**Structuring the process portfolio**

Students will have pursued their own interests, ideas and strengths, and their submitted work should highlight the key milestones in this journey. The submission may come from scanned pages, photographs or digital files. The process portfolio screens may take a variety of forms, such as sketches, images, digital drawings, photographs or text. While there is no limit to the number of items students may wish to include on each screen, students should be reminded that overcrowded or illegible materials may result in examiners being unable to interpret and understand their intentions.

The selected screens should evidence a sustained inquiry into the techniques the student has used for making art, the way in which they have experimented, explored, manipulated and refined materials, technologies and techniques and how these have been applied to developing work. Students should show where they have made independent decisions about the choices of media, form and purpose that are appropriate to their intentions. The portfolio should communicate their investigation, development of ideas and artworks and evidence a synthesis of ideas and media. This process will have inevitably resulted in both resolved and unresolved artworks and candidates should consider their successes and failures as equally valuable learning experiences.

Examiners are looking to reward evidence of the following:

* sustained experimentation and manipulation of a variety of media and techniques and an ability to select art-making materials and media appropriate to stated intentions
* sustained working that has been informed by critical investigation of artists, artworks and artistic genres and evidence of how these have influenced and impacted own practice
* how initial ideas and intentions have been formed and how connections have been made between skills, chosen media and ideas
* how ideas, skills, processes and techniques are reviewed and refined along with reflection on the acquisition of skills and analysis of development as a visual artist
* how the submitted screens are clearly and coherently presented with competent and consistent use of appropriate subject-specific language.

Students must ensure that their work makes effective use of appropriate subject-specific language. **Academic honesty**

Every image used within the process portfolio must be appropriately referenced to acknowledge the title, artist, date (where this information is known) and the source, following the protocol of the referencing style chosen by the school. Students must ensure their own original work is identified and acknowledged in the same way to ensure examiners are clear about the origins of the materials. When the student is aware that another person’s work, ideas or images have influenced their conceptual or developmental work but it has not been referred to directly in their work, the source must be included as a bibliography reference within the submitted portfolio screens. The submitted screens must not include any resolved works submitted for part 3: exhibition assessment task.

**Art-making forms**For SL students the submitted work must be in at least **two** art-making forms, each from separate columns of the table below. For HL students the submitted work must have been created in at least **three** art-making forms, selected from a minimum of two columns of the art-making forms table below. The examples given are for guidance only and are not intended to represent a definitive list.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Two-dimensional forms**  | **Three-dimensional forms**  | **Lens-based, electronic and screen-based forms**  |
| * **Drawing**: such as charcoal, pencil, ink
* **Painting**: such as acrylic, oil, watercolour
* **Printmaking**: such as relief, intaglio,

planographic, chine collé * **Graphics**: such as illustration and design
 | * **Sculpture**: such as ceramics, found objects, wood,

assemblage * **Designed objects**: such as fashion, architectural, vessels
* **Site specific/ephemeral**: such as land art, installation, mural
* **Textiles**: such as fibre, weaving, printed fabric
 | * **Time-based and sequential art**: such as animation, graphic novel, storyboard
* **Lens media**: such as still, moving, montage
* **Digital/screen based**: such as vector graphics, software generated
 |

Submitted work might well include experiments undertaken during (and reflections upon) taster sessions in particular media, demonstrations of techniques, workshops, master classes, guided experimentation and studio practice experienced as part of the core syllabus activities outlined above.

**Formal requirements of the task—SL**

• SL students submit 9–18 screens which evidence their sustained experimentation, exploration, manipulation and refinement of a variety of art-making activities. For SL students the submitted work must be in at least **two** art-making forms, each from separate columns of the art-making forms table.

**Formal requirements of the task—HL**

• HL students submit 13–25 screens which evidence their sustained experimentation, exploration, manipulation and refinement of a variety of art-making activities. For HL students the submitted work must have been created in at least **three** art-making forms, selected from a minimum of two columns of the art-making forms table.

**Submitting assessment work**

The submitted screens must not include any resolved works submitted for part 3: exhibition assessment task.

The size and format of screens submitted for assessment is not prescribed. Submitted materials are assessed on screen and students must ensure that their work is clear and legible when presented in a digital, on- screen format. Students should not scan multiple pages of work from their journals and submit them as a single screen, for example, as overcrowded or illegible materials may result in examiners being unable to interpret and understand the intentions of the work.

The procedure for submitting work for assessment can be found in the *Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme*. Students are required to indicate the number of screens when the materials are submitted. Where submitted materials exceed the prescribed screen limits examiners are instructed to base their assessment solely on the materials that appear within the limits.

