

# DP visual arts updated criteria (pre-publication draft)

The DP visual arts assessment criteria has been updated for first use from **May 2017** onwards. This document contains a pre-publication draft of the criteria for all three SL and HL assessment tasks which teachers should use with candidates being assessed in 2017. The updated DP *Visual arts guide* will be published on the OCC by February 2017.

While the assessment criteria contain a number of significant improvements, the nature of the assessment tasks themselves have not altered. Therefore assessment work that has already been completed will not need to be revised as a result of these updates.

Please note: for the **November 2016** assessment session teachers must continue to follow the current guide and use the existing criteria found in the March 2014 version of the *Visual arts guide*.

## Draft external assessment criteria—SL and HL

### Part 1: Comparative study

#### Summary

Part 1: Comparative study		Marks	Total
A	Identification and analysis of formal qualities	6	30
B	Analysis and understanding of function and purpose	6	
C	Analysis and evaluation of cultural significance	6	
D	Making comparisons and connections	6	
E	Presentation and subject-specific language	6	
F	(HL only) Making connections to own art-making practice	12	42

#### Criteria

##### A. Identification and analysis of formal qualities

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- informed identification and analysis of the formal qualities of the selected artworks, objects and artifacts?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–2	The work provides an outline of the formal qualities of the selected pieces, but this is limited, superficial, or relies heavily on personal opinion.
3–4	The work provides a largely descriptive account of the identified formal qualities of the selected pieces. There is some evidence of informed analysis, but this is underdeveloped.
5–6	The work provides a consistent, insightful and informed identification and analysis of the formal qualities of the selected pieces.

## B. Analysis and understanding of function and purpose

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- informed analysis and understanding of the function and purpose of the selected artworks, objects and artifacts within the cultural context in which they were created?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least three artworks by at least two different artists from at least two contrasting cultural contexts will not be awarded a mark higher than 2 in this criterion.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–2	The work provides an outline of the function and purpose of the selected pieces, but this is limited, superficial, or relies heavily on personal opinion.
3–4	The work provides a largely descriptive account of the function and purpose of the selected pieces from at least two contrasting cultural contexts. There is some evidence of informed analysis and understanding, but these are not fully developed.
5–6	The work provides a consistent, insightful and informed analysis and demonstrates thorough understanding of the function and purpose of the selected pieces from at least two contrasting cultural contexts.

## C. Analysis and evaluation of cultural significance

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- informed analysis and evaluation of the cultural significance of the selected artworks, objects and artifacts within the specific context in which they were created (such as the cultural, socio-political and historical significance of the works, with respect to the original audience and purpose, as well as to a contemporary audience)?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least three artworks by at least two different artists from at least two contrasting cultural contexts will not be awarded a mark higher than 2 in this criterion.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–2	The work provides an outline of the material, conceptual and cultural significance of the selected pieces, but this is limited, superficial, or relies heavily on personal opinion.
3–4	The work provides a largely descriptive account of the material, conceptual and cultural significance of the selected pieces from at least two contrasting cultural contexts. There is some evidence of informed analysis and evaluation, but these are not fully developed.
5–6	The work provides a consistently insightful and informed analysis and thorough evaluation of the material, conceptual and cultural significance of the selected pieces from at least two contrasting cultural contexts.

## D. Making comparisons and connections

To what extent does the work demonstrate:

- effective critical analysis and discussion of the connections, similarities and differences between the selected artworks, objects and artifacts?

Candidates who do not examine and compare at least three artworks by at least two different artists 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.

Mark	Descriptor
1–2	The work outlines connections, similarities and differences between the selected pieces, with little analysis. These connections are largely superficial or inappropriate and demonstrate a basic understanding of how the pieces compare and contrast.
3–4	The work analyses and describes the connections, similarities and differences between the selected pieces, with some critical analysis. The connections are logical and coherent, and demonstrate an adequate understanding of how the pieces compare and contrast.
5–6	The work critically analyses and discusses the connections, similarities and differences between the selected pieces. These connections are logical and coherent, showing a thorough understanding of how the pieces compare and contrast.

### 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 is limited or inconsistent in conveying information clearly or in a visually appropriate manner, The work contains some appropriate subject-specific language but this is limited.
3–4	The work clearly and coherently conveys information, in a visually appropriate and legible manner, with some consistent use of appropriate subject-specific language.
5–6	The work clearly and coherently conveys information which results in a visually creative and legible study that enhances the impact of the work and the reader's understanding. Subject-specific language is used accurately and appropriately throughout.

