

DANCE

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 16	17 – 34	35 – 51	52 – 61	62 – 69	70 – 79	80 – 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 16	17 – 36	37 – 55	56 – 64	65 – 72	73 – 82	83 – 100

Dance Performance

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 4	5 – 8	9 – 12	13 – 14	15 – 15	16 – 17	18 – 22

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 4	5 – 8	9 – 12	13 – 14	15 – 15	16 – 17	18 – 22

The range and suitability of the work submitted

In most cases work samples were well-organized and labelled. The majority of the work submitted was appropriate and often challenging to the dancers' technical and expressive abilities. It is very encouraging to see an expanded stylistic range of work submitted by most candidates and many more artistic works by different choreographers shown. Work was drawn from ballet, modern, jazz, Irish, hip-hop, African, Middle Eastern, classical and Bollywood East Indian dance. Candidates displayed joy in exploring new works from a wider cultural spectrum often not previously familiar to them.

It is good to see schools providing candidates with several choreographers to work with as well as with varied styles representing different cultural backgrounds. Only a couple of schools still presented works choreographed solely by the teacher.

A few schools are making good progress in finding ways to feature the candidate in group works. Too many schools, however, still continue to use very large group works that are longer than the solo and duet works and that do not feature the candidate enough, nor allow them full commitment and “impact” due to being crowded and “lost” amongst other performers. At HL the *Dance Draft Guide* clearly states that the solo and duet work need to be at least 50% of the performance time. It is strongly suggested that unless the candidate at HL is featured in at least a good part of the group work, a third work should be presented as either a solo or a duet.

Despite a great difference in technical skills, mostly due to a varied degree of training, there is an overall improvement in both performance impact and interpretative abilities. The majority of the candidates demonstrated clarity of intention and communicative ability enabling effective performances and a stronger overall impact. A greater level of boldness and expressiveness is evident. The candidates’ overall technical skill demonstrates good understanding of alignment, coordination, strength/resilience, rhythmical accuracy and temporal clarity. Further work is needed in more detailed articulation of the torso and how it expands and contracts, pushes and pulls in relation to the larger space. While there is improvement in varying degrees of effort, weight, and dynamic range, more detailed work is needed.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Impact

Some candidates performed with boldness, commitment and good dynamic range. Others were not as strong and physically articulate enough in their movements, nor had good enough stylistic understanding of the works performed affecting the impact of the performance.

Criterion B: Technical skills

With well-chosen choreographies some candidates did very well. Others need to further push themselves in sustaining energy levels, rhythmic accuracy, facial expressions and focus, as well as finer articulation of body parts. More attention to torso is necessary and larger dynamic range. Awareness and more dynamic relation to the larger space are also recommended.

Criterion C: Interpretative ability

While some candidates demonstrated clear intention and interpretation, others need more attention to facial expression and focus – internal or external. Improved sense of weight and effort shifts from light to strong would be helpful. These, along with a lowered sense of gravity appropriate to works performed, would allow for deeper and fuller expression.

Criterion D: Programme notes

The added criterion of “Programme notes” this session worked well in that there were no omissions in having the programme notes presented. Some however, were not complete, missing either credits or fuller discussion (even if short) of the works and their intent.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Solo and/or duet must be at least 50% of the total performance time at HL (see *Dance Draft Guide*).
- When completing the 6/DPCS form (page 3), fuller notes should be given on candidates' backgrounds. This should include their progress over the two years of study.
- Encourage candidates to think and write short paragraphs on the intent and interpretation of the pieces they perform earlier on so that programme notes, though short, demonstrate more thoughtful writing (in no more than a paragraph or two). Dancers need to be able to translate their kinaesthetic intelligence and personal voice into written and spoken word, as well as make it visible in the performance of the work.
- Ensure candidates receive enough coaching, particularly in styles that are new to them. Repertoire chosen by the candidates, as advised by teachers, should challenge candidates to stretch (as appropriate) their comfort level in both physical as well as expressive capacities. Of utmost importance are vitality, a sense of vibrant presence even if still; physical and psychological commitment to the material performed and understanding of its content as well as its style. The use of music mixes and lyrics containing profanities are strongly discouraged.

