intention are evident.
4.C The work demonstrates some imaginative ideas and purposeful manipulation of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.
4.D The work may show engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking, but with uneven success.
4.E Some of the work has evocative qualities that will engage the viewer, though confidence is not obvious; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of drawing materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a good understanding of analog drawing issues.
4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the images have been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.I Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

3 MODERATE SELECTED WORKS

3.A The work demonstrates a moderate understanding of drawing through foundational visual concepts, with moderately successful compositional resolution and execution.
3.B Decision making and intention are questionable.
3.C Some imaginative ideas about use of the principles of design in the drawing compositions appear to be emerging.
3.D The work may show attempts at experimentation and/or risk taking, but with limited success.
3.E There may be one or two evocative, engaging works; confidence is questionable.
3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence and use of materials and media.
3.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a moderate understanding of analog drawing issues.
3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of nearly direct reproductions; even if the work is skillfully rendered, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.I Although the five works may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
2  **WEAK SELECTED WORKS**

2.A  The work demonstrates a weak understanding of drawing; few visual concepts are considered; compositional resolution is erratic; and overall execution is awkward.

2.B  Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.

2.C  The work relies heavily on unimaginative and weakly articulated ideas about the use of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.

2.D  The work shows little attempt at experimentation or risk taking, or the experimentation has little success.

2.E  There is little about the work in terms of content, style, or process that engages the viewer; the work lacks confidence.

2.F  The work demonstrates weak technical competence, awkward use of drawing materials and media, and minimal mark-making skills.

2.G  When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a weak understanding of analog drawing issues.

2.H  The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if the works are of average rendering skill, there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.

2.I  The five works show little evidence of accomplishment, and overall the work is at a weak level.

1  **POOR SELECTED WORKS**

1.A  The work demonstrates little understanding of drawing, visual concepts, or composition; overall the execution is naïve and clumsy.

1.B  There is little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.

1.C  The work lacks imaginative or inventive ideas about the use of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.

1.D  The work shows negligible experimentation or risk taking, or the experimentation is unsuccessful.

1.E  The work does not engage the viewer; no confidence is evident.

1.F  Use of drawing materials and media is naïve and is lacking in mark-making skills and technical competence.

1.G  When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates minimal understanding of analog drawing issues.

1.H  The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are poorly rendered; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.

1.I  Overall the five drawings lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
DRAWING: SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION (CONCENTRATION) — SECTION II

A sustained investigation is defined as “a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence.” In scoring sustained investigations, there are four major areas of concern:

- **Coherence and/or development.** Is the work presented actually a sustained investigation?
- **Quality of the concept/idea represented.** Is there evidence of thinking and of focus?
- **Degree of development and investigation that is evident in the work.** Is there evidence of growth and discovery in the work?
- **Quality of the work in both concept and technique.**

**Note:** These four areas will necessarily appear in shifting relationships of relative strength and weakness. Where the four are not even in the level of achievement they represent, they will be considered as a whole to arrive at the score for the section.

Because this section is concerned with a process of growth and discovery, the work presented may span a range of levels of achievement. If this is the case, the higher level that is reached should be considered in the score that is given.

**Key Scoring Descriptors**

A. **Integration of the Topic of the Sustained Investigation and the Work Presented**
B. **Decision Making and Discovery Through Investigation**
C. **Originality and Innovative Thinking**
D. **Evocative Theme that Engages the Viewer**
E. **Transformation and Growth**
F. **Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media**
G. **Understanding the Use of Digital or Photographic Processes**
H. ** Appropriation and Student Vision**
I. **Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Sustained Investigations Only)**
J. **Overall Accomplishment and Quality**

In applying these descriptors, consider drawing issues such as the following:

- **Line Quality**
- **Surface Manipulation**
- **Light and Shade**
- **The Illusion of Depth**
- **Rendering of Form**
- **Mark Making**
- **Composition**
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6  EXCELLENT SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

6.A The topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
6.C The sustained investigation clearly demonstrates an original vision and innovative ideas and/or risk taking.
6.D An evocative, engaging theme is sustained through most of the work.
6.E The work conveys a sense of successful transformation and growth.
6.F In general, the work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
6.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of analog drawing issues.
6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.
6.J Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5  STRONG SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

5.A The topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
5.B The investigation of the topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in many works.
5.C The sustained investigation generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
5.D An evocative, engaging theme is clearly present in much of the work.
5.E The work generally conveys a sense of transformation and growth.
5.F The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
5.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a strong understanding of analog drawing issues.
5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision through individual transformation of the images.
5.J Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
4 GOOD SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

4.A The topic and the work presented are closely related.
4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the topic.
4.C The sustained investigation demonstrates some originality and some innovative thinking.
4.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernible.
4.E Some transformation is noticeable; some growth is evident, but the work may be repetitive.
4.F The work demonstrates adequate technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a good understanding of analog drawing issues.
4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the images have been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.J Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

3 MODERATE SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

3.A The connection between the topic and the work presented is evident but erratic.
3.B Decision making is sporadic, and the work demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
3.C The sustained investigation demonstrates emerging attempts at originality and innovative thinking.
3.D A potentially engaging theme is somewhat discernible, but it is inadequately considered.
3.E Transformation may be discernible; growth is limited.
3.F Though uneven, the work demonstrates emerging technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
3.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a moderate understanding of analog drawing issues.
3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of nearly direct reproductions; even if the work has been skillfully rendered, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.J Although the works may show an emerging level or accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
2 **WEAK** SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

2.A There is a sense of a sustained investigation, but integration of the topic and the work is inadequately considered.

