



AP[®] Studio Art 2014 Scoring Guidelines

© 2014 The College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board.

Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.org.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.org.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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**

**AP[®] STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES**

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**

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

2-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 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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 naïve 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

2-D DESIGN CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II (continued)

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 An evocative, engaging concentration theme is clearly present in much of the work.
- 5.E Overall the work shows understanding and effective application of 2-D design principles; there may be some less successful pieces.
- 5.F The work generally conveys a sense of transformation and growth.
- 5.G The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

2-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 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

2-D DESIGN CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II
(continued)

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 naïve and lacks skill.
- 1.H The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernible student “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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

2-D DESIGN BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES)—SECTION III

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

2-D DESIGN BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES)—SECTION III (continued)

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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, unfocused, or poorly lighted; there may be too few images to constitute investigation of breadth.
- 1.H Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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:

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 (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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

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

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

3-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. **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

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

3-D DESIGN CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II (continued)

6 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.

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 some works.
- 5.C The work for the concentration generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
- 5.D An evocative, engaging concentration theme is clearly present in much of the work.
- 5.E Overall the work shows a strong understanding and effective application of 3-D design principles; some pieces may be less successful.
- 5.F The work generally conveys a sense of transformation and growth.
- 5.G In general, the work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas, and expertise with some skills is evident.
- 5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "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.

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 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

3-D DESIGN CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II
(continued)

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

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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.**

Unity
Variety
Balance
Emphasis
Contrast

Rhythm
Repetition
Proportion
Scale
Occupied/Unoccupied Space
Time

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**

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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, unfocused, or poorly lighted; the set of images may be incomplete.
- 1.H Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is at a poor level.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

Drawing Portfolio

General information and a few provisos:

- ❖ The scoring rubric for the AP portfolios contains score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak), and 1 (poor).
- ❖ Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.
- ❖ Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.
- ❖ Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.
- ❖ The descriptors are examples; it isn't expected that all the descriptors for a 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**

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)—SECTION I (continued)

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING QUALITY (SELECTED WORKS)—SECTION I (continued)

- 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING 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 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

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II (continued)

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II (continued)

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 skillfully 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING CONCENTRATION (SUSTAINED INVESTIGATION)—SECTION II
(continued)

- 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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART 2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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.**

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

**Surface Manipulation
The Illusion of Depth
Mark Making**

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**

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES) —SECTION III (continued)

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.

AP[®] STUDIO ART

2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

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 naïve and lacks skill or technical competence.
- 1.F When digital or photographic processes are used, the work demonstrates minimal understanding of analog drawing issues.

AP[®] STUDIO ART
2014 SCORING GUIDELINES

DRAWING BREADTH (RANGE OF APPROACHES) —SECTION III (continued)

- 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.