External assessment criteria—SL and HL

**Part 2: Process portfolio Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 2: Process portfolio**  | **SL marks**  | **SL total**  | **HL marks**  | **HL total**  |
| **A**  | Skills, techniques and processes  | 12  | 34  | 12  | 34  |
| **B**  | Critical investigation  | 6  | 6  |
| **C**  | Communication of ideas and intentions  | 6  | 6  |
| **D**  | Reviewing, refining and reflecting  | 6  | 6  |
| **E**  | Presentation and subject-specific language  | 4  | 4  |

**Criteria
A. Skills, techniques and processes**Using the required number of art-making forms from the art-making forms table, to what extent does the work demonstrate:
• sustained experimentation and manipulation of a range of skills, techniques and processes, showing

the ability to select and use materials appropriate to their intentions?

Candidates who do not submit works reflecting the minimum number of media and forms will not be awarded a mark higher than 3 in this criterion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark**  | **Descriptor**  |
| 0  | The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below  |
| 1–3  | The work demonstrates some experimentation and manipulation of skills, techniques, processes and selection of materials, which may not be appropriate or related to intentions. This work is incoherent.  |
| 4–6  | Working across at least the required number of media and forms, the work demonstrates experimentation and manipulation of some skills, techniques, processes and the appropriate selection of materials, which are largely consistent with intentions. This work is superficial at times.  |
| 7–9  | Working across at least the required number of media and forms, the work demonstrates purposeful experimentation and manipulation of a range of skills, techniques and processes. The selection of materials is mostly consistent with intentions.  |
| 10–12  | Working across at least the required number of media and forms, the work demonstrates assured and sustained experimentation and manipulation of a range of skills, techniques and processes, and a highly appropriate selection of materials, consistent with intentions.  |

**B. Critical investigation**

To what extent does the work demonstrate: • critical investigation of artists, artworks and artistic genres, communicating the student’s growing awareness of how this investigation influences and impacts upon their own developing art-making practices and intentions?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark**  | **Descriptor**  |
| 0  | The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below  |
| 1–2  | The work shows limited critical investigation with little or limited awareness of the impact on the student’s own developing art practices or intentions.  |
| 3–4  | The work shows sound critical investigation which displays an awareness of the impact on the student’s own developing art practices and intentions.  |
| 5–6  | The work shows in-depth critical investigation, clearly communicating a secure and insightful awareness of how this investigation has impacted upon the student’s own developing practices and intentions.  |

**C. Communication of ideas and intentions (in both visual and written forms)**

Using the required number of art-making forms from the art-making forms table, to what extent does the student demonstrate: • the ability to clearly articulate how their initial ideas and intentions have been formed and developed and how they have assimilated technical skills, chosen media and ideas to develop their work further?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark**  | **Descriptor**  |
| 0  | The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.  |
| 1–2  | The work lists how initial ideas or intentions have been formed or developed. The work rarely communicates how technical skills, media or ideas have contributed to their work.  |
| 3–4  | The work attempts to identify how initial ideas and intentions have been formed and developed, but this is underdeveloped. The work communicates how technical skills, media and ideas have been assimilated, but with room for further depth.  |
| 5–6  | The work clearly articulates how initial ideas and intentions have been formed and developed. The work effectively communicates how technical skills, media and ideas have been assimilated to develop the work further.  |
|  |  |

**D. Reviewing, refining and reflecting (in both visual and written forms)**

To what extent does the work demonstrate: the ability to review and refine selected ideas, skills, processes and techniques, and to reflect on the acquisition of skills and their development as a visual artist?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark**  | **Descriptor**  |
| 0  | The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.  |
| 1–2  | The work demonstrates little understanding of the process of reviewing or refining ideas, skills, processes or techniques. Reflection is mostly descriptive or superficial.  |
| 3–4  | The work demonstrates a process of reviewing and refining ideas, skills, processes and techniques, but this is underdeveloped. The work presents a reflection upon the acquisition of skills as an artist, but with room for further depth.  |
| 5–6  | The work demonstrates a highly effective and consistent process of reviewing and refining ideas, skills, processes and techniques. The work presents a meaningful and assured reflection upon the acquisition of skills and analysis of the student’s development as an artist.  |

**E. Presentation and subject-specific language** To what extent does the work: ensure that information is conveyed clearly and coherently in a visually appropriate and legible manner, supported by the consistent use of appropriate subject-specific language?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mark**  | **Descriptor**  |
| 0  | The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.  |
| 1–2  | The work makes some attempt to convey information clearly or in a visually appropriate manner; however this may be inconsistent or not always appropriate. There is some attempt to use subject-specific language but this is infrequent or with inaccuracies.  |
| 3–4  | The work clearly and coherently conveys information which results in visually appropriate, legible and engaging work. Subject-specific language is used accurately and appropriately throughout.  |