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 scale 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.
- **This is a living document—one that evolves over time. Though this is the rubric used in 2014, it is always open to subsequent revision.**

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

- Unity
- Variety
- Balance
- Emphasis
- Contrast
- Rhythm
- Repetition
- Proportion
- Scale
- Figure/Ground Relationships
2-D DESIGN QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS) —SECTION I

Five works that demonstrate your 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 the Student “Voice”

H. Overall Accomplishment

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

- Unity
- Variety
- Rhythm
- Proportion
- Scale
- Balance
- Emphasis
- Contrast
- Repetition
- Figure/Ground Relationship
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6 **EXCELLENT QUALITY**
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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.H Although the five works may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 **STRONG QUALITY**
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 “voice” 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.

4 **GOOD QUALITY**
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 “voice” 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.
2-D DESIGN QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS) —SECTION I (continued)

3  MODERATE QUALITY
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 “voice” 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.

2  WEAK QUALITY
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 “voice” or individual transformation.
2.H The five works show little evidence of accomplishment, and overall the work is at a weak level.

1  POOR QUALITY
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 The work is generally inept; 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 “voice” or individual transformation.
1.H Overall, the five works lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
2-D DESIGN CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II

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

- **Coherence and/or development.** Is the work presented actually a concentration?
- **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 acknowledged in the score that is given.

---

**Key Scoring Descriptors**

**A.** Integration of the Topic of the Concentration 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 the Student “Voice”

**I.** Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Concentration Only)

**J.** Overall Accomplishment

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, and process of the work. Also, keep in mind 2-D design issues such as the following.

Unity, Variety, Balance, Emphasis, Contrast, Rhythm, Repetition, Proportion, Scale, Figure/Ground Relationships
6 **EXCELLENT** CONCENTRATION

6.A The concentration topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
6.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides convincing evidence of informed decision making and discovery.
6.C The concentration 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 clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.J Although the works may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 **STRONG** CONCENTRATION

5.A The concentration topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
5.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in many works.
5.C The work for the concentration generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
5.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernible.
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 “voice” 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.

4 **GOOD** CONCENTRATION

4.A The concentration topic and the work presented are closely related.
4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the concentration.
4.C The concentration 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 “voice” 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 CONCENTRATION**

3.A The connection between the concentration 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 concentration 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 “voice” and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
3.J Although the works for the concentration may show an emerging level of accomplishment, overall the work is at a moderate level.

2  **WEAK CONCENTRATION**

2.A The work conveys a sense of a concentration, 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 concentration 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 “voice” 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 CONCENTRATION

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

1.B The work shows little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.

1.C The concentration 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 na"ive 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 “voice” 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 for the concentration lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
A variety of works demonstrating understanding of 2-D design issues

Look for engagement with a range of design principles such as the following.

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

Key Scoring Descriptors

A. Application of 2-D Design Principles to 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 the Student “Voice”

G. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Breadth sections only)

H. Overall Accomplishment

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, and process of the work.
6 EXCELLENT BREADTH
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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.H The work may show a varying range of accomplishment, but overall it is at an excellent level.

5 STRONG BREADTH
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 “voice” 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 BREADTH
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 “voice” 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.
2-D DESIGN BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES)—SECTION III (continued)

3 MODERATE BREADTH
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 “voice” 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 BREADTH
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 “voice” 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 BREADTH
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 The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naïve 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 “voice” or individual transformation.
1.G The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocussed, or poorly
lighted; there may too few images to constitute investigation of breadth.
1.H Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.
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 scale 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.
- This is a living document—one that evolves over time. Though this is the rubric used in 2014, it is always open to subsequent revision.

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

- Unity
- Variety
- Balance
- Emphasis
- Contrast
- Rhythm
- Repetition
- Proportion
- Scale
- Occupied/Unoccupied Space
- Time
AP® STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

3-D DESIGN QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)—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 the Student “Voice”

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:

<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>
3-D DESIGN QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)—SECTION I (continued)

6 EXCELLENT QUALITY
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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.J Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 STRONG QUALITY
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 “voice” 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.

4 GOOD QUALITY
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.
3-D DESIGN QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)—SECTION I (continued)

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 “voice” 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.

3 MODERATE QUALITY

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 “voice” 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 QUALITY

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 “voice” 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 QUALITY**

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 The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naive 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.G The works are obviously direct, poorly fabricated copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernible student “voice” or individual transformation.

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

1.I Overall, the five works lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
A concentration is defined as "a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence." In scoring concentrations, there are four major areas of concern.

- **Coherence and/or development.** Is the work presented actually a concentration?
- **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 acknowledged in the score that is given.

**Key Scoring Descriptors**

A. Integration of the Topic of the Concentration 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 the Student “Voice”  
I. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Concentrations Only)  
J. Overall Accomplishment

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, and process of the work. Also, keep in mind 3-D design issues such as the following.

Unity, Variety, Balance, Emphasis, Contrast, Rhythm, Repetition, Proportion, Scale, Occupied/Unoccupied Space, and Time
EXCELLENT CONCENTRATION
6.A The concentration topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
6.B The investigation of the concentration provides convincing evidence of informed decision making and discovery.
6.C The concentration 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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.J Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

STRONG CONCENTRATION
5.A The concentration topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
5.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in some works.
5.C The work for the concentration generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
5.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernible.
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 “voice” 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.

