

Through a Glass Darkly: the Teaching and Assessment of Drawing Skills in the UK Post-16 Art & Design Curriculum

Drawing practices in art & design post-16 education in the UK have undergone significant developments over the last sixty years, but there has been little research into what has changed, how it differs between different types of courses, and what has driven those changes. This paper attempts to investigate how drawing is taught and assessed in post-16 schools and colleges, particularly on A Level art and design courses, how the role of drawing in the curriculum has changed over the past sixty years, and how those changes have influenced the nature of the portfolios which students entering higher education bring to interview. It seeks to answer the question – do we now teach and assess observational drawing skills ‘through a glass darkly’, obscured by other considerations within the art educational curriculum ?

Observational drawing has always been regarded as a key art and design skill. As Michelle Fava has explained :

The abilities enabled by drawing are ... fundamental and have to do with one's ability to concentrate, to attend, to consider, to observe, to comprehend. If practiced regularly, visual cognition can become embedded in one's thinking, in much the same way that a habitual practice of writing would establish the propensity to analyse the world linguistically. (Fava 2010, 135)

Observational drawing skills are still an important requirement for students progressing to art and design undergraduate courses from A level and Foundation courses. The QAA Subject Benchmark for Art & Design states that :

In the education of artists and designers, the constituent disciplines emphasise the development of visual literacy. Drawing ability is regarded as a prerequisite skill for observation, recording, analysis, speculation, development, visualisation, evaluation and communication. (QAA 2017, 10)

The portfolio requirements of universities demonstrate this. With the exception of lens-based courses, admissions tutors at higher education institutions still want to know whether students ‘can draw’, and therefore they ask to see observed drawings in most applicants’ portfolios, usually in addition to developmental work for finished projects. The following is just a small sample of the portfolio requirements listed on university websites in 2017:

Anglia Ruskin University - BA(Hons) Fashion Design : *Varied drawing and use of materials – observational – objects, body, clothes*

Norwich University of the Arts - BA(Hons) Fine Art : *Drawing which could include literal images from observation or imaginative work*

Sheffield Hallam University - BA(Hons) Illustration : *Drawing skills and sketchbooks*

De Montfort University Leicester - BA(Hons) Graphic Design : *A range of drawing skills - you must show evidence of a range of core imaging skills, from the refined to the experimental, and include examples of life drawing and objective drawing*

The Teaching of Drawing - from the South Kensington System to the Basic Design Movement

The history of observational drawing education in the UK is long and has been well-recorded. From 1853 until the 1930s, the British Government Schools of Design ran courses in 26 stages,

a national curriculum for art schools, which became known as the ‘South Kensington System’.

This comprehensive training in traditional observational drawing usually included the following types of drawing :

elementary drawing	painting the figure
shading from the flat	geometrical drawing
shading from casts	perspective
chiaroscuro painting	modelling
colouring figure drawing from the flat	design
figure drawing from the round	

To become an artist or designer of any kind, you started by learning to draw from observation following this programme – from the cast, from still life, and then from life. Even after the Second World War, this only changed very slowly in Britain (Macdonald 1970).

But from the late 1950s, the way drawing was taught and assessed did change fundamentally, and it did so in two very different ways. Some parts of the art education system were influenced by the revolution which was the Basic Design Movement, and by the subsequent introduction of the one year post-A level Art Foundation Course. Other parts of the system, and particularly A level courses, were influenced by a much slower evolutionary process, which gradually changed the method of art and design assessment from the timed drawing examination to the submission of coursework.

At Leeds College of Art, the prospectus from 1958 described the Intermediate Certificate in Arts and Crafts, a two year course between school and the National Diploma in Design (NDD - the equivalent of a higher education qualification) (Leeds 1958). The Intermediate Certificate

was assessed by the government examiners, by means of three examinations :

- a Pictorial composition - 12 hours
- b Drawing (still life or life drawing) - 6 hours
- c Creative design for a craft - 6 hours.

