



## **AP<sup>®</sup> Studio Art 2005 Scoring Guidelines**

### **The College Board: Connecting Students to College Success**

The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 4,700 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves over three and a half million students and their parents, 23,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admissions, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT<sup>®</sup>, the PSAT/NMSQT<sup>®</sup>, and the Advanced Placement Program<sup>®</sup> (AP<sup>®</sup>). The College Board is committed to the principles of excellence and equity, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

Copyright © 2005 by College Board. All rights reserved. College Board, AP Central, APCD, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Vertical Teams, Pre-AP, SAT, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Entrance Examination Board. Admitted Class Evaluation Service, CollegeEd, Connect to college success, MyRoad, SAT Professional Development, SAT Readiness Program, and Setting the Cornerstones are trademarks owned by the College Entrance Examination Board. PSAT/NMSQT is a registered trademark of the College Entrance Examination Board and National Merit Scholarship Corporation. Other products and services may be trademarks of their respective owners. Permission to use copyrighted College Board materials may be requested online at: <http://www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html>.

**Visit the College Board on the Web: [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com).**  
**AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program and Pre-AP: [apcentral.collegeboard.com](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com).**

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**2-D Design Portfolio**

**General information and a few provisos:**

- The scoring guidelines for the AP portfolios contain 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 is not 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 these are the scoring guidelines that were used in 2005, they are always open to subsequent revision.

**Principles of Design:**

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

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2005 SCORING GUIDELINES

## 2-D Design Quality—Section I

**Five works that demonstrate mastery of design**—apparent in the composition, concept, and execution of the works.

**6 EXCELLENT QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is consistently of high quality, although not all pieces will necessarily be at precisely the same level of expertise;
- shows an imaginative, inventive, and confident articulation of the principles of design;
- shows accomplished use of the elements of design guided by the principles;
- shows a well-informed sense of composition;
- shows obvious evidence of thinking;
- demonstrates evidence of confidence and of verve;
- addresses fairly complex visual and/or conceptual ideas;
- uses materials effectively; technique is generally excellent;
- may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk-taking;
- may be notable for sensitivity and/or subtlety;
- demonstrates informed decision-making.

Any apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists seems merely to have provided a visual reference in the service of a larger, personal vision.

**5 STRONG QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally strong, although there may be inconsistencies in overall quality;
- demonstrates a strong grasp of the elements and principles of design, using them to express a visual idea;
- shows generally strong composition;
- shows effective manipulation of the elements of design within the work as a whole;
- shows evidence of thinking, i.e., it conveys a sense that it is about something;
- is fairly confident;
- may have evocative qualities;
- successfully engages with most aspects of technique and materials.

If there is apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, there is also a strong sense of the student's individual transformation of the images.

**4 GOOD QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- has some sense of purpose or direction, but it may not be fully resolved;
- demonstrates a good understanding of the elements and principles of design;
- uses the elements of design in support of at least one principle of design;
- shows generally purposeful composition;
- demonstrates some degree of success;
- shows some manipulation of ideas;
- has some technical aspects that are handled well or some ideas that are handled well, but the two do not always mesh or work together;
- shows a sense of technical competence.

If there is apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's individual "voice" can be discerned.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**2-D Design Quality—Section I (continued)**

**3 MODERATE QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- shows an emerging awareness of the elements and principles of design;
- shows a stronger emphasis on the elements of design than on the principles; demonstrates a limited sense of composition;
- shows a sense of real effort, but problems are not successfully resolved;
- is more accomplished technically than it is conceptually;
- might not show the technical skills needed to resolve the ideas it addresses;
- has erratic technique, with little or no sense of challenge;
- shows some ambition while achieving only moderate success.

If published photographic sources or the work of other artists are used, the work appears to be a nearly direct reproduction; the student's "voice" is minimal.

**2 WEAK QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally weak or awkward;
- shows little awareness of elements and principles of design;
- may show some ability at using the elements of design with little awareness of the principles;
- is weak in terms of composition;
- employs simplistic solutions to design problems;
- has little sense of exploration;
- lacks a clear sense of intention;
- shows limited artistic decision-making.

The works are copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; little discernible student "voice."