Regarding recording candidates (this section also applies to Composition and Analysis):

- Frame the candidate's full body closely and follow the movement. This is especially important in filming group works. In such dance works, it is important to film the full group in so far as possible throughout the filming. Not doing so creates an incomplete impression of the candidate's work.
- A frontal view is required for the filming of both composition and performance. Filming in a studio with standard classroom light is often the best option. Schools are reminded again to provide sufficient space for filming. In some schools, using an excessively small area for filming has meant that both dynamic range and spatial exploration is hampered. This does not allow for maximum demonstration of the candidate's grasp of the assessment criteria.
- In the case of performance filming, please remember to distinguish the candidate clearly, either by means of a large number, or a distinctly different colour of attire. What seemed a distinct colour difference in the studio may not be as clear on DVD. It will be best if the candidate is wearing a highly contrasting shade (for instance, if others are in black, the candidate could be in white).
- In several cases candidates went out of camera range in the performance. Please monitor this more carefully. The moderator cannot mark what cannot be seen.
- Filming from some schools included an excessive focus adjustment during filming. Since these adjustments often resulted in unfocused sections, it was difficult to actually "see" a candidate's performance. Schools are advised to establish a clear, wide focus at the start of filming and to leave that focus intact for the remainder of the performance.

Composition and Analysis

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 4	5 – 9	10 – 13	14 – 17	18 – 20	21 – 24	25 – 30

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 11	12 – 13	14 – 15	16 – 17	18 – 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

Overall, the compositions submitted for assessment this session demonstrated a good understanding and application of the course. While some schools, both those being examined for the first time and some schools previously examined, clearly would benefit from further development of the basic presentation of dance elements (space, time, and force/dynamics), an increasing number of submitted work consistently demonstrated a varied and carefully structured course.

Overall, the weakest compositional exploration continues to involve dynamic range, with many candidates investigating either only one aspect, or jumping drastically between ends of the dynamic continuum, but not presenting nuance. This is an area for improvement and is one through which teachers can strengthen a candidate's understanding by means of short in-class composition assignments. Particularly useful in this regard are explorations derived from contrasting pairings of Rudolf von Laban's Effort Actions and/or his Effort/Shape teachings. Additional exercises might focus on use of text, props, costume elements, and/or collaboration with candidates in other arts disciplines.

Regarding the analytical statement, some schools have made considerable progress. All teachers are reminded that the title of the piece being described in the statement should be included in the title. An accurate word count was also not entered in a number of analytical statements.

In general, the analytical statement should be reflective of the choreography itself, not a lengthy discourse on emotional motivations for the dance, or on choreography in general. The statement is intended to be a synthesis of the candidate's experience as a composer/arranger of one work, not a daily journal, nor a series of rehearsal notes. In the writing, discussion relating to the work's structure, performance, and research leading to the final presentation should be emphasized. Many lacked sufficient detail in these areas.

Teachers are reminded once again not to favour the use of mimetic movement, or text, over generative and interpretative movement in composition instruction. Candidates should also be encouraged to explore fresh movement material that stretches them beyond their favourite

and familiar movement vocabulary. Compositions that “tell the story” of popular music with lyrics should be avoided. Overuse of such material results in a lack of invention and a lack of independent theme development.

Schools are also cautioned to look very carefully at the **minimum number of minutes** required for both SL and HL candidates and to be certain that BOTH the teacher and the candidate assert and **record accurately the length of time for each composition**. Some candidates were below the minimum time in each level, with some schools consistently submitting work below the minimum time across a number of candidates.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Overall impression

At SL, some candidates’ dance compositions achieved a strong presentation in the DVD material submitted. In the cases where dances were well-made, the candidates demonstrated clear understanding of dance elements, created well-motivated and performed compositions, and, in a few cases, offered innovative solutions to their stated themes.

At HL, a fair proportion of candidates continue to achieve adequate to fairly good marks for this criterion. Central to the task is identifying and conveying a clear theme. Candidates whose marks are lower in this criterion are generally those who have not demonstrated a sufficient comprehension of the compositional elements. This generally leads to a less focused communication of intention in some or all of the dances. Overall candidates are exploring a wider range of styles and themes, with an increasing number of dances attempting fusion of styles.

At both levels, the overuse of “pop” music with lyrics continues to be the single greatest impediment to developing a candidate’s individual choreographic “voice”. This overuse often results in candidates confusing their use of dance to illustrate the words of the song as their self-development of a theme. The better-wrought compositions are those in which a movement theme (narrative or abstract) is developed and for which music (or other accompaniment) serve to augment the candidate’s intent.

