

Assessment Report

New Zealand Scholarship Music 2023

Performance standard 93305

General commentary

There is no need for candidates to read their NSN out loud before they begin as part of their introduction (this can lead to unnecessary hesitation and nerves in the introduction by the candidate trying to memorise the NSN or read it off a device or piece of paper). It can make the start of the performance very awkward and unnatural. A clearly labelled file is all that is required. However, the candidate should not state their name.

Camera angle – ensure the whole performer can be seen, especially in instances where their technique needs to be observed (e.g. pedalling on the piano).

Videos should be set to one fixed camera only. Zooming in and out on a performer can mean the candidate loses opportunities to demonstrate their communication (e.g. hand gestures, communication with their accompanist) as the zoomed-in camera angle loses these elements from the picture.

Accompanists (if applicable) should always be visible / in the picture to show candidate's communication with the accompanist.

It is important that videos submitted for portfolios do not include any unnecessary dialogue between performers and their teachers, audience, or accompanist before the performance begins or once it ends. In other instances, recordings have not been started on time – care must be taken to ensure the introduction by the candidate is captured in full and the video is not cut short before the candidate has finished completely (e.g. bowed to the audience, acknowledged their accompanist) as a performance is judged from start to finish including these aspects (just as any performance recital would be in a live setting).

Ensure video editing does not cut off the performance before the clapping so that audience acknowledgement can be captured if applicable.

Musical examples used in the critical reflection should have clefs and time signatures. Often these are cut and pasted in from scores and lack clefs and metre markings and so become less meaningful.

Authenticity Statements need to be signed by the school, confirming that the material presented is the candidate's own work and that performances have taken place in front of an audience.

Scores for performance portfolios must be supplied.

Report on performance standard

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with **Outstanding Performance** commonly:

- submitted a performance portfolio that was prepared to specifically meet the requirements for this scholarship
- presented a carefully planned and authentic performance in front of an audience using appropriate stage etiquette (introduction of pieces, engagement with audience, strong communication with accompanist / other performers (where applicable))
- performed a repertoire that was varied
- demonstrated a highly advanced level of technical ability and musical awareness / understanding of the works
- consistently demonstrated a high level of communication throughout the whole performance
- demonstrated interpretations at a high level of musicality (expressive and mature playing that is highly musical and not just technically accurate)
- provided a composition portfolio that was well presented and carefully chosen to meet the guidelines of the scholarship criteria
- were highly creative with their compositions
- presented well-structured compositions where instrumentation was carefully considered
- showed original thematic material that was well developed and demonstrated exceptional quality in style
- provided visual scores and recordings of the works that were high quality
- provided a critical analysis that was insightful, highly reflective, and analysed the whole process (e.g. from planning to performance/final completed work) as well as future steps
- submitted writing that was well supported by references to other material
- submitted writing that was of exceptional quality, effectively included appropriate terminology, well-informed conclusions and insights
- overall, provided written communication that was consistently at a high level.

Candidates who were awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- performed advanced technical skills
- showed understanding of their chosen works throughout the performance
- were well prepared in their performance, and showed a consistently high level of communication throughout
- gave a succinct and confident introduction to the audience (regardless of its size)
- showed excellent communication with the accompanist and/or other performer(s)
- composed with originality and comprehensive understanding of elements, characteristics and performance techniques
- showed understanding of the technical demands and capabilities of instruments within the composition
- provided highly accurate visual representation of the works that were applicable to the genre and very detailed
- provided high quality recordings

- presented an in-depth critical discussion that clearly analysed the effectiveness / success of the work in regard to the musical contribution of significant elements used
- provided a substantial written response that was consistent throughout, with strong applicable links to the score
- submitted a critical reflection that was original and made relevant links to their portfolio and external sources throughout
- submitted a comprehensive and insightful portfolio
- effectively and convincingly communicated a written response that was unique with well-chosen / applicable annotations.

Candidates who were **not** awarded **Scholarship** commonly:

- submitted a portfolio that did not sufficiently meet the specified guidelines e.g. a performance portfolio that was only 8 minutes long (essentially only half a portfolio)
- did not meet the criteria as outlined on the NZQA site (e.g. the recording was edited, or not one recording made specifically for NCEA scholarship music)
- provided collaborative works instead of just their own work
- did not complete some elements of the musicology portfolio as per the guidelines provided
- did not demonstrate a high level of technical ability on their chosen instrument during their performance
- submitted a composition which lacked advanced instrumentation writing skills and thematic development
- did not demonstrate advanced understanding of their chosen works (included errors, or lack of detail in their musicology analysis)
- wrote a commentary that described rather than reflected / analysed
- discussed at length aspects of their musical background and achievements as a performer / composer / musician, which were not relevant nor required
- did not complete a substantial critical reflection, falling well short of the 3,000 word recommendation resulting in lack of detail