**1 POOR QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally inept;
- shows a lack of understanding of the principles of design;
- is poorly composed;
- has minimal command of the elements of design;
- shows little evidence of thinking/artistic decision-making;
- reveals a misunderstanding of technique;
- shows a lack of awareness of tools/media;
- uses trite solutions to visual problems.

The works are obviously direct copies of photographic sources or the work of other artists; no discernible student "voice."

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**2-D Design Concentration—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—including the amount of work or number of pieces represented
- 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.

The scoring guidelines that follow provide examples of overall characteristics of concentrations that would merit each of the six scores.

---

**6 EXCELLENT CONCENTRATION**

- There is an unmistakable connection between the idea of the concentration and the work presented.
- The concentration engages the viewer with the work and the idea.
- The work shows effective integration of concept and design skills.
- Technical aspects are strong to excellent.
- The work shows informed risk-taking and development beyond technical concerns.
- An evocative theme is carried out.
- The work demonstrates an original vision.
- Overall, the work is of excellent quality.

**5 STRONG CONCENTRATION**

- The work and the concentration topic have a close relationship.
- The idea of the concentration is good to strong.
- There is evidence of thought in the work.
- The work is technically competent; skill is evident.
- There is evidence of effective pursuit of the idea.
- There may be some less successful pieces, but overall the work shows a strong grasp of design principles.
- The work shows a sense of transformation over time, although it may not be totally successful.
- An evocative theme is investigated.
- Overall, the work is of strong quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART**  
**2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**2-D Design Concentration—Section II (continued)**

**4 GOOD CONCENTRATION**

- There is a sense of concentration, and the work is related to the idea.
- The work may be inconsistent in terms of quality, but overall the application of design principles is good.
- Manipulation of ideas is evident.
- Some growth and discovery are evident.
- The work may be a concentration and be technically competent but demonstrates an incomplete sense of investigation.
- Although the work is of strong or excellent quality, it is not a concentration.
- Overall, the work is of good quality.

**3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION**

- The work is a concentration, but the topic is inadequately considered.
- The concentration may include several loosely related ideas.
- The concentration may be so broad that the student could not really explore an idea in depth.
- The work may be inconsistently related to the idea.
- Some growth is evident, but only moderate understanding of design principles is demonstrated.
- Although the work may be of good quality, it is not a concentration.
- Overall the work is of moderate quality.

**2 WEAK CONCENTRATION**

- There is little investigation of the idea.
- The idea is appropriate for a concentration, but the knowledge and understanding needed to execute it are not evident.
- A concentration is presented, but the work is weak in application of design principles.
- The work may appear to constitute a good start, but it does not show sufficient investigation.
- Although the work shows moderate grasp of design principles, it is not a concentration.
- Quantity of work may be lacking.
- Overall, the work is of weak quality.

**1 POOR CONCENTRATION**

- There is very little or no sense of investigation.
- The idea of the concentration is not carried out.
- The work shows very little or no evidence of understanding of design principles.
- There is a lack of an underlying rationale that would link the work.
- There is not enough work to represent a concentration.
- The slides are virtually impossible to see.
- Overall, the work is of poor quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**2-D Design Breadth—Section III**

A variety of works demonstrating understanding of the principles of design. Look for engagement with a range of design principles:

**Unity/variety**  
**Balance/ Emphasis/Contrast**  
**Rhythm**

**Repetition**  
**Proportion/scale**  
**Figure/ground relationship**

---

**6 EXCELLENT BREADTH**

- The work demonstrates serious, successful engagement with a broad range of design problems.
- Work demonstrates confident articulation of the principles of design.
- The work uses the elements and principles of design in inventive or evocative ways.
- Most work demonstrates successful experimentation, risk-taking, and/or ambition.
- The work is technically accomplished.
- Work addresses sophisticated/complex ideas with confidence and verve.
- Form and content are synthesized to communicate visual ideas.
- Overall, the work is of excellent quality.