Criterion B: Craft

At SL, some themes used by candidates were not conducive to movement development, being either overly complex, or including ideas that would be more effectively explored in another medium (often writing).

At HL, teachers and candidates are urged to remember that kinetic interest and logic are key in the making of dances. Continued exploration of movement vocabulary development is strongly encouraged.

At both levels, the work from some schools and candidates hues closely and successfully to this principal. Several schools and their candidates consistently present works that include “stock” phrases and/or an overdependence on classroom combinations strung together without regard for their relationship to the theme/intent of the dance. This is to be discouraged. Rather, in depth investigation and development of movement phrases is to be encouraged. Short assignments that are focused on such concepts as weight bearing, character development, contrasting speeds, the articulation of a range of dynamic qualities,

and spatial pathways (to mention just a few), can each assist in the candidate's acquisition of craft. Threaded through the course from year one, they help build strong composition skills.

As has been the case in years past, the majority of schools are advised to discourage ending music mid-phrase and/or fading a musical composition arbitrarily. As has been noted in years past, this indicates disregard for the work of another artist and will negatively impact on marks. Teachers and candidates are reminded that kinetic potential is key in developing dance compositions.

Criterion C: Analytical statement (SL)

This is the weakest section of the composition and analysis work submitted by SL candidates. It is strongly suggested that, prior to the preparation of the final statement, shorter writing assignments should be given that enable candidates to practise addressing this criterion. By embracing descriptive writing that uses dance vocabulary and short analysis of movement phrases as a regular practice, candidates can grow to understand writing as central to their growth as young dance makers.

Criterion C: Compositional contrast (HL only)

Improvement was evident in a fair portion of candidate submissions. Especially successful in this area were those submissions in which candidates varied their stylistic focus and/or included varied sources of accompaniment (music, text, *etc.*) and incorporated the use of props.

Criterion D: Analytical statement (HL)

Writing a complete, coherent statement that adheres to the guidelines continues to be the single biggest challenge for most candidates in the area of composition and analysis. Candidates should be encouraged to include more specific detail regarding their in-depth discussion of dance elements and intent. They should always incorporate appropriate dance vocabulary to support their discussion. Statements are strongest when they adhere to the stated guidelines and embrace critical analysis. Self-congratulation and excessive dependence on journal-like reportage are not the intent of this element of assessment.

Much candidate writing suffered from a lack of correct grammar and an inability to construct cogent prose overall. Teachers are strongly urged to incorporate regular opportunities for candidates to write regular short critiques of their own work as well as that of their peers as part of the course. This regular written work, if commented on by the teacher, will strengthen the candidate's capacity to approach the final statement. Candidates will have a better chance of delving more deeply and meaningfully into this longer analysis of the creative process. Finally, it is suggested that, where possible, dance teachers could seek the assistance of their colleagues who teach English composition. A lack of clarity and sufficient depth in written statements impacts negatively on marks.

Criterion E: Connections (HL only)

Within the component, this is the area most overlooked by candidates. Candidates and teachers are reminded that 5 marks can be awarded in this criterion. Not including any discussion of the connections was the single largest cause of lost marks in composition and analysis. All statements at HL should include sufficient reference to other areas of the Dance course. Candidates should provide carefully developed analysis of the ways that the study of each element (performance, composition and analysis, and dance investigation) contributes

to the creation of the candidates' one dance composition. Once again, specific descriptive writing is encouraged over cursory statements that are unsupported.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

In relation to music, the single most limiting factor in candidate compositions continues to be the overuse of popular music with lyrics. It is strongly recommended that candidates be encouraged **not** to rely on lyrics as the sole motivation for their work. Furthermore, a candidate is recommended **not** to submit more than one composition using such popular music accompaniment. The evidence from previous years suggests that over-reliance on lyrics minimizes the candidate's possibility for individualistic creative input, as well as limiting the viewer's possibility for imaginative interpretations of the dance. Teachers and schools are also cautioned not to submit material including lyrics containing obscenities. Finally, teachers are **strongly cautioned** not to allow the arbitrary cutting of musical compositions of any type when they accompany candidate, teacher, or guest artists' dance compositions. Several schools continue not to monitor these aspects of the candidate composition work and this negatively impacts the evaluation. When props are used, it is important to be certain that they are integral to the dance and not merely decorative in nature. This applies whether the props are hand-held or larger in nature (tables, chairs, *etc.*). Again, shorter assignments during the course that include prop exploration would be useful and are encouraged.