## At HL only

### F. Making connections to own art-making practice

To what extent does the work:

- analyse and evaluate the outcomes of the comparative study investigation and on how this has influenced the student's own development as an artist, identifying connections between one or more of the selected works and the student's own art-making processes and practices?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–3	The work outlines the outcomes of the investigation in a limited way. There are few or only superficial connections to their own art-making practice.
4–6	The work provides some analysis of the outcomes of the investigation. The student describes the extent to which their own art-making and pieces have been influenced by artworks, objects and artifacts examined in the comparative study, making inconsistent or incomplete connections.
7–9	The work provides an analysis of the outcomes of the investigation. The student explains the extent to which their own art-making and pieces have been influenced by artworks, objects and artifacts examined in the comparative study, making adequate connections.
10–12	The work provides a consistent and insightful evaluation on the outcomes of the investigation. The student effectively analyses and evaluates the extent to which their own art-making and pieces have been influenced by artworks, objects and artifacts examined in the comparative study, making informed and meaningful connections throughout.

# Draft 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 portfolio demonstrate:

- the student's 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 portfolios reflecting the minimum required number of media and forms will not be awarded a mark higher than 3 in this criterion.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The portfolio does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–3	The portfolio demonstrates some experimentation and manipulation of skills, techniques, processes and selection of materials, which may not be appropriate or related to intentions.
4–6	Working across at least the minimum required number of media and forms, the portfolio demonstrates experimentation and manipulation of some skills, techniques, processes and the appropriate selection of materials, which are largely consistent with intentions.
7–9	Working across at least the minimum required number of media and forms, the portfolio demonstrates purposeful experimentation and manipulation of a range of skills, techniques and processes. The selection of materials is largely consistent with intentions.
10–12	Working across at least the minimum required number of media and forms, the portfolio 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 portfolio demonstrate:

- the student's critical investigation of artists, artworks and artistic genres, communicating a growing awareness of how this investigation influences and impacts upon their own developing art-making practices and intentions?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The portfolio does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–2	The portfolio shows superficial critical investigation into other artist's art-making practices with little or limited awareness of the impact on the student's own developing art practices or intentions.
3–4	The portfolio shows adequate critical investigation into other artist's art-making practices which displays an awareness of the impact on the student's own developing art practices and/or intentions.
5–6	The portfolio shows in-depth critical investigation into other artist's art-making practices, 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 portfolio demonstrate:

- the student's 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 portfolio does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–2	The portfolio presents limited evidence of how initial ideas or intentions have been formed or developed. The work rarely communicates how technical skills, media and/or ideas have contributed to the processes in their art-making.
3–4	The portfolio adequately identifies how initial ideas and intentions have been formed and developed. The work adequately communicates how technical skills, media and ideas have been assimilated.
5–6	The portfolio clearly articulates how initial ideas and intentions have been formed and developed. The portfolio effectively communicates how technical skills, media and ideas have been assimilated to develop the portfolio further.

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

To what extent does the portfolio demonstrate:

- the student's 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 portfolio does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–2	The portfolio demonstrates limited evidence of the process of reviewing or refining ideas, skills, processes or techniques. Reflection is mostly descriptive or superficial.
3–4	The portfolio demonstrates a process of reviewing and refining ideas, skills, processes and techniques. The work presents an adequate reflection upon the student's acquisition of skills as an artist.
5–6	The portfolio demonstrates an effective and consistent process of reviewing and refining ideas, skills, processes and techniques. The portfolio 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 portfolio:

- 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 portfolio does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1	The portfolio conveys evidence with limited clarity or coherence. There is limited visual evidence and the portfolio contains little or no subject-specific language used to document the art-making process.
2	The portfolio conveys some evidence clearly and/or coherently, however this is inconsistent. There is some range of visual evidence and some inconsistent or elementary use of subject-specific language used to document the art-making process.
3	The portfolio conveys evidence clearly, coherently and appropriately. There is a good range of visual evidence and adequate use of appropriate subject-specific language used to document the art-making process.
4	The portfolio conveys evidence clearly and coherently in an engaging manner. There is an excellent range of visual evidence and consistent use of appropriate subject-specific language used to document the art-making process.

## Draft internal assessment criteria—SL and HL

### Part 3: Exhibition

#### Summary

Part 3: Exhibition		SL marks	SL total	HL marks	HL total
A	Coherent body of works	9	30	9	30
B	Technical competence	9		9	
C	Conceptual qualities	9		9	
D	Curatorial practice	3		3	

#### Criteria

##### A. Coherent body of works

**Evidence:** curatorial rationale, the submitted artworks, exhibition text and exhibition photographs

To what extent does the submitted work communicate:

- a coherent collection of works which fulfill stated artistic intentions and communicate clear thematic or stylistic relationships across individual pieces?