**5 STRONG BREADTH**

- The work demonstrates engagement with a broad range of design problems.
- The work demonstrates successful articulation of the principles of design.
- Works may demonstrate successful experimentation and/or risk-taking.
- The use of materials is appropriate to the problems addressed and technique is generally strong.
- The work addresses sophisticated and/or complex ideas with some success.
- The work shows clear decision-making.
- The link between form and content is strong.
- Overall, the quality of the work is strong

**4 GOOD BREADTH**

- Work shows engagement with a reasonable range of design problems.
- The work demonstrates a clear effort to apply the principles of design, with some success.
- Work may appear as very successful solutions to design exercises but not go beyond that level.
- Technique and use of materials is reasonably competent.
- Work shows an emerging sense of ambition and/or sophistication.
- There is evidence of thinking in most of the works.
- There is some relationship between form and content.
- Range of design problems may be limited, despite strong to excellent quality.
- Work may demonstrate strong to excellent breadth of design problems attempted but be of less than good quality.
- Overall, the work is of good quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**2-D Design Breadth—Section III (continued)**

**3 MODERATE BREADTH**

- The work shows engagement with superficial range of design problems.
- Understanding and application of design principles is emerging.
- Work may appear to be good solutions to design exercises but not go beyond that level.
- Technical skill is uneven or questionable.
- Work may show slight experimentation or risk-taking.
- There is evidence of a modest level of thinking/decision-making in the work.
- The relationship between form and content is unclear.
- Work may be of good quality but with a narrow range of experience demonstrated.
- Work may exhibit good breadth but be of less than moderate quality.
- Overall, the work is of moderate quality.

**2 WEAK BREADTH**

- Work shows little engagement with a range of design problems.
- Understanding of design principles appears to be fairly undeveloped.
- Work may attempt to address a range of design issues without much success.
- Technique/use of materials is awkward.
- Work may demonstrate good to moderate technique, but the engagement with the principles of design is weak.
- Solutions to a range of problems may be simplistic.
- Evidence of thinking/decision-making is slight or present in only a few works.
- There is little apparent relationship between form and content.
- Work may be moderate in quality but does not address a range of design issues.
- There may be a moderate demonstration of breadth, but the work is of poor quality.
- Overall, the work is of weak quality.

**1 POOR BREADTH**

- The range of design problems addressed is extremely limited.
- Understanding of design principles is questionable or lacking.
- Work may be weak in quality and does not address a range of design issues.
- A variety of design problems are attempted, but solutions are generally unsuccessful.
- Technique is clumsy/incompetent.
- Work may demonstrate moderate to weak technique, but the engagement with the principles of design is poor.
- Solutions tend to be inept or trite.
- Little, if any, evidence of thinking/decision-making is present in the work.
- Form, material, and content are unconsidered.
- Not enough work is presented to demonstrate breadth.
- The slides are virtually impossible to see.
- Overall, the work is of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2005 SCORING GUIDELINES

## 3-D Design Portfolio

### General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring guidelines for the AP portfolios contain 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 is not 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 these are the scoring guidelines that were used in 2005, they are always open to subsequent revision.

### Principles of 3-D Design:

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

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**3-D Design Quality—Section I**

**Slides of five works that demonstrate mastery of three-dimensional design**—apparent in the composition, concept, and execution of the works.

**6 EXCELLENT QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is consistently of high quality, although not all pieces will necessarily be at precisely the same level of expertise;
- shows an imaginative, inventive, and confident articulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design;
- shows convincing engagement with three-dimensional space;
- shows convincing use of the elements of 3-D design in concert with the principles;
- shows obvious evidence of thinking;
- demonstrates evidence of confidence and of verve;
- addresses fairly complex visual and/or conceptual ideas;
- uses materials effectively; technique is generally excellent;
- may show successful engagement with experimentation/risk-taking;
- may be notable for sensitivity/subtlety;
- demonstrates informed decision-making.

Any apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists seems merely to have provided a visual reference in the service of a larger, personal vision.

**5 STRONG QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally strong, although there may be inconsistencies in overall quality;
- demonstrates a strong grasp of the principles of 3-D design, using them to express a visual idea;
- shows generally strong engagement with three-dimensional space;
- shows effective manipulation of the elements of 3-D design within the work as a whole;
- shows evidence of thinking, i.e., it conveys a sense that it is about something;
- is fairly confident;
- may have evocative qualities;
- successfully engages with most aspects of technique and materials.

If there is apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, there is also a strong sense of the student's individual transformation of the images.

**4 GOOD QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- has some sense of purpose or direction, but it may not be fully resolved;
- demonstrates a good understanding of principles of 3-D design;
- demonstrates purposeful engagement with three-dimensional space;
- uses the elements of 3-D design in support of at least one principle of design;
- demonstrates some degree of success;
- shows some manipulation of ideas;
- has some technical aspects that are handled well or some ideas that are handled well, but the two do not always mesh and work together;
- shows a sense of technical competence.