However, the students who were examined as if they were on this course in 1958-59 had actually signed up to a course with very different aims, Harry Thubron's new Basic Course, which at this point had no official status, and therefore did not lead in itself to a qualification. This, the first basic design course in the UK, was described in the same prospectus, as following an alternative curriculum (Leeds 1958):

2D exercises

- 1 Lines*
- 2 Planes*
- 3 Free Spatial Relationships of a Given Rectilinear Area*
- 4 Development of Primary Forms & Other Complementaries*
- 5 Colour Analysis*
- 6 Analytical Drawing from Natural Forms*

3D exercises

- 7 Colour Analysis in Spatial Relationships*
- 8 Development of Cubic Relationship in Mass*
- 9 Spatial Division & Light Relationships with Rectilinear Planes*
- 10 Spatial Division in Relationship with Straight Lines*
- 11 Spatial Relationship in Curvilinear Forms leading to Spherical Construction*

Liberated by the experimental approach to drawing on this new course, but ill prepared for the traditional rigour of a drawing exam, all the Leeds students who attempted the Pictorial Composition and Drawing exams in 1958 failed. Traditional drawing tutors had to be rushed

in to give them a crash course in drawing, in order for them to pass at the second attempt (Miller 2003, 65).

Basic design signalled a cultural revolution. It brought with it a completely new language, and new methods of working, as described by Maurice De Sausmarez in what became almost a textbook for the movement, 'Basic Design : The Dynamics of Visual Form' (De Sausmarez 1964).

Out went the traditional vocabulary of drawing :

<i>Drawing</i>	<i>Still Life</i>
<i>Composition</i>	<i>Anatomical Study</i>
<i>Life Drawing</i>	<i>Observational Drawing</i>
<i>Perspective</i>	

In came a new vocabulary of visual form:

<i>Mark Making</i>	<i>Line, Plane and Form</i>
<i>Analytical Drawing</i>	<i>Harmony and Discord</i>
<i>Spatial relationships</i>	<i>Colour Studies</i>
<i>Performative exercises</i>	

These kind of drawing exercises became formalised as the initial stages of the Pre-Diploma (later Foundation) course, from its inception in 1963. Their purpose was less to teach students to draw from observation, and more to encourage experimentation with the formal language, tools and materials of visual expression. The rigorous application of this methodology over a prolonged period of study has since been thinned down in post-16 education courses such as

the Foundation Diploma and the Extended Diploma from a rich stew to a fairly meagre soup, but in their purpose and method, these kind of drawing exercises have actually changed very little over the intervening fifty or more years.

This approach to the way drawing is taught and perceived has evolved on art foundation courses through to the present day, and over time has become a part of the creative process from initial idea to finished project, rather than a learning experience in its own right. The language now used to describe drawing in foundation courses demonstrates this evolution. For example, the Edexcel Art Foundation Diploma Course Syllabus for 2016 consisted of 144 pages. In all those pages, there are just six uses of the words ‘draw’ or ‘drawing’, each of which refers to drawing as a technical process; e.g. in two different units it appears eighth in a list of examples of techniques which might be used:

cutting, fixing, machining, drilling, glazing, weaving, priming, drawing, layering, fixing, carving, casting, binding, cueing, structuring, constructing. (Edexcel 2016, 102)

Where drawing is mentioned, it is always referred to as part of an investigative process :

Drawing and other forms of visual investigation are critical during this stage, particularly in researching and applying 2D and 3D basic visual systems and design methodologies, (especially in Unit 1: Researching Recording and Responding in Art and Design). (ibid, 130)

Unit 1, the part of the Art Foundation Diploma course most closely focussed on drawing, is titled ‘Researching, Recording and Responding in Art and Design’. Learning outcome 1 for this unit is to ‘record ideas in appropriate forms’. And the content of the unit is described as follows:

Communicate a personal response: intentions e.g. message, idea, theme; interrogate subject matter e.g. recording, constructing, deconstructing, redefining; adopt ways of thinking e.g.

working processes, ideas and developmental work, outcomes, justification, empathy with critical ideas. (ibid, 14)

Reading this, it is hard not to reach the conclusion that on foundation courses the teaching of drawing might be gradually getting lost among so many other aspects of the creative process.

