2022 VCE Dance performance external assessment report

General comments

In 2022, the Dance solo performance examination comprised two components designed to demonstrate a range of technical and choreographic skills. Component 1 consisted of a skills-based solo composed in Unit 3, Area of Study 2 and component 2 a cohesive composition composed in Unit 4, Area of Study 2. The criteria for both solos reflects the [examination specifications](https://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/assessment/vce-assessment/past-examinations/Pages/Dance.aspx). These criteria draw on the key knowledge and key skills in Units 3 and 4.

Although many students were well prepared and rehearsed as required in the key knowledge and key skills, the following was noted:

* In the skills-based solo some students included an excess of gestural material, at the expense of more complex actions such as turning and elevation. This was evident when students chose to base their choreography on a more lyrical style. Some students needed to consider the degree of difficulty they presented throughout the movement vocabulary in relation to their ability to perform the movements. Students are expected to demonstrate a range of skills to meet Criteria 1–4 successfully.
* In the composition solo some students presented a solo that wasn’t framed by an understanding of the criteria, and often choreographed a lyrical style, which interprets the lyrics of the music, rather than addressing the criteria. Students needed a clear intention to be able to facilitate purposeful movement choices. Often students wrote an intention that was vague and/or difficult to interpret when assessing the sections of the dance, which impacted their ability to demonstrate the criteria.

Specific information

Unit 3 – Skills-based solo

Criterion 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 17 | 23 | 7.9 |

Criterion 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 11 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 26 | 7.9 |

Criterion 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 18 | 16 | 18 | 26 | 7.9 |

Criterion 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 32 | 8.0 |

Criterion 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 34 | 8.2 |

Criterion 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 16 | 15 | 37 | 8.3 |

Criterion 7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 16 | 13 | 15 | 14 | 33 | 8.0 |

Criterion 8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 16 | 19 | 18 | 32 | 8.2 |

In terms of intention, most students based their solo on an exploration of the criteria.

Criteria 1 to 4 required students to demonstrate control of all eight physical skills within a range of actions from the six movement categories.

High-scoring performances presented a range of movements from the movement categories to demonstrate outstanding control of all eight physical skills. Students integrated safe dance practice within their movement selections and executed a high level of body articulation, coordination and complex movements.

In lower-scoring performances, students were often impeded by the range of movement categories selected and generally the same actions were repeated throughout the solo. This impacted their ability to successfully demonstrate enough variety in the ways the eight physical skills were demonstrated to meet Criteria 1–4. Another issue was the lack of control of the student’s alignment (Criterion 1) and muscular strength (Criterion‑2), especially when students attempted more complex movement sequences.

Criteria 5 to 7 required students to demonstrate skill in the manipulation of each element — time, space (shape) and energy — throughout the phrases and sections of the solo.

High-scoring performances demonstrated a skilled arrangement of the movement phrases through innovative manipulations of time, shape and energy to structure the sections of the dance. They were able to create a high level of expression and artistry through their interpretations.

In lower-scoring performances, students often choreographed to the beat of selected music so the phrasing lacked contrasts of time. Criterion 5 was also hindered by the students’ selection of music, which often lacked dynamic variation. The integration of shape (Criterion 6) was often not explored in personalised or innovative ways and the exploration of the qualities of movement (Criterion 7) was not explored or varied to produce the required differences in force and flow to successfully create expression and artistry (light and shade).

Criterion 8 required students to demonstrate skill in the projection of the whole body to demonstrate artistry and communicate to the audience.

High-scoring performances maintained the projection of the whole body throughout the dance. They presented smooth transitions between the phrases and sections and used their eyeline and expression to confidently communicate their artistry to the audience.

In lower-scoring performances, students’ artistry was not fully developed. Students often lacked the confidence to establish their projection in the assessment room and/or did not always control the transitions between the movements. They needed to demonstrate a more extensive range of performance skills.