If there is apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's individual "voice" can be discerned.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**3-D Design Quality—Section I (continued)**

**3 MODERATE QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- shows an emerging awareness of the principles of 3-D design;
- shows a stronger focus on the elements of 3-D design than on the principles;
- engagement with three-dimensional space is limited;
- shows a sense of real effort, but problems are not successfully resolved;
- is more accomplished technically than it is conceptually;
- might not show the technical skills needed to resolve the ideas it addresses;
- has erratic technique, with little or no sense of challenge;
- shows some ambition while achieving only moderate success.

If published photographic sources or the work of other artists are used, the work appears to be a nearly direct reproduction; the student's "voice" is minimal.

**2 WEAK QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally weak or awkward;
- shows little awareness of the principles of 3-D design;
- may show some ability at using the elements of 3-D design, with little awareness of the principles;
- shows weak engagement with three-dimensional space;
- solves problems simplistically;
- has little sense of exploration;
- lacks a clear sense of intention;
- shows limited artistic decision-making.

The works are copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; little discernible student "voice."

**1 POOR QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally inept;
- shows a lack of understanding of the principles of 3-D design;
- shows minimal engagement with three-dimensional space;
- has minimal command of the elements of design;
- shows little evidence of thinking/artistic decision-making;
- reveals a misunderstanding of technique;
- shows a lack of awareness of tools/media;
- uses trite solutions to visual problems.

The works are obviously direct copies of photographic sources or the work of other artists; no discernible student "voice."

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2005 SCORING GUIDELINES

## 3-D Design Concentration—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—including the amount of work or number of pieces represented
- 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.

The scoring guidelines that follow provide examples of overall characteristics of concentrations that would merit each of the six scores.

---

### 6 **EXCELLENT** CONCENTRATION

- There is an unmistakable connection between the idea of the concentration and the work presented.
- The concentration engages the viewer with the work and the idea.
- The work shows effective integration of concept and 3-D design skills.
- Technical aspects are strong to excellent.
- The work shows informed risk-taking and development beyond technical concerns.
- An evocative theme is carried out.
- The work demonstrates an original vision.
- Overall, the work is of excellent quality.

### 5 **STRONG** CONCENTRATION

- The work and the concentration topic have a close relationship.
- The idea of the concentration is good to strong.
- There is evidence of thought in the work.
- The work is technically competent; skill is evident.
- There is evidence of effective pursuit of the idea.
- There may be some weaker pieces, but overall the work shows a strong grasp of 3-D design principles.
- The work shows a sense of transformation over time, although it might not be totally successful.
- An evocative theme is investigated.
- Overall, the work is of strong quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART**  
**2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**3-D Design Concentration—Section II (continued)**

**4 GOOD CONCENTRATION**

- There is a sense of concentration, and the work is related to the idea.
- The work may be inconsistent in terms of quality, but overall the application of 3-D design principles is good.
- Manipulation of ideas is evident.
- Some growth and discovery are evident.
- The work may be a concentration and be technically competent but demonstrates an incomplete sense of investigation.
- Although the work is of strong or excellent quality, it is not a concentration.
- Overall, the work is of good quality.

**3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION**

- The work is a concentration, but the topic is inadequately considered.
- It might include several loosely related ideas.
- It might be so broad that the student could not really explore an idea in depth.
- The work might be inconsistently related to the idea.
- Some growth is evident, but only moderate understanding of 3-D design principles is demonstrated.
- Although the work may be of good quality, it is not a concentration.
- Overall, the work is of moderate quality.

**2 WEAK CONCENTRATION**

- There is little investigation of the idea.
- The idea is appropriate for a concentration, but the knowledge and understanding needed to execute it are not evident.
- A concentration is presented, but the work is consistently weak in application of 3-D design principles.
- The work may appear to constitute a good start, but it does not show sufficient investigation.
- Although the work shows moderate grasp of 3d design, it is not a concentration.
- Quantity of work may be lacking.
- Overall, the work is of weak quality.