A level Art - From Drawing Examinations to Coursework Portfolios

The revolution brought about by the Basic Design Movement has been thoroughly documented over the last fifty years, although its impact was mostly limited to the pedagogy of the art foundation course (e.g. Thistlewood 1981; Forrest 1985; Miller 2003). On the other hand, the evolution of the content and methodology of the assessment process for A level art and design has received much less attention. Those few studies which have been made focussed mainly on the problem of subjectivity in the application of assessment criteria (Allison 1977, Macgregor 1990, Steers 1994). Since many students today progress directly from A level to higher education, the curriculum they have followed is at least as important to university admissions tutors as the experience of those who have taken an art foundation course, and so the evolution of A level art courses also deserves study. It also acts as a useful barometer of changes in approach to the teaching of drawing more generally.

By referencing papers in the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate archive, housed in the Cambridge Assessment offices in Cambridge, the main objective of this paper is therefore to explore the ways in which broad changes in syllabus and examination design have influenced the teaching of drawing, by tracing the many revisions made to the A level art examination process since it started in 1951. The Cambridge syllabuses have been chosen as representative of these development, but a similar evolution could be traced in the archives of

other A level examination boards, since all have been subject to the same influences over this period, mainly coming from government policies and teachers' views. The uniformity between boards in the earlier period is reflected in the documents referenced below which survey trends across the different examination boards (SSEC 1963, Joint 1968). This uniformity has increased since the advent of Curriculum 2000, since the content and assessment of A level syllabuses have been largely standardised through Government directives. The analysis will explore how this slow revolution in art educational assessment has influenced, and sometimes reflected, changes in the teaching of drawing.

In terms of formal examinations, two main developments occurred over this period. First, the assessment process gradually changed from objective drawing examinations based on the original South Kensington System, to the current system of coursework assessment. And secondly, the history of art exam paper was transformed into a written coursework project, and more recently became more integrated into the practical elements. In terms of pedagogy, these rather dry changes to syllabus regulations and exam papers actually demonstrate fundamental shifts in the way we now view the role of drawing within the post-16 art and design curriculum.

Taking 1963 as a starting point (the first year of the nationally approved Pre-Diploma / Art Foundation Course), the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate (UCLES) A Level Art examination had changed little since it was introduced in 1951. The June 1963 exam required candidates to take four papers, which consisted almost entirely of a series of 3 hour practical exams:

One or two from:

Paper 1 - Drawing or Painting from Still Life – 3 hours

Paper 2 - Drawing or Painting from Nature – 3 hours

Paper 3 - Drawing or Painting from Living person – 3 hours

One or two from :

Paper 4 - Original Imaginative Composition in Colour – 3 hours

Paper 5 - Crafts A – 3 hours

Paper 6 - Crafts B

Plus :

Paper 7 - Historical and Critical – 3 hours

For each of the three drawing papers, the teacher or exam supervisor was given precise instructions about the nature, appearance and arrangement of the subject to be drawn, in an attempt to ensure that students in all centres were executing the same observational drawing. The problem of creating meaningful samples of work in an exam of just three hours duration was recognised only in paper 6, Crafts B. For this paper alone, coursework specimens were sent to the board. On paper 4, some allowance was also given to the idea that a more sustained period of creative activity than three hours might be beneficial. Using a mechanism which was later to expand in its scope, for this paper the board sent to schools the choice of topics for students to explore, one week prior to the examination (UCLES 1963).

At this time of considerable change in art and design education, the A level exam was under national scrutiny, as it was the main progression route to the new DipAD higher education courses, the replacement for the NDD and pre-cursor to the BA(Hons). A report by the

Secondary Schools Examination Council on the 1963 A level art examination stated that the standard was 'not sufficiently high to equip students for entry to courses for the Diploma in Art and Design' (SSEC 1963, para 4). The report also criticised the continued use of a 'memory drawing' exam (a remnant of the old South Kensington system) by some examination boards, and concluded that 'a syllabus which is restricted and confined in its regulations suggests that the examiners are out of touch with present day education in art' (ibid, para 7i). A revised syllabus was therefore proposed, which came into force in 1965 :

One from :

Paper 1 - Drawing or Painting from Nature or from Still Life – 5 hours

Paper 2 - Drawing or Painting from a Living person – 5 hours

Paper 3 - Study of Natural Forms – 5 hours

One from

Paper 4 - Composition in Colour OR Non-representational Composition – 5 hours

Paper 5 - Design – 5 hours

Paper 6 - Sculpture and other Crafts

Plus :

Paper 7 - Historical and Critical – 3 hours

The new syllabus reduced the number of papers from four to three, but it was the other changes which were perhaps more significant (UCLES 1965). Each student could now choose and arrange the still life objects they would draw. The uniformity of the previous examination system had been abandoned, and students' individuality of expression was to be encouraged.

