2022 VCE VET Dance external assessment report

General comments

Generally, the solos performed referenced movement vocabulary that was stylistically consistent with the styles stated on the industry statement. Most solos demonstrated evidence of varying degrees of rehearsal to achieve a range of levels of technical accuracy and style-specific artistic and interpretative expression in their performances. Generally, industry statements accurately stated the stylistic context, market and intended audience for the performance.

The movement vocabulary/repertoire selected for the solos was generally style-specific and appropriately selected for the students’ level of technical skill. Solos that demonstrated simple movement vocabulary did not score highly because they lacked movement of sufficient technical complexity. Solos where the selected movement vocabulary was technically complex but did not have a wide enough range, also did not score highly.

Most solos met the stated time requirements. Some solos, however, did not meet the minimum time requirement of two minutes and this impacted on student achievement in some criteria.

Generally, students were appropriately and safely attired for their performances in their selected dance styles.

Specific information

Note: The statistics in this report may be subject to rounding resulting in a total more or less than 100 per cent.

1. Correct posture and body alignment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 4 | 13 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 12 | 8 | 7.1 |

This criterion refers to the way in which posture and body alignment are maintained stylistically throughout the performance, both when in motion and when stationary.

Students who scored highly demonstrated controlled style-specific posture and body alignment consistently throughout their performances. Students who did not score as well had lapses in the maintenance of their posture and body alignment during the performance.

2. Relationship to gravity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 21 | 22 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 7.2 |

This criterion relates to the demonstration of style-specific gravity and levity (elevation and grounded movements). Students who scored highly demonstrated an extensive range of highly complex style-specific elevations and grounded movements executed with control and technical accuracy throughout their performances.

Students who did not score as well demonstrated less complex or a less extensive range of style-specific elevations and grounded movements, often with lapses in control and technical accuracy in their execution.

3. Balance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 3 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 19 | 13 | 11 | 7.2 |

This criterion assesses the students’ ability to maintain and integrate style-specific balance and stability when undertaking movement phrases and when stationary.

Students who scored highly demonstrated unwavering style-specific controlled balance and stability. They executed an extensive range of highly complex balancing movements involving extending, folding and rotating a range of body parts both when moving and static.

Students who did not score as well demonstrated lapses in their control and stability when executing movement phrases and static balances. The range of movements they used was less extensive and/or of lesser complexity.

4. Flexibility

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 7.4 |

This criterion assesses the students’ ability to safely demonstrate a range of style-specific integrated flexibility within a range of movements and body parts (including joints and spine as appropriate for the selected dance style).

Students who scored highly safely demonstrated style-specific integrated flexibility within an extensive range of body parts (including joints and spine) through complex movements.

Students who scored less well either demonstrated a less extensive range of style-specific integrated flexibility and/or the range of movements they used to demonstrate flexibility was less extensive and less technically complex.

5. Stamina

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 26 | 7.8 |

This criterion requires students to demonstrate sustained muscular and cardio-respiratory stamina across the performance of 2–5 minutes.

Students who scored highly demonstrated sustained muscular and cardio-respiratory stamina throughout their entire performances and showed no sign of fatigue.

Students who scored less well showed fatigue and were not able to sustain their respiratory stamina to varying degrees during the performance.

6. Isolation, coordination and style-specific weight transference

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 4 | 12 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 7.2 |

This criterion requires students to demonstrate isolation, coordination and style-specific weight transference of style-specific movements.

Students who scored highly demonstrated sustained control while executing an extensive range of highly complex style-specific movements. These included rotating movements using the whole body and single body parts, and the isolation and articulation of upper and lower body parts. They were able to execute secure and confident transfers of weight and movement transitions, with accurate style-specific foot engagement.

Students who scored less well either demonstrated a less extensive range of movements and/or movements of less technical complexity. They also showed less control in execution and/or lapses in the accuracy of their foot engagement.

7. Successional movement and spatial awareness

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 20 | 17 | 20 | 13 | 12 | 7.2 |

This criterion assesses style-specific skills in the use of successional movement and spatial awareness.

Students who scored highly demonstrated outstanding use of both their personal and general performance space and consistently maintained body consciousness throughout the performance. They orientated themselves within the performance space effectively and demonstrated controlled execution of highly complex and varied movement patterns and pathways, using a range of complex locomotor techniques.

Students who scored less well were less skillful in their body consciousness and use of both their personal and general performance space. They used a less extensive and/or complex range of movement patterns and pathways within the performance and demonstrated some control lapses.

8. Expressive use of movement dynamics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 13 | 13 | 7.3 |

This criterion assesses the style-specific application of expressive movement dynamics and variations in the force and flow of movement, including the release of energy in an integrated manner.

Students who scored highly applied an extensive range of style-specific controlled movement dynamics and their variations when executing highly complex movements throughout their performance.

Students who scored less well demonstrated a more limited range of style-specific movement dynamics and their variations. They chose less-complex movements and there were lapses in their controlled execution.

9. Musicality, rhythm and timing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 13 | 16 | 7.5 |

This criterion assesses the style-specific skills in the physical interpretation of music and rhythm through the students’ ability to maintain appropriate tempi and phrasing throughout their performances.

Students who scored highly maintained appropriate tempo and phrasing throughout solos that contained highly complex variations in tempi, movement accents and rhythmic patterns. They were able to create and sustain an authentic connection between the accompanying music and dance.

Students who scored less well demonstrated less variation and/or complexity in tempo, movement accents and rhythmic patterns and/or lapses in the connection between the music and dance.

10. Artistic and interpretive expression and polish

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Average |
| % | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 23 | 18 | 16 | 7.8 |

This criterion assessed style-specific skills in stage presence and performance awareness, while maintaining the intention of the industry statement. It also assesses concentration and focus, movement memory and polish.

Students who scored highly demonstrated a very high level of stage presence and performance awareness throughout the performance. They maintained their concentration and focus throughout the performance with unwavering memory retention. They presented solos that were stylistically authentic and polished.

Students who scored less well had lapses in their stage presence and performance awareness, in their concentration and focus and/or in memory retention. Their solos were presented with less polish.