**1 POOR CONCENTRATION**

- There is very little or no sense of investigation.
- The idea of the concentration is not carried out.
- The work shows little or no evidence of understanding of 3-D design principles.
- There is a lack of an underlying rationale that would link the work.
- There is not enough work to represent a concentration.
- The slides are virtually impossible to see.
- Overall, the work is of poor quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**3-D Design Breadth—Section III**

A variety of works demonstrating understanding of the principles of 3-D design. Look for engagement with a range of 3-D design principles:

**Unity/variety**  
**Balance**  
**Emphasis**  
**Contrast**

**Rhythm**  
**Repetition**  
**Proportion/scale**  
**Figure/ground relationship**

---

**6 EXCELLENT BREADTH**

- The work demonstrates serious, successful engagement with a broad range of 3-D design problems.
- Work demonstrates confident articulation of the principles of 3-D design.
- The work uses the elements and principles of 3-D design in inventive or evocative ways.
- Most work demonstrates successful experimentation, risk-taking, and/or ambition.
- The work demonstrates technical accomplishment.
- Work addresses sophisticated/complex ideas with confidence and verve.
- Form and content are synthesized to communicate visual ideas.
- Overall, the work is of excellent quality.

**5 STRONG BREADTH**

- The works demonstrate engagement with a broad range of 3-D design problems.
- The works demonstrate successful articulation of the principles of 3-D design.
- Work may demonstrate successful experimentation and/or risk-taking.
- The use of materials is appropriate to the problems addressed and technique is generally strong.
- The work addresses sophisticated and/or complex ideas with some success.
- The work shows clear decision-making.
- The link between form and content is strong.
- Overall, the quality of the work is strong.

**4 GOOD BREADTH**

- Work shows engagement with a reasonable range of 3-D design problems.
- The work demonstrates a clear effort to apply the principles of 3-D design, with some success.
- Range of design problems may be limited, despite strong to excellent quality.
- Work may appear as very successful solutions to design exercises but does not go beyond that level.
- Technique and use of materials show an emerging sense of competence.
- Work shows an emerging sense of ambition and/or sophistication.
- There is evidence of thinking in most of the works.
- There is some relationship between form and content.
- Work may demonstrate strong to excellent breadth of design problems attempted but be of less than good quality.
- Overall, the work is of good quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART**  
**2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**3-D Design Breadth—Section III (continued)**

**3 MODERATE BREADTH**

- The work shows a superficial range of engagement with 3-D design problems.
- Understanding and application of 3-D design principles is limited.
- Work may be of good quality but with a narrow range of experience demonstrated.
- Work may appear to be good solutions to design exercises but not go beyond that level.
- Technical skill is uneven or questionable.
- Work may show slight experimentation or risk-taking.
- There is evidence of a modest level of thinking/decision-making in the work.
- The relationship between form and content is unclear.
- Work may exhibit good breadth but be of less than moderate quality.
- Overall, the work is of moderate quality.

**2 WEAK BREADTH**

- Work shows little engagement with a range of 3-D design problems.
- Understanding of 3-D design principles appears to be undeveloped.
- Work may be moderate in quality but does not address a range of design issues.
- Work may attempt to address a range of design issues without much success.
- Technique/use of materials is awkward.
- Work may demonstrate good to moderate technique, but the engagement with the principles of design is weak.
- Solutions to a range of problems are simplistic.
- Evidence of thinking/decision-making is slight or present in only a few works.
- There is little apparent relationship between form and content.
- There may be a moderate demonstration of breadth, but the work is of poor quality.
- Overall, the work is of weak quality.

**1 POOR BREADTH**

- The range of 3-D design problems addressed is extremely limited.
- Understanding of 3-D design principles is questionable or lacking.
- Work is weak in quality and does not address a range of design issues.
- A variety of design problems are attempted, but solutions are generally unsuccessful.
- Technique is clumsy/incompetent.
- Work demonstrates moderate to weak technique, but the engagement with the principles of design is poor.
- Solutions tend to be inept or trite.
- Little, if any, evidence of thinking/decision-making is present in the work.
- Form, material, and content are unconsidered.
- Not enough work is presented to demonstrate breadth.
- The slides are virtually impossible to see.
- Overall, the work is of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2005 SCORING GUIDELINES

## Drawing Portfolio

### General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring guidelines for the AP portfolios contain 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 is not 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 these are the scoring guidelines that were used in 2005, they are always open to subsequent revision.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2005 SCORING GUIDELINES

## Drawing Quality—Section I

**Five works that demonstrate mastery of drawing**—apparent in the composition, concept, and execution of the works.

**6 EXCELLENT QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is consistently of high quality, although not all pieces will necessarily be at precisely the same level of expertise;
- shows obvious evidence of thinking;
- demonstrates a sense of confidence, and of verve;
- addresses fairly complex visual and/or conceptual ideas;
- shows an imaginative, inventive, and confident use of the elements and principles of design;
- uses materials effectively; technique is generally excellent;
- may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk-taking;
- may be notable for sensitivity and/or subtlety;
- shows purposeful composition;
- demonstrates informed decision-making.