Candidates for papers 1, 3, 4 and 5 were to receive the topics for all these papers one week in advance. The examination time was increased to 5 hours within one day. For papers 4 and 5, some preliminary studies made during the preceding week could be included for assessment. Experiments had been held as early as 1954 to trial the submission of coursework (UCLES 1955). Now it was agreed that a maximum of 3 pieces of coursework could also be submitted for papers 1 and 4. The adoption of coursework as the main examination component had started. A report from the Joint Standing Committee of Four Secondary Teachers' Associations in 1968 commented that, 'the revised syllabus is generally approved, also the longer working time and the use of preliminary studies. The whole examination is a much better test of the candidate's ability.' (Joint 1968, para. 880/7)

As the new syllabus became established, concerns began to be expressed by schools that although coursework could be submitted, it was not then returned to candidates, depriving students of some of their best work when attending college entrance interviews (Joint 1968). The UCLES board slowly relented on this, and by 1980 schools were permitted to request the return of coursework (but not exam pieces). The examiner's report on paper 1 that year noted a significant increase in the amount of coursework being submitted, as a result of this change (UCLES 1980a). By 1980, papers were being sent to schools two weeks before the examinations, and 3 pieces of coursework and / or preliminary studies could be submitted for each practical paper (UCLES 1980b).

The move towards coursework assessment and away from drawing under exam conditions was by now unstoppable. In 1986, faced with increased quantities of coursework being transported to and from their offices, the UCLES exam board started sending examiners to assess in schools and colleges where large cohorts were sitting the examination (UCLES 1986).

Demands for further changes over the following 3 years led to a radical revision of the syllabus in 1990. From this point on, the exam consisted of just three elements, with the highest weighting given to the coursework element, and the distinctions between art, design and craft disappeared. Even the history of art was now to be assessed through coursework - albeit written - in the form of the Personal Study:

Component I	Controlled Test	30%
Component II	Coursework	40%
Component III	Personal Study	30%

The Controlled Test was very different to the old 3 hour drawing examination. It was titled Observation, Analysis and Recording rather than Drawing and Painting. It lasted for 10 hours (raised to 15 hours in 1994), the preliminary studies could be made over eight weeks, and the period of time spent under exam conditions no longer had to be confined to the studio, so long as the students were being supervised. The distinction between ‘exam’ and ‘coursework’ had by now been almost completely eroded (UCLES 1990a).

The introduction nationally of the Curriculum 2000 reforms for first A level examinations in 2002 broke up the two year course into AS level and A2 level years. For each of these, the tripartite assessment structure was initially retained, breaking assessment into six units, but QCA rules required that the greater 40 per cent weighting moved from coursework to the controlled tests (OCR 2000). The examiners’ report for the first year of the new syllabus commented that some centres struggled to distinguish between the developmental focus of the work assessed for AS, and more resolved projects, building on the previous year’s research work, which were required at A2 level (OCR 2002).

Curriculum 2000 also saw the introduction of ‘endorsed’ syllabuses, allowing students once again to specialise in a visual discipline that might correspond more closely to a specialist university course – fine art, graphic design, 3D design, photography, or textiles (OCR 2000). This element of specialisation had been partly catered for under paper 5 in the 1960s courses, but had been lost in the 1990 reforms.

In 2008, as the rigidity of the Curriculum 2000 reforms began to soften nationally, the complexity of this system was reduced, and a four unit model was adopted which was much closer to the 1990s structure, except that 60 per cent was now awarded for the controlled test (OCR 2008). Contextual study was now integrated with the coursework. In 2009 this was further amended, to return the weighting of the controlled test to 40 per cent (OCR 2009a):

AS level	Controlled Assignment	20%
	Coursework	30%
A level	Controlled Assignment	20%
	Personal Investigation	30%

This simplification, which allowed more flexibility in the way that teachers delivered the course, was welcomed at the time. The examiner’s report for 2010 recorded that, ‘Centres enjoyed just having two units for each of the qualifications and there was a lot of support for the new course’ (OCR 2010, 1)