2.B Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.

2.C The sustained investigation is unoriginal or relies mostly on appropriation.

2.D A potentially engaging theme is present but is largely unsuccessful.

2.E The work is mostly repetitive; only a few pieces show slight signs of transformation or suggest growth.

2.F Overall the work demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.

2.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a weak understanding of analog drawing issues.

2.H The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or of the work of other artists; even if they are of average rendering skill, there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.

2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted.

2.J The work shows little evidence of accomplishment; overall the work is at a weak level.

1 **POOR** SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION

1.A There is very little or no evidence of a topic in the work presented, or there is not enough work to represent a sustained investigation.

1.B There is little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.

1.C The investigation comprises trite or simplistic solutions that are poorly executed.

1.D A theme that could engage the viewer with the work is absent.

1.E Overall, the work shows negligible transformation or growth.

1.F The work shows very little technical competence; it is naive and lacks skill.

1.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates minimal understanding of analog drawing issues.

1.H The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or of the work of other artists and have been are poorly rendered; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.

1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted.

1.J Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.
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DRAWING: RANGE OF APPROACHES (BREADTH) — SECTION III

Works demonstrating understanding of a range of drawing issues

Look for engagement with a range of Drawing issues such as the following:

| Line Quality | Surface Manipulation |
| Light and Shade | The Illusion of Depth |
| Rendering of Form | Mark Making |
| Composition | |

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. Investigation of a Broad Range of Visual Concepts and Composition

B. Originality, Imagination, and Invention in Using the Elements and Principles of Design in Drawing Composition

C. Range of Intentions or Approaches

D. Confident, Evocative Work that Engages the Viewer

E. Technical Competence and Skill with Drawing Materials and Media

F. Understanding the Use of Digital or Photographic Sources

G. Appropriation and Student Vision

H. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Range of Approaches Sections Only)

I. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

6 EXCELLENT RANGE OF APPROACHES

6.A The work demonstrates informed investigation of a broad range of visual concepts and compositions.
6.B The work clearly demonstrates original vision, a variety of innovative ideas and/or risk taking, and inventive articulation of a broad range of the elements and principles of design.
6.C The work clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or purposes.
6.D The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
6.E The work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
6.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of analog drawing issues.
6.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision.
6.I Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 STRONG RANGE OF APPROACHES

5.A The work demonstrates thoughtful investigation of a range of visual concepts and compositions.
5.B The work demonstrates a range of original, innovative ideas and effective manipulation of the elements and principles of design.
5.C The work demonstrates a variety of intentions or purposes.
5.D Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence.
5.E The work is technically strong; drawing materials and media are used well to express ideas.
5.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a strong understanding of analog drawing issues.
5.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student’s vision through individual transformation of the images.
5.I Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
GOOD RANGE OF APPROACHES

4. The work demonstrates a good investigation of varied visual concepts and compositions.
4.B The work demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking, and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of design.
4.C The work shows a variety of intentions or approaches, although not all are successfully articulated.
4.D Some of the work has discernible evocative or engaging qualities, though confidence is not strongly apparent; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
4.E The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
4.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a good understanding of analog drawing issues.
4.G With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student’s vision is discernible; the images have been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas.
4.I Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

MODERATE RANGE OF APPROACHES

3. The work demonstrates a superficial investigation of a limited range of visual concepts and/or compositions.
3.B Some original ideas seem to be emerging, or some attempt at innovation with the elements and principles of design is evident.
3.C The work shows a limited variety of intentions or approaches.
3.D The work is emerging in terms of potentially engaging qualities; confidence is questionable.
3.E The work demonstrates moderate technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
3.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a moderate understanding of analog drawing issues.
3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists have been appropriated, the resulting work appears to be a collection of nearly direct reproductions; even if the work is skillfully rendered, the student’s vision and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.I Although the works may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.
2 **WEAK** RANGE OF APPROACHES

2.A The work demonstrates a weak investigation of a very limited range of visual concepts and/or compositions.
2.B The ideas in the work are unoriginal; the work does not show inventive use of the elements and principles of design.
2.C The work does not clearly demonstrate a variety of intentions or approaches.
2.D There is little about the work that is engaging; the work lacks confidence.
2.E The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.
2.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates a weak understanding of analog drawing issues.
2.G The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if the works are of average rendering skill, there is little discernible student vision or individual transformation.
2.H The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted.
2.I The work shows little evidence of accomplishment; overall, the work is at a weak level.

1 **POOR** RANGE OF APPROACHES

1.A The work shows little or no useful investigation of visual concepts and/or compositions, regardless of the number of problem-solving attempts.
1.B There is no original or imaginative ideation in the work in regard to the elements and principles of design; the work comprises trite or simplistic solutions.
1.C The work does not demonstrate a variety of intentions or approaches.
1.D The work does not engage the viewer; there is no confidence evident in the work.
1.E Use of materials and media is naïve and lacks skill or technical competence.
1.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates minimal understanding of analog drawing issues.
1.G The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and have been poorly rendered; there is no discernible student vision or individual transformation.
1.H The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; the set of images may be incomplete.
1.I Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.