Unit 4 – Cohesive composition solo

Criterion 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 20 | 17 | 19 | 10 | 14 | 7.1 |

Criterion 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 11 | 17 | 7.2 |

Criterion 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 16 | 10 | 17 | 7.1 |

Criterion 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 18 | 10 | 21 | 7.4 |

Criterion 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 19 | 10 | 19 | 7.3 |

Criterion 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 12 | 21 | 7.4 |

Criterion 7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 11 | 20 | 7.3 |

Criterion 8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 17 | 19 | 14 | 24 | 7.8 |

Statement of Intention

Students were asked to record the intention communicated throughout the different sections of the dance, to identify the formal structure and to briefly comment on the main choreographic devices or motif used to structure the solo. The Statement of Intention is not assessed but is used to inform the assessors and should outline the intention of the cohesive composition solo dance work.

Students are reminded that the assessors are viewing the work for the first time during the examination, therefore the statement of intention needs to be clearly written according to the instructions on the form.

Some students wrote detailed information that wasn’t broken up into the appropriate sections, which made it difficult for assessors to follow; others provided a general synopsis plus a breakdown of the intention of each section of the dance that didn’t correspond to the original overview. Assessors were able to compare the student’s solo with the written statement more effectively when the intention of each section of the dance was succinctly outlined within the 80 to 100 word limit in the first box.

Students need to take care when identifying their formal structure. It should reflect the choreography they present. While the Statement of Intention is not assessed, what is written is important because it enables the assessors to gain an understanding of the intention of the dance and the choices made.

Generally, students completed the choreographic device section on the statement and either listed the devices or provided an overview of how they were integrated throughout each section.

Criteria 1 to 3 required students to select and arrange movement vocabulary to create an appropriate formal structure and demonstrate skill in the manipulation of various choreographic devices to help structure the sections and communicate the intention.

High-scoring performances selected innovative movement vocabulary to reflect their stated intention and arranged the movement material into clear sections, using choreographic devices effectively to reflect the stated formal structure.

In lower-scoring performances, students presented movement selections (Criterion 1) that weren’t consistent with their written intention. In these cases, it seemed that the students may not have engaged in any research or planning to build a knowledge base of their theme, as the choices were either basic or had no relation to the ideas they wanted to communicate.

When addressing formal structure (Criterion 2) students often created a clear first section; however, they neglected to progress the movement to create variation or contrast in the subsequent sections and often didn’t communicate their stated formal structure. When the relationship between the movement sections and the stated formal structure was not evident, the solo often lacked clarity and cohesion.

Lower-scoring students needed to further clarify and integrate choreographic devices (Criterion 3) to effectively structure the composition and establish or progress the intention. Often the choreographic devices were not visible in the dance composition, and this made it difficult for assessors to pinpoint how they were integrated/developed to create links and unity between the sections.

Criteria 4 to 7 required students to demonstrate skill in the manipulation of spatial organisation (level, direction, eye/body focus and dimension) to communicate the intention.

High-scoring solos arranged the movement vocabulary in purposeful ways by using different combinations of spatial organisation to construct the sections clearly and communicate the stated intention.

In lower-scoring performances, the arrangement of spatial organisation didn’t consistently support the intention. In some cases, the arrangement wasn’t relevant or the use of one or more of the elements was overlooked. Generally, eye and body focus and level were considered; however, dimension or the size of the movement shape and direction were used to a lesser extent with many solos being performed in wide-open shapes while moving in a lateral pathway across the space.

Criterion 8 required students to demonstrate skill in the use of performance practices and artistry to communicate the intention to the audience.

High-scoring performances effectively projected their intention through a focus on the performance and artistry.

In lower-scoring performances, students were often under-rehearsed, and the sense of artistry was not sufficiently developed. Students should be encouraged to make a connection back to the intention of the dance so the use of performance skills, including facial expression, evokes the appropriate response in the audience.