The final vestiges of Curriculum 2000 were shrugged off in the 2017 syllabus, with the decoupling of AS level from the full A level course. Although the full A level is now

notionally reduced to just two elements, coursework (Personal Investigation) is split into two, in order to accommodate the art historical component (OCR 2017):

Personal Investigation	60%
Practical Portfolio -	30%
Related Study -	30%
Externally Set Task	40%

With the exception of the required 40 per cent weighting for the ‘examination’ element, the latest syllabus is in many ways similar to that of 1990. The most significant difference lies in the pairing of the art history personal study with the portfolio, as a Related Study. It remains a separate element of assessment. However, the nature of the Related Study can be more practical than in the past, e.g. ‘an illustrated essay, digital presentation/blog, illustrated study sheets or written report’ (OCR 2017, 6). More significant perhaps is the emphasis placed since the 2008 reforms on contextualising the coursework in the portfolio itself. In the description of scope and context in the 2017 syllabus document, four of the nine bullet points relate to studying the context of the work. The following description under Approaches sums up well the importance now placed on this:

Critical and contextual understanding should be embedded throughout the course of study through all investigative processes, research and practical work. Learners should reflect critically and extract meaning from art, craft and design and use this to place their own work in a framework of advanced study. (OCR 2017, 9)

From Observational Drawing to Visual Research

It is worth at this point pausing to consider what effect all these changes in syllabus have had on the teaching of drawing. In the early 1960s, A level practical classes were conducted mainly with the aim of improving students' observational drawing skills, in preparation for the timed drawing paper. Week after week, students would spend their art classes practising drawing or painting directly from observation. In addition to stocks of paper, charcoal and pencils, art room cupboards were filled with an assortment of vases, dried flowers, musical instruments and other still-life objects. The task set each week for the whole class was designed to explore a specific representational problem, or a particular aspect of drawing – composition, perspective, line, tone, colour, etc. The observed drawing or painting was the end-product.

By the 1990s, each student was encouraged to explore their own aspect of drawing. The controlled test, based on several weeks of preliminary development work, was to lead over ten or fifteen hours to an individual finished art or design project, rather than an observed drawing or painting which explored the same aspects of visual language as the rest of the class.

The emphasis was now on teaching students the creative process, using drawing mainly as a means to an end, not as an end in itself. The change in nomenclature in 1990 is telling.

Drawing now consisted of the processes of observation, analysis and recording - stages in the production of work. As on foundation courses, it was a method of visual research, forming the basis for further development. This does not mean that the technical skills required to draw were ignored by either students, teachers or examiners. But it does mean that a drawing was to be assessed in relation to its value as part of the creative process, more than as a piece of work in its own right, and this has continued to be the case.

The other main change is the emphasis placed since the introduction of Curriculum 2000 upon combining art historical sources and drawing as two aspects of the investigative process. Much drawing from observation is now viewed by students through a lens heavily shaded by the works of previous artists, and as a result, the drawings sometimes risk being closer to pastiche than to individual expression. In 2005, for example, the examiners' report on the Cambridge International version (which combined coursework and personal study earlier than the UK syllabus), commented on the AS level coursework unit which incorporated the personal study element for this level:

The majority of submissions were rather mediocre, where secondary source material was very common. Too many candidates relied heavily on this approach as a final idea with little or no personal development. Some candidates, clearly skilled technically, produced safe, competent copied work rather than being encouraged to experiment and develop their own personal ideas.

For this component, referencing the work of other artists/designers is a useful way to encourage investigations into use of media and working methods – also into ways of approaching a variety of subject matter. However, a series of copies of other works, or long and detailed biographical notes, does little to inform personal exploration or development. (OCR 2005, 5)

In 2009, several centres piloted the upcoming integration of coursework portfolio and personal study at A2 level. The advantages and disadvantages of different approaches were recorded in the examiners' report, and again the danger of encouraging pastiche in weaker candidates was noted:

Centre A decided to allow students to select their own artists in the summer term of Year 12. These students then carried on their investigations during the autumn term of Year 13. Their choices had been based on their interests during Year 12.