GOOD CONCENTRATION
4.A The concentration topic and the work presented are closely related.
4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the concentration.
4.C The concentration 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 “voice” 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-D DESIGN CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II
(continued)

3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION
3.A The connection between the concentration topic and the work is evident but erratic.
3.B Decision making is sporadic, and the work of the concentration demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
3.C The concentration 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 “voice” 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.

2 WEAK CONCENTRATION
2.A There is a sense of a concentration, 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 concentration 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 “voice” 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 installation.
2.J The work shows little evidence of accomplishment and overall it is of weak quality.
1 POOR CONCENTRATION
1.A There is very little or no evidence of a concentration topic in the work presented, or there is not enough work to represent a concentration.
1.B An idea for a concentration may be presented, but the knowledge and understanding to investigate and carry it out are not evident in the work.
1.C The concentration 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 concentration 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 “voice” or individual transformation.
1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocussed, or poorly lighted; any details provide no additional information about the objects or installation.
1.J Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor quality
3-D DESIGN BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES)—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.**

<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>

**Key Scoring Descriptors**

A. **Application of 3-D Design Principles to 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 the Student “Voice”**

G. **Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Breadth Sections Only)**

H. **Overall Accomplishment**
3-D DESIGN BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES)—SECTION III (continued)

6 EXCELLENT BREADTH
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, 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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.H Although the work may show varying levels of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 STRONG BREADTH
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 “voice” 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 BREADTH
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 “voice” 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.
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3-D DESIGN BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES)—SECTION III (continued)

3 MODERATE BREADTH
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 “voice” 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.

2 WEAK BREADTH
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 “voice” 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 BREADTH
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 The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naïve 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 “voice” or individual transformation.
1.G The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocussed, or poorly lighted; the set of images may be incomplete.
1.H Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.
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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 scale 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.
- **This is a living document—one that evolves over time. Though this is the rubric used in 2014, it is always open to subsequent revision.**

**DRAWING issues 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
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DRAWING QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)―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 the Student “Voice"
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
6 **EXCELLENT QUALITY**
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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.I Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 **STRONG QUALITY**
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 “voice” is prominent.
5.I Although the five works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a strong level.
DRAWING QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)—SECTION I (continued)

4  GOOD QUALITY
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 “voice” 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 QUALITY
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 “voice” 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 QUALITY
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 “voice” or individual transformation.

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

1 POOR QUALITY

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 The work is generally inept; 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 “voice” or individual transformation.

1.I Overall the five drawings lack accomplishment and are at a poor level.
A concentration is defined as "a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence." In scoring concentrations, there are four major areas of concern.

- **Coherence and/or development.** Is the work presented actually a concentration?
- **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 acknowledged in the score that is given.

**Key Scoring Descriptors**

A. Integration of the Topic of the Concentration 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 the Student “Voice”

I. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Concentrations Only)

J. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

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

Line Quality, Light and Shade, Rendering of Form, Composition, Surface Manipulation, the Illusion of Depth, Mark Making
6 **EXCELLENT** CONCENTRATION

6.A The concentration topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
6.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides convincing evidence of informed decision making and discovery.
6.C The concentration 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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.J Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 **STRONG** CONCENTRATION

5.A The concentration topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
5.B The investigation of the concentration provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in many works.
5.C The concentration 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 “voice” through individual transformation of the images.
5.J Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at a good level.

4 **GOOD** CONCENTRATION

4.A The concentration topic and the work presented are closely related.
4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the concentration.
4.C The concentration 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 “voice” 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.
DRAWING CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II

3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION
3.A The connection between the concentration 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 concentration 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 skilfully rendered, the student’s “voice” 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 CONCENTRATION
2.A There is a sense of a concentration, 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 concentration 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 “voice” 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 CONCENTRATION
1.A There is very little or no evidence of a concentration topic in the work presented, or there is not enough work to represent a concentration.
1.B There is little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.
1.C The concentration 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 naïve 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 “voice” 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.
DRAWING BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES) — SECTION III

Works demonstrating understanding of a range of drawing issues

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Quality</th>
<th>Surface Manipulation</th>
<th>Surface Manipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light and Shade</td>
<td>The Illusion of Depth</td>
<td>The Illusion of Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering of Form</td>
<td>Mark Making</td>
<td>Mark Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Scoring Descriptors

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

B. Decision Making in Terms of Experimentation and/or Risk Taking

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

D. Originality and Innovative Thinking

E. Range of Intentions or Approaches

F. Confident, Evocative Work that Engages the Viewer

G. Technical Competence and Skill with Drawing Materials and Media

H. Understanding the Use of Digital or Photographic Sources

I. Appropriation and the Student “Voice”

J. Image Quality (for Weak and Poor Breadth Sections Only)

K. Overall Accomplishment and Quality
6 EXCELLENT BREADTH
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 in which the student’s “voice” is prominent.
6.I Although the works may show a varying range of accomplishment, overall the work is at an excellent level.

5 STRONG BREADTH
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 “voice” 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.

4 GOOD BREADTH
4.A 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 “voice” 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.
DRAWING BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES) —SECTION III (continued)

3  MODERATE BREADTH
3.A 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 “voice” 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 good level.

2  WEAK BREADTH
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 “voice” or individual transformation.
2.H The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocussed, or poorly lighted.
2.I The work shows little evidence of accomplishment; overall the work is at a weak level.

1  POOR BREADTH
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 The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naive 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 are poorly rendered; there is no discernible student “voice” or individual transformation.

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

1.I Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.