Candidates who fail to submit the minimum number of artworks cannot achieve a mark higher than 6.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–3	The work shows little coherence through minimal communication of thematic or stylistic relationships across individual pieces. The selection and application of media, processes and techniques and the use of imagery show minimal consideration of intentions.

Mark	Descriptor
4–6	The work shows some coherence through adequate communication of thematic or stylistic relationships across individual pieces. Stated intentions are adequately fulfilled through the selection and application of media, processes and techniques and the considered use of imagery.
7–9	The work forms a coherent body of work through effective communication of thematic or stylistic relationships across individual pieces. Stated intentions are consistently and effectively fulfilled through the selection and application of media, processes and techniques and the considered use of imagery.

## B. Technical competence

**Evidence:** curatorial rationale, the submitted artworks, exhibition text and exhibition photographs

To what extent does the submitted work demonstrate:

- effective application and manipulation of media and materials;
- effective application and manipulation of the formal qualities?

Candidates who fail to submit the minimum number of artworks cannot achieve a mark higher than 6.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–3	The work demonstrates minimal application and manipulation of media and materials to reach a minimal level of technical competence in the chosen forms and the minimal application and manipulation of the formal qualities.
4–6	The work demonstrates adequate application and manipulation of media and materials to reach an acceptable level of technical competence in the chosen forms and the adequate application and manipulation of the formal qualities.
7–9	The work demonstrates effective application and manipulation of media and materials to reach an assured level of technical competence in the chosen forms and the effective application and manipulation of the formal qualities.

## C. Conceptual qualities

**Evidence:** curatorial rationale, the submitted artworks, exhibition text and exhibition photographs

To what extent does the submitted work demonstrate:

- effective resolution of imagery, signs and symbols to realize the function, meaning and purpose of the art works, as appropriate to stated intentions?

Candidates who fail to submit the minimum number of artworks cannot achieve a mark higher than 6.

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1–3	The work demonstrates minimal elaboration of ideas, themes or concepts and demonstrates minimal use of imagery, signs or symbols, or the imagery, signs or symbols used are obvious, contrived or superficial. There is minimal communication of artistic intentions.
4–6	The work visually elaborates some ideas, themes or concepts to a point of adequate realization and demonstrates the use of imagery, signs or symbols that result in adequate communication of stated artistic intentions.
7–9	The work visually elaborates ideas, themes or concepts to a point of effective realization and demonstrates the subtle use of complex imagery, signs or symbols that result in effective communication of stated artistic intentions.

### D. Curatorial practice (SL only)

**Evidence:** curatorial rationale, the submitted artworks, exhibition text and exhibition photographs

To what extent does the curatorial rationale justify:

- the selection, arrangement and exhibition of a group of artworks within a designated space?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1	The curatorial rationale partially justifies the selection and arrangement of the exhibited works as appropriate to the student's stated intentions or the curatorial rationale may not be an accurate representation of the exhibition.
2	The curatorial rationale mostly justifies the selection and arrangement of the exhibited works, which are presented and arranged in line with the student's stated intentions in the space made available to the student.
3	The curatorial rationale fully justifies the selection and arrangement of the exhibited works, which are presented and arranged clearly, as appropriate to the student's stated intentions within the space made available to the student.

### D. Curatorial practice (HL only)

**Evidence:** curatorial rationale, the submitted artworks, exhibition text and exhibition photographs

To what extent does the curatorial rationale demonstrate:

- the justification of the selection, arrangement and exhibition of a group of artworks within a designated space?
- reflection on how the exhibition conveys an understanding of the relationship between the artworks and the viewer?

Mark	Descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard identified by the descriptors below.
1	The curatorial rationale partially justifies the selection and arrangement of the exhibited works as appropriate to the student's stated intentions or the curatorial rationale is not an accurate representation of the exhibition.  The curatorial rationale conveys little justification for the relationship between the artworks and the viewer within the space made available to the student.
2	The curatorial rationale mostly justifies the selection and arrangement of the exhibited works as appropriate to the student's stated intentions.  The curatorial rationale mostly articulates the relationship between the artworks and the viewer within the space made available to the student.
3	The curatorial rationale fully justifies the selection and arrangement of the exhibited works as appropriate to the student's stated intentions.  The curatorial rationale effectively articulates the relationship between the artworks and the viewer within the space made available to the student.