The advantage of such a system was that the actual final outcomes were very different from each other and their personal study work was well integrated and related well to their own work. However weaker candidates often produced final pieces, which resembled pastiches of the artist that they had selected. (OCR 2009b, 4)

This situation has changed little over the last few years . Students may learn to draw a still life through a combination of observation and the study of Cezanne or Ben Nicholson. An architectural study which demonstrates an individual approach to recording the world surrounding the student, but which does not also show an acquaintance with the work of, for example, Robert Delaunay or Piranesi, could fail to score highly enough under assessment objective 01, which counts for 25 per cent of the portfolio mark :

Develop ideas through sustained and focused investigations informed by contextual and other sources, demonstrating analytical and critical understanding. (OCR 2017, 36)

Evidence on whether these changes in the A level exam system were a response to demands from schools, or whether the changes themselves influenced the way drawing was taught in the schools, is mixed. On the one hand, the schools (or the examiners following their lead) sometimes seem to have led demands for change, particularly in the 1960s. Minutes of the UCLES Art Subject Committee for November 1964, for example, record pressures from schools for longer preparation time before the examinations, and include discussion of a letter received from one of the committee members, Miss Gardiner, complaining that the ‘minor

alterations to the syllabus put forward by the sub-committee did not appear to be sufficient in the face of a “steadily continuing revolution in the form of art teaching.” And she continued, “the best work going on in the art departments of schools cannot be examined adequately by the present means.” (UCLES 1964, para 3). On the other hand, later in this evolutionary process, several documents suggest that some schools were stuck in the past and not fully exploiting the freedoms given by the new syllabuses. An examiner’s report from 1980, for example, complains of candidates from weaker schools taking preliminary work into the examination and simply copying it during the exam period (UCLES 1980a). The examiner’s report for 1990 complains more generally that ‘as has always been the case, there are many centres where the restrictive nature of the course inhibits a candidate’s individual approach’ (UCLES 1990b, 1). Most likely the situation was indeed mixed, with good schools and examiners encouraging reform, whilst those reforms themselves only slowly persuaded less adventurous schoolteachers to change their practices.

In 1965, the UCLES A level art syllabus was just 5 pages long, but still referred to the words ‘draw’ or ‘drawing’ 13 times. For 2017, the specification was ten times as long (52 pages), yet uses these words only 20 times. It is not the intention here to argue that A level teachers have ceased to teach the skills of drawing. But it is reasonable to conclude that at least since the 1990s, much else has been added to the list of assessment objectives, and that the A level examination process in itself no longer encourages the teaching of ways of observing the world and drawing it, as a universal and essential skill for artists and designers, in the way that it had done in the past. There is still encouragement to pay attention to drawing skills, and there is still plenty of evidence of good drawing practice. But as the external examiner’s report for the AS coursework unit in 2006 noted, this is not universal :

It is clear that AO3 (Practical Research) is well covered in this unit with candidates exploring a wide range of techniques as well as processes and materials. However, it is also clear that many candidates would benefit from more attention to AO1 (Visual Recording). It was evident in many centres that candidates did not invest sufficient attention in making close observations of their selected subject. Detailed drawings or photographs will allow candidates to more fully grasp the visual qualities of their subject and enable them to more fully realise their intentions. (OCR 2006, 7)

Conclusions

So what conclusions can we draw from this analysis ? First, it seems clear that in further education and 6th form exam syllabuses, observational drawing is now taught and assessed less as an end in itself. Rather, it is valued as visual research, which together with the exploration of art historical sources, informs the development of individual students' project work. There is no doubt that this approach has been very successful in developing the creative methodologies and individuality needed to succeed at higher levels. On the other hand, the curriculum may have lost some of its emphasis on that aspect of visual literacy which encourages general cognitive skills to develop through sustained observation and analysis of the visible world, a phenomenon which was analysed in Michelle Fava's paper, 'What is the role of observational drawing in contemporary art & design curricula?' (Fava 2010).

Fava also pointed out how some researchers have concluded that students' drawing ability has declined over this period (Fava 2010 129). It has not been the main purpose of this paper to enter that debate. But it would be reasonable to conclude that the reduction in weighting of observational drawing by comparison with creative project-work, within both Foundation and

A level assessment regimes, will inevitably have led to less time being devoted to the practice of drawing within the post-16 curriculum.

