AP Studio Art 3-D Rubric – Mrs. Soto

Breadth Section- 8 works/ 16 images

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | Range 93-100%Excellent | 6.A shows an informed investigation of a range of 3-D design principles. 6.B demonstrates original vision, a variety of innovative ideas and/or risk taking, and inventive articulation of a broad range of E of A/ P of A 6.C shows an excellent application of 3-D design principles to a broad range of design problems. 6.D clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space; it articulates multiple insights. 6.E the work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, verve or nuanced subtlety). 6.F technical competence of the work is excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas, and a mastery of skills is demonstrated at a high level. 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 There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work reaches a level of excellent breadth and quality. |
| 5 | Range 85-92%Strong | 5.A shows thoughtful investigation of a range of 3-D design problems. 5.B clearly demonstrates a range of original and innovative ideas as well as effective manipulation of a broad range of E of A/ P of A5.C shows strong application of 3-D design principles to a range of design problems. 5.D demonstrates a variety of intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space; a range of insights is apparent. 5.E Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence. 5.F work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas, and expertise with some skills is plainly evident. 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 work. 5.I There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of strong breadth and quality. |
| 4 | Range 78-84%Good | 4.A shows a clear investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.4.B The work demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking, and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design4.C shows good application of 3-D design principles to an acceptable range of design problems. 4.D shows a variety of intentions and purposes in the activation of physical space; they may not be clearly articulated. 4.E 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.F demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas may 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 work has been manipulated to express the student’s individual ideas. 4.I There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of good breadth and quality. |
| 3 | Range 70-77%Moderate | 3.A shows a superficial investigation of a range of 3-D 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 shows superficial application of 3-D design principles to a limited range of design problems. 3.D shows a limited range of intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space. 3.E beginning to emerge in terms of potentially engaging qualities; confidence is questionable. 3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence, some knowledgeable use of materials and media, and rudimentary skills. 3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be similar fabrications; although skillfully duplicated, the student’s “voice” and the individual transformation of the work are minimal. 3.I There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works, and overall the work is of moderate breadth and quality. |
| 2 | Range 62-69%Weak | 2.A shows very little evidence of an investigation of a range of 3-D design problems. 2.B ideas in the work are unoriginal or rely mostly on appropriation; the work does not show inventive use of E of A and P of A. 2.C shows a weak application of 3-D design principles to a very limited range of design problems.2.D work does not clearly show a range of intentions or purpose in the activation of physical space. 2.E There is little about the work that engages the viewer; the work lacks confidence.2.F work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence, clumsy use of materials and media, and minimal skills. 2.G 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.H 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.I There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the works, and overall the work is of weak breadth and quality. |
| 1 | Range 54-61%Poor | 1.A The work shows negligible investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.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, simplistic, or appropriated solutions. 1.C The work shows very little or no useful application of 3-D design principles, regardless of the number of problem-solving attempts. 1.D The work is repetitive in regard to intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space. 1.E The work does not engage the viewer; there is no confidence evident in the work. 1.F The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naïve and is lacking in skill or technical competence. 1.G 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.H The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused, or poorly lighted; there may be an incomplete set of images. 1.I Overall the work in the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor breadth and quality. |