In those schools where the analytical statement continues to be a challenge for candidates, it is once again strongly recommended that, before the final statement is approached, teachers create shorter assignments throughout the course. These can be constructed to enable candidates to encounter individual aspects of the work that will be included in the final statement. (For instance, one might have candidates write on use of space or time or dynamics, or the relationship between the dance and accompaniment in relation to one dance viewed or created). These earlier writing assignments can then be read by the teacher, commented upon, and rewritten to address lacks in content or clarity. Such exercises will, it is hoped, build a candidate's capacity for analysis and improve the overall quality of the final analytical statement. Teachers are also strongly advised to read carefully the guidelines for the composition analytical statement. Clearly this responsibility lies with the teacher and the candidate.

It is strongly encouraged that teachers look for ways to deliver a course that will stretch candidates' boundaries. Offering opportunities for greater contrasts in dynamics, further development of texture, more diverse use of rhythms, and varying stylistic vocabularies in composition will all assist the candidate in conveying an intent that is individual to them and has more complexity. Teachers are also encouraged to press further in exploring a variety of musical styles for composition work and to encourage candidates to submit dances that demonstrate as wide a musical palate as possible.

Teachers are also strongly encouraged to address the areas of concern that have been made apparent through exam materials and also to continue to network via the Online Curriculum Centre (OCC) in order to address the areas of weakness identified. Sharing questions and solutions about interpretation(s) of the curriculum will help develop a community dialogue among schools and has the potential to strengthen all participants' delivery of the course.

Regarding forms and teachers' comments (this also applies to Dance Performance):

- The majority of schools are submitting forms that are either incomplete or incorrect. Doing so can have the result of disadvantaging candidates. Teachers and candidates are urged to pay careful attention to the accurate and complete submission of forms for each area of assessment.
- Teachers are requested to include their legibly written comments relating to **each** candidate in the box provided on the 6/DCACS form. Some teachers did not do so. This is unfortunate as doing so can aid the examiner and moderator in more fully understanding the circumstances of each candidate.
- Teachers are also required to remember to sign forms as requested.

Dance Investigation

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 4	5 – 9	10 – 14	15 – 16	17 – 18	19 – 20	21 – 25

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 11	12 – 13	14 – 15	16 – 17	18 – 20

The range and suitability of the work submitted

In general the candidates are selecting interesting and appropriate topics for their research, reflecting the encouragement of teachers to focus on the candidates' ideas and abilities.

There was a good range of topics presented and at no time did the work seem unsuitable. On the whole the topics were well chosen and reflected the candidates' interests and experience.

At SL in a few instances the unfamiliar dance form/tradition selected was not well researched so that some information was very vague and unclear.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Criterion A: Historical context

The information regarding the historical contexts of the two dance forms selected were generally well researched and explained at SL. In general, at HL, historical contexts of each

of the dance forms/traditions were well done; however, the description of the similarities and differences of the dance forms/traditions was not always so detailed.

Criterion B: Current context

At SL there was often little information about the current context; in fact, in some cases it was hardly mentioned at all. The discussion about the similarities and differences in both the historical and cultural contexts needed some attention.

At HL, the current contexts of the two dance forms/traditions were described separately and the similarities and differences often not mentioned.

Criterion C: Dance elements

In the dance elements criterion at SL the use of body, such as steps, gestures, actions, use of space, music and costume was fairly well done; however, further information particularly about the dynamic elements was needed.

However at HL, the discussion and description of the dance elements was often brief with very little mention of the dynamic elements of the forms or traditions. The use of music, costume and general use of the body was often compared well.

Criterion D: Sources

The use of sources needs attention at both levels. In some instances, there were few primary and secondary sources and in several the sources were not cited. There seems to be some confusion about direct quotes and paraphrasing. In some cases paraphrasing of a work was not given a citation.

Criterion E: Organization

The presentation and organization of the investigations were generally good at both levels.

Criterion F: Comparative discussion of short extracts (HL only)

The description and comparison of the two extracts was generally well done.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- Further work is also needed in the area of dance elements. Assistance with the vocabulary and observation of dynamic elements is certainly needed.
- In general in SL investigations, historical contexts of each of the dance forms/traditions were well done; however, the use of sources was not always clear; some candidates providing more of a bibliography than works cited. In some cases paraphrasing of a work was not given a citation. It is therefore recommended that more work be undertaken with SL candidates regarding the use of sources and how these should be cited within the report.