University admissions tutors are still setting portfolio guidelines which place a value on observational drawing skills per se. At interview, however, those tutors usually have to make their judgements about drawing ability mainly on the basis of sketchbook research for project work, and this also often incorporates investigations into other artists' techniques, styles and approaches. We may indeed conclude from this that the assessment of observational drawing ability now appears to be made 'through a glass darkly', albeit one which demonstrates much better than in the past the use of drawing as a central part of the creative process.

References :

- Allison, B. (1977) Problems and Recent Developments in Art and Design Examinations in England, in *Art Education*, Vol. 30, No. 8 pp. 9-12.
- De Saumarez, M. (1964) *Basic design; the Dynamics of Visual Form*. Studio Vista.
- Edexcel (2016) Edexcel Art Foundation Diploma Course Syllabus (on-line). Available at: <https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/btec-fad/art-and-design.html> (accessed: 9 April 2019).
- Fava, M. (2010) What is the role of observational drawing in contemporary art & design curricula? In Norman, E. & Seery, N. (Eds.) *Graphicacy & Modelling*. IDATER.
- Forrest, E. (1985) Harry Thubron at Leeds, and Views on the Value of his Ideas for Education Today, *Journal of Art & Design Education*, vol.4 no.2 pp.147-167.
- Joint (1968) *Joint Standing Committee of Four Teachers' Associations, Comments on GCE Summer Question Papers*. (Typescript) Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- Leeds (1958) *Leeds College of Art*, Student Prospectus.
- MacDonald, S. (1970) *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*. University of London Press.
- MacGregor, R.N. (1990) Reflections on Art Assessment Practices, in *Journal of Art & Design Education*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 315-327.
- Ed. Miller, C. (2003) *Behind the Mosaic: One Hundred Years of Art Education*. Leeds City Art Gallery.
- OCR (2000), *OCR Advanced level Art and Design (Linear), 2000, Syllabus, 9302-9322*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- OCR (2002), *OCR Advanced (A / AS) Level Examination, Art, June 2002, Report on the Units, 3800-06/7800-06*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2005), *Cambridge International Examinations, A / AS Level (International), Art, Art & Design, June 2005, Report on the June Examination, 3704/9704*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2006), *OCR A / AS Level, Art, June 2006, Report on the June Examination, 3800-06/7800-06*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2008), *OCR AS/A level GCE, Art and Design, 2008, Specification, 3800-06/7800-06*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2009a), *OCR AS/A level GCE, Art and Design, 2009, Specification, H160-166/H560-566*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2009b), *OCR A / AS Level, Art, June 2009, Report on the June Examination, H160-166/H560-566*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2010), *OCR A / AS Level, Art, June 2010, Report on the June Examination, H160-166/H560-566*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2011a), *OCR A Level, Art, June 2011, Centre Assessment Material, H160-166/H560-566*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2011b), *OCR AS Level, Art, June 2011, Centre Assessment Material, H160-166/H560-566*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

OCR (2017), *OCR A level, Art and Design, 2017, Specification, H600-H606 (on-line)*.

Available at: <https://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170210-specification-accredited-a-level-gce-art-and-design-h600-h606.pdf> (accessed 9 April 2019).

QAA (2017), *Subject Benchmark Statement for Art and Design, UK Quality Code for Higher Education*, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

SSEC (1963), *Secondary Schools Examination Council, Advanced Level Examinations in Art in the GCE*. (Typescript) Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.

- Steers, J. (1994) Art & Design: Assessment and Public Examinations, in *Journal of Art & Design Education*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 287-297.
- Thistlewood, D. (1981), *A Continuing Process; the New Creativity in British Art Education 1955-65*. Institute of Contemporary Arts.
- UCLES (1955), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, GCE Art Advanced Level, June 1955; Experiment on the use of students' work in and out of school*. (Typescript) Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1963), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, A Level, Art, 1963, syllabus*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1964), *Minutes of UCLES Art Subject Committee, 11 November 1964*. (Typescript) Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1965), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, A Level, Art, 1965, syllabus*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1980a), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate A Level, Art, June 1980 Examiner's Report on Examination*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1980b), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, A Level, Art, 1980, syllabus*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1986), *Minutes of UCLES Art Subject Committee, 21 October 1986* (Typescript) Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1990a), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate, A Level, Art, 1990, syllabus*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.
- UCLES (1990b), *University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate A Level Art, June 1990, Examiner's Report on Examination*. Cambridge, Cambridge Assessment Archive.