Any apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists seems merely to have provided a visual reference in the service of a larger, personal vision.

**5 STRONG QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- is generally strong, although there may be inconsistencies in overall quality;
- shows evidence of thinking, i.e., it conveys a sense that it is about something;
- shows evidence of confidence;
- may have evocative qualities;
- successfully engages with most aspects of technique and materials;
- demonstrates a strong grasp of the elements and principles of design, using them to express a visual idea;
- shows generally strong composition.

If there is apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, there is also a strong sense of the student's individual transformation of the images.

**4 GOOD QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- has some sense of purpose or direction, but it may not be fully resolved;
- demonstrates some degree of success;
- shows some manipulation of ideas;
- demonstrates a good understanding of the elements and principles of design;
- has some technical aspects that are handled well or some ideas that are handled well, but the two do not always mesh and work together;
- shows a sense of technical competence.

If there is apparent use of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's individual "voice" can be discerned.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Drawing Quality—Section I (continued)**

**3 MODERATE QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- might show a sense of real effort, but problems are not successfully resolved;
- might be more accomplished technically than it is conceptually;
- might not show the technical skills needed to resolve the ideas it addresses;
- shows an emerging awareness of the elements and principles of design;
- might have erratic technique, with little or no sense of challenge;
- might show some ambition while achieving only moderate success.

If published photographic sources or the work of other artists are used, the work appears to be a nearly direct reproduction; the student's "voice" is minimal.

**2 WEAK QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- shows weak or awkward technique;
- solves problems simplistically;
- has little sense of exploration;
- lacks a clear sense of intention;
- shows little awareness of elements and principles of design; composition is weak;
- shows limited artistic decision-making.

The works are copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; little discernible student "voice."

**1 POOR QUALITY.** Work at this level:

- shows little evidence of thinking/artistic decision-making;
- reveals a misunderstanding of technique;
- shows a lack of awareness of tools/media;
- uses trite solutions to visual problems;
- is poorly composed, with minimal consideration given to elements and principles of design.

The works are obviously direct copies of photographic sources or the work of other artists; no discernible student "voice."

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2005 SCORING GUIDELINES

## Drawing Concentration—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—including the amount of work or number of pieces represented
- 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.

The scoring guidelines that follow provide examples of overall characteristics of concentrations that would merit each of the six scores.

---

### 6 EXCELLENT CONCENTRATION

- There is an unmistakable connection between the idea of the concentration and the work presented.
- The concentration engages the viewer with the work and the idea.
- The work shows effective integration of concept and technique.
- Mastery of drawing techniques is strong to excellent.
- The work shows informed risk-taking and development beyond technical concerns.
- An evocative theme is carried out.
- The work demonstrates an original vision.
- Overall, the work is of excellent quality.

### 5 STRONG CONCENTRATION

- The work and the concentration topic have a close relationship.
- The idea of the concentration is good to strong; there is evidence of thought in the work.
- The work is technically competent; skill is evident.
- There is evidence of effective pursuit of the idea.
- There may be some less-successful pieces, but overall, there is strong evidence of drawing competency.
- The work shows a sense of transformation over time, although it may not be totally successful.
- An evocative theme is investigated.
- Overall, the work is of strong quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Drawing Concentration—Section II (continued)**

**4 GOOD CONCENTRATION**

- There is a sense of concentration, and the work is related to the idea.
- The drawing quality is generally good.
- Manipulation of ideas is evident.
- Some growth and discovery are evident.
- The work may be a concentration and be technically competent but demonstrates an insufficient sense of investigation.
- Although the work is of strong or excellent quality, it is not a concentration.
- Overall, the work is of good quality.

