# Government of South Australia LogoSACE Board Logo2023 Music Performance — Solo Subject Assessment Advice

Overview

Subject assessment advice, based on the 2023 assessment cycle, gives an overview of how students performed in their school and external assessments in relation to the learning requirements, assessment design criteria, and performance standards set out in the relevant subject outline. They provide information and advice regarding the assessment types, the application of the performance standards in school and external assessments, and the quality of student performance.

Teachers should refer to the subject outline for specifications on content and learning requirements, and to the subject operational information for operational matters and key dates.

# School Assessment

Teachers can improve the moderation process and the online process by:

* thoroughly checking that all grades entered in school online are correct
* checking that PSR grades are consistent with uploaded teacher mark/comment sheets
* ensuring that all files are accurately labelled and uploaded for each student
* including performance notes sheets in the moderation materials for each individual student
* selecting repertoire that enables the student to demonstrate skills specifically aligned to those of a soloist, not as an ensemble member
* filming so that all aspects of the technique used by the student are visible; items such as music stands should not obscure the performer
* ensuring satisfactory balance in recordings, so that the student can be clearly heard over the accompaniment.

Assessment Type 1: Performance

Students present a solo performance, or set of performances, of a single work or a set of works by one or more composers.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* selecting repertoire that enables the student topresent works that appropriately align with their technical and musical capabilities
* selecting musical works that are soloistic in nature, i.e. students perform the predominant solo part in the music

The more successful responses commonly:

* delivered a thoroughly prepared performance characterised by fluency and cohesiveness
* displayed consistent focus on all musical facets throughout the performance
* exhibited consistent control over tone, dynamics, articulation, breathing and phrasing
* demonstrated a high level of musicianship in presenting a variety of techniques
* maintained a confident level of engagement with the audience, coupled with appropriate stage etiquette
* if performing with an accompanist, worked collaboratively with the accompanist.

*The less successful responses commonly:*

* included performances that were under-prepared
* performed repertoire that was beyond the scope of the student’s technical level
* demonstrated inconsistent technique and fluency within the performance of the repertoire
* presented works that limited students’ ability to demonstrate a variety of techniques or styles
* showed a partial understanding of the stylistic aspects of the repertoire
* prepared repertoire that was simplistic in nature
* presented a part of an ensemble work as a solo performance
* used backing tracks as accompaniment that included the solo part.

Assessment Type 2: Performance and Discussion

For this assessment type students present a solo performance or set of performances to a maximum of 6–8 minutes, of a single work or a set of works by one or more composers. This assessment also includes a discussion of key musical elements of the chosen repertoire, with a critique of strategies to improve and refine the student’s performance to a maximum of 800 words if written, 4 minutes as an oral presentation, or the multimodal equivalent.

Teachers should take note of the differences in the discussion points between the two performance subjects (Ensemble and Solo). Refer to the subject outline for further details.

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* selecting repertoire that allows for an in-depth level of analysis
* ensuring that the focus of the Discussion is on musical elements — particularly analysis of structure and style, and practice strategies developed by the student to improve and refine their performance(s)
* marking all the student’s evidence for the assessment type holistically. Components of the task, such as the discussion, are not weighted, and specific features of assessment design criteria can be applied to evidence in one or more components.

1. The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a high level of technique and confidence within the performance(s)
* demonstrated considered stage presence, performing with poise and fluency whilst engaging with their repertoire
* included a discussion that focused on the analysis of a variety of musical elements in detail
* showed evidence of their understanding through relevant examples and annotations using bar numbers to contextualise the analysis
* addressed structural and stylistic elements of the chosen repertoire within the discussion
* addressed practice strategies used to develop and prepare their performance within the discussion
* included consistent, accurate, and highly effective use of musical terminology
* clearly featured students in performances recorded on video.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not submit the discussion
* did not include refinements and strategies developed to improve their skills, technique or accuracy within the performance
* submitted discussions that focused more on evaluative or descriptive features rather than analytical information
* did not use appropriate musical terminology within the discussion
* focused on a limited number of musical elements within the discussion (e.g. intonation, lyrics, dynamics)
* did not elaborate on practice strategies used by the student in the development and preparation of their performance
* lacked technical fluency and stylistic understanding within the performance of the work(s)
* included performances that did not allow the student to demonstrate a variety of techniques and skills.

# External Assessment

Teachers can elicit more successful responses by:

* including musical scores relevant to the chosen repertoire
* ensuring an evaluation is submitted for each student. The focus of the evaluation should be on performance preparation, critique of their performance and aspects of stage presence
* marking all the student’s evidence for the external assessment AT3 holistically. There is no specific weighting for the evaluation.

Assessment Type 3: Performance Portfolio

For this assessment type students present a solo performance or set of performances to a maximum of 6–8 minutes, of a single work or a set of works by one or more composers. This assessment also includes an evaluation of their learning journey to a maximum or 500 words if written, 3 minutes as an oral presentation, or the multimodal equivalent.

Teachers should ensure students understand the differences between the purpose of the discussion in Assessment Type 2, and the evaluation in Assessment Type 3. The discussion focuses on analytical and stylistic features of the repertoire (RM1), and practice techniques used to develop and refine the performance given in Assessment Type 2. The evaluation in Assessment Type 3 focuses on an evaluation and critique of the final performance and the learning undertaken throughout the year (RM2).

The more successful responses commonly:

* demonstrated a high level of technical facility and stylistic understanding within the performance
* reflected a high level of energy and focus throughout the performance
* demonstrated sophisticated control of tone and a wide variety of dynamics and articulations within the performance
* performed repertoire which enabled the student to display a range of techniques and musical interpretation
* demonstrated insight into key musical elements, critiquing skills, accuracy, and technique of the chosen repertoire within the evaluation
* addressed how their preparation throughout their study influenced their final performance
* critically evaluated their stage presence and engagement as a performer
* completed the evaluation soon after the performance had occurred.

The less successful responses commonly:

* did not submit the evaluation
* presented ensemble parts to a backing track that were outside the scope of the subject (i.e. presenting an ensemble performance as a solo performance)
* demonstrated limited use of dynamic contrast, a variety of articulations and a range of tone colours
* lacked technical fluency and accuracy within the performance
* submitted evaluations that made statements without providing supporting evidence or examples
* lacked attention to detail of musical indications marked on the score (where provided)
* made limited use of musical terminology in relation to the elements of music
* did not address how their preparation influenced their final performance for the assessment
* only evaluated their stage presence, engagement and confidence as a performer
* lacked detail or omitted a critique of skills relating to accuracy and technique within the Evaluation
* included irrelevant, extensive biographical details about the composer/original recording artist.