

Dance

Overall grade boundaries

Higher level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 15	16 - 35	36 - 55	56 - 65	66 - 72	73 - 82	83 - 100

Standard level

Grade:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mark range:	0 - 15	16 - 35	36 - 55	56 - 65	66 - 73	74 - 83	84 - 100

Composition and Analysis

Component grade boundaries

Higher 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

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, similarly to last year, compositions submitted for assessment at HL demonstrated a poor to excellent understanding and application of this aspect of the dance curriculum and at SL, mediocre to excellent. Clearly, some schools, from all phases, would benefit from further development of the basic presentation of dance elements (space, time, and force/dynamics) as well as further development of an understanding of customary composition concepts and vocabulary. On the other hand, other schools are delivering an increasingly strong and

comprehensive framework for the dance composition and analysis curriculum. The examiner observations below offer a variety of comments and suggestions based on the review of all the submissions this examination session.

Candidate performance against each criterion

Weak compositional exploration continues to be seen in relation to dynamic range, duet and group structures, and the development of movement vocabulary that is physically challenging. Some candidates investigate a narrow range of movement, depend predominantly on pedestrian movement and overuse “stock” dance phrases from technique classes, all of which restrict the emergence of individual compositional “voices”.

Teachers are reminded once again not to favour the use of mimetic movement over interpretive movement in composition teaching. Fresh movement material that stretches candidates beyond their favourite and familiar dance vocabulary, while often time-consuming, can bring challenges and rewards.

As has been previously suggested, we encourage candidates not to submit more than one selection using popular music with lyrics. We repeat that the evidence from all examination sessions 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. Finally, teachers are strongly urged *not* to allow the arbitrary cutting of musical compositions of any type (irrespective of whether they accompany student, 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. In a small number of schools this practice is seen in all of the submissions. This arbitrary disregard for the work of another creative artist means that the candidate concerned receives a lower mark.

Regarding guidelines, teachers are reminded to review with candidates the requirements for dance composition and also to reiterate for candidates what the minimum and maximum allotted times are for the total composition presentation. The assessment of candidates whose work does not comply with the requirements is impacted. It was also noted for the future that requiring all HL candidates to explore composition for a group would be beneficial to their compositional learning.

Regarding the composition statement, some schools have made considerable progress. All teachers are reminded that the title of the piece being described in the composition statement must be included in the title of the paper. In general, the statement should be reflective of the

choreography itself, *not* a lengthy discourse on motivations for the dance or on dance composition in general. The statement is intended to be an analysis and synthesis of the candidate's experience as 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. It is also important for the candidate to comment on those aspects of the work that she/he would change if a further version were made in future. Papers from a small number of schools lack sufficient detail in these areas and overemphasize "personal diary-like" writing. This negatively impacts the assessment of their candidates' work.

Teachers are also strongly urged to read carefully the guidelines for the composition statement. The statement is *not* to be a discussion divided equally among the works submitted; it is intended that detailed analysis be given for *one* work and brief comments on the remainder. It is important to keep to the word limit, (neither over or significantly under). There were a few candidates who included too many words (examiners read only to the maximum word count) and a small number who presented too few words. Since these candidates did not cover the required facets of the statement within the word count, they received lower marks as a result. Schools are also reminded that 6/DCACS forms must be signed by both the candidate and the teacher.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

It is suggested that teachers strengthen candidate understanding of the vast variety of compositional approaches through short improvisation and composition assignments. Teachers are encouraged to access workshops and specialists in their communities in order to broaden the experiences provided to their students. All teachers are reminded that some excellent dance composition resources are available on various websites, (for example, the Liz Lerman Company's Toolbox at: www.danceexchange.org/toolbox/). Teachers are also reminded of the usefulness of exchanging teaching ideas for composition with other dance teachers via the e-mail list.

Reiterating information from past reports, schools are reminded that 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, and so on). Again, shorter assignments during the course that include prop exploration are encouraged. For instance, some candidates submitted work in which imaginative prop use contributed to the rhythmic accompaniment for the dances.

Teachers are again encouraged to be vigilant in exploring a variety of musical styles for

composition assignments and to encourage candidates to submit dances that demonstrate as wide a musical palette as possible. In fact, it is suggested that teachers keep a “library” of music samples for students that includes material without lyrics and music that represents material outside the popular music canon. It is clear that some teachers are doing so. The work from candidates at these schools often avoids the most egregious mimetic synchronicity between movement and lyrics.

Once again, it is requested that the teacher check that the candidate has *accurately recorded the length of time for each composition and the total time*. At both HL and SL some candidates were below the minimum time, with some schools submitting work below the minimum guidelines across a number of candidates. This results in lower marks for their candidates. In addition, some schools did not completely follow the stated requirements. Again, failure to abide by the guidelines results in lowered evaluations for that component for each candidate submitting insufficient material. The guide for the year of examination must be checked through and, when and where appropriate, shared with the candidates throughout their learning.

Overall, we continue to encourage the development of a composition curriculum that will stretch candidates’ dance 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 intention that has more complexity. Some excellent work was submitted this year in which candidates created compositions, for example, in conjunction with poetry and other spoken word accompaniment.

In those schools where the written statement continues to be a challenge for candidates, it is strongly recommended, as was stated in this report last year, 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 in relation to one dance study viewed or created or the use of time in another). These earlier writing assignments can then be read by the teacher, commented upon, and rewritten to address paucity 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 writing assignment.

In summary, a number of schools submitted work that consistently demonstrated a varied and carefully structured course and candidate compositions that were well-crafted and innovative at both SL and HL. Some teachers in some schools would benefit from a very careful and thorough reading of the guide and a reconsideration of how they are shaping the composition sequence for delivery to candidates. As the guide has been revised over the past few years

and more schools have entered the pilot course, it is clear from candidate performance across the schools that a wide variety of approaches can result in quite successful dance composition experiences. Many students are engaging in a dance composition curriculum that meets the intention of its writers.

Dance Performance

Component grade boundaries

Higher level

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

Standard level

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

The range and suitability of the work submitted

The requirement that all dances performed will be choreographed or arranged by a teacher, a guest choreographer or learned from the standard repertory rather than choreographed by a student, improved the suitability and quality of the samples.

Generally, candidates performed dances representing a variety of genres and styles. It was a particular pleasure to see, in a few schools, candidates performing several different works which were carefully selected to suit their particular abilities. Candidates did not perform as well when all were given the same one or two works, regardless of their particular strengths.

A note of caution: while it was good to see more schools using modern dance études learned from the American Dance Legacy Institute, some candidates were not prepared or ready to perform these works with stylistically and technically appropriate physical accuracy, dynamic range, spatial awareness, rhythm; the central intent of the piece was, therefore, unclear. Schools should take into account that it is a requirement of the Institute for teachers to attend an intensive summer workshop sponsored by the Institute or have the Institute send a dancer who has great familiarity with the work to teach the dances.

HL candidates who were performing in two works, of which one was a lengthy group work which did not distinguish them from the rest of the group, in addition to performing only one short solo, were somewhat disadvantaged: it was hard to assess their individual strengths. It was noted for the future that at least half of the HL presentation time should be devoted to solo and/or duet work.

Candidate performance against each criterion

It is encouraging to see improvement in the performance of dances, with more artistic orientation. Even schools that practise competitive dancing and dance line/cheerleading demonstrated that the IB orientation geared towards qualitative rather than quantitative approach is taking hold. Richer, more complex and layered work which allows for more individual interpretation in performance is more evident.

There continues to be a large range in candidates' technical abilities amongst schools and within the same schools. It also continues to be evident that when the interpretation ability is excellent, technical difficulties can be surmounted. In general, interpretation skills were less consistent across the sample, and it does not seem candidates are fully aware of choices about energy, dynamics, and manipulation of speed, rhythm, flow, weight and focus to facilitate full expression appropriate to each dance. On the other hand, a few solos were absolutely excellent and fulfilled all criteria.

While most schools did well with their programme notes, some schools neglected to include in addition to the factual information, one or two paragraphs focusing on the individual interpretation and intention in performing the selected dances. This information is important to include, not least because it is supportive to the candidate's thinking about interpretative issues.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

- At all times and all levels, the art of dance is about vitality and the life force. Therefore, whatever the level of technical skill, movement material needs to be performed with full physicality and commitment.
- Offering a larger variety of repertory for candidates in order to better carefully feature and challenge each candidate.
- The requirement is to use DVD.
- In filming a group work do not place the candidate exactly behind another dancer.

- The use of varied colours in group works does not allow the viewer to distinguish the dancer. Candidates should wear black and white or similar contrast.
- In the teacher comments on the 6/DPCS, it would help if handwriting were clearer in some cases; word-processed comments would be appreciated where possible. Further details on candidates' dance background and approach to learning are important to include.

World 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

There were a number of excellent dance investigation papers. There were other papers that indicated that the candidates did not fully understand the difference between a “familiar” dance culture and/or tradition and an “unfamiliar” one. In some cases it was evident that the familiar dance form was one that the candidate had not personally experienced physically. In some other cases candidates appeared to regard the familiar form as one they knew a little bit about through reading, viewing or the internet. Physical participation in the familiar form is something that needs to be clearly stated and understood. (Please refer to the dance guide for further detail about this aspect.)

Candidate performance against each criterion

Further attention is needed in the referencing of proper sources to support the investigation. Teachers should take responsibility for advising candidates about the availability of relevant sources readily available in their vicinity. There is still too much reliance on secondary

sources, particularly the internet and text. Personal physical experience, workshops pertinent to the subject and live performance viewing provide valuable information relative to the subject. Some candidates have wisely resorted to interviews with dancers, teachers and/or choreographers for information.

In order to enable greater differentiation between HL and SL requirements, a further HL criterion (E “Analytical response”) was included in HL dance investigation for the first time this examination session. This required HL candidates to analyse and compare one aspect of two short extracts, one each from the familiar and unfamiliar dance cultures and/or traditions chosen for the investigation.

Too many of the HL papers received did not identify the chosen “extracts” so it was left to the examiner to search through the body of the paper to find them. It was also noted for the future that the “Analytical response” (Criterion E) would be better addressed as a separate section towards the end of a candidate’s paper (HL), not in a more fragmentary way throughout the paper.

Another problem occurred in regard to the use of the word “choreography” which to many in the field implies solid and repeatable dance structure. As so many of the dance forms investigated, such as hula, folk, trance and hip hop, tend to be stylistically and culturally based but not bound by a repeatable structure, it was decided during a recent meeting, to use the word “composition” for future reference in place of “choreography”.

Recommendations and guidance for the teaching of future candidates

There were many more HL investigations than SL papers submitted this examination session, as has been the case during previous years. Some students would have been better advised to enter as SL as some HL papers were poorly researched and written. Teachers should remain aware of their students’ potential and advise them accordingly for the benefit of the candidate.

In sum, it is essential that teachers and candidates work from the most up to date dance guide and, in conjunction, refer to the Sample Handbook of procedures for the Diploma Programme for dance. In this way requirements can be cross-checked and information needed for the cover sheets monitored.