**3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION**

- The work is a concentration, but the topic is inadequately considered.
- It may include several loosely related ideas.
- It may be so broad that the student could not really explore an idea in depth.
- The work may be inconsistently related to the idea.
- Some growth is evident, but only moderate drawing skill is demonstrated.
- Although the work may be of good quality, it is not a concentration.
- Overall, the work is of moderate quality.

**2 WEAK CONCENTRATION**

- There is little investigation of the idea.
- The idea is appropriate for a concentration, but the knowledge and understanding needed to execute it are not evident.
- A concentration is presented, but the work is consistently weak in drawing quality.
- The work may appear to constitute a good start, but it does not show sufficient investigation.
- Although the work shows moderate drawing competence, it is not a concentration.
- Quantity of work may be lacking.
- Overall, the work is of weak quality.

**1 POOR CONCENTRATION**

- There is no sense of investigation.
- The work shows little or no evidence of drawing competence.
- The work may be a concentration, but drawing is of poor quality.
- The idea is incoherent or not focused.
- There is a lack of an underlying rationale that would link the work.
- There is not enough work to represent a concentration.
- The slides are virtually impossible to see.
- Overall, the work is of poor quality.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Drawing Breadth—Section III**

Works demonstrating understanding of a variety drawing issues. Look for engagement with a range of:

**form**  
**content**  
**tonal values**  
**line quality**  
**perspective and other spatial**  
**systems**  
**composition**

**drawing surface**  
**depth**  
**pattern**  
**means of representation and abstraction**  
**materials**  
**techniques**  
**styles and so on....**

---

**6 EXCELLENT BREADTH**

- Work demonstrates serious, successful engagement with a broad range of drawing issues and/or techniques.
- The work successfully demonstrates command of stylistic as well as technical concerns.
- Work is executed with confidence.
- Work shows flexibility of thinking, as evidenced in the variety of works presented.
- Form and content are effectively synthesized to communicate visual ideas.
- A variety of materials are used effectively.
- Most work demonstrates successful experimentation, risk-taking, and/or ambition.

**5 STRONG BREADTH**

- Work demonstrates engagement with a broad range of drawing issues.
- A range of stylistic, as well as technical drawing concerns is evident in the work.
- The quality of the work is strong.
- The work shows clear decision-making; there is evidence of thinking.
- The link between form and content is strong.
- A range of materials is used, in most cases successfully.
- The work may include some excellent pieces but does not address a strong range of drawing issues.

**4 GOOD BREADTH**

- Work demonstrates engagement with a reasonable range of drawing issues.
- Technical skill in drawing is generally competent.
- Work is of generally good quality; its success may be somewhat variable.
- There is evidence of thinking in at least some of the works.
- There is some relationship between form and content.
- Work may demonstrate strong to excellent breadth of drawing issues but be of less than good quality.
- Work may be of strong or excellent quality, without demonstrating breadth of experience.

**AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART  
2005 SCORING GUIDELINES**

**Drawing Breadth—Section III (continued)**

**3 MODERATE BREADTH**

- In general, work shows engagement with a superficial range of drawing issues.
- Technical skill in drawing is uneven and/or variable.
- Overall, the work is of moderate quality.
- Modest evidence of thinking/decision-making in the work.
- The relationship between form and content is unclear.
- There may be a sense of experimentation, without a completely competent resolution or exploration of what is being attempted.
- Work may demonstrate attempts at good breadth but be of less than moderate quality.
- Work may be of good quality but with a narrow range of experience demonstrated.

**2 WEAK BREADTH**

- Range of drawing issues addressed is very limited.
- Solutions to the range of problems attempted may be simplistic.
- Understanding of drawing issues appears to be undeveloped.
- Technical skill in drawing is limited. Drawing tends to be awkward.
- Overall, the work is of weak quality.
- Evidence of thinking may be slight or present in only a few works.
- There is little apparent relationship between form and content.
- Some works may be of moderate quality, but the work does not address a range of drawing issues.
- There may be a moderate demonstration of breadth but with work of poor quality.

**1 POOR BREADTH**

- The range of drawing issues addressed is extremely limited.
- Engagement with drawing issues is questionable and/or lacking.
- Technique is clumsy and/or inept.
- Overall, the work is of poor quality.
- Little, if any evidence of thinking/decision-making.
- Form, material, and content are unconsidered.
- Not enough work presented to demonstrate breadth.
- Slides are virtually impossible to see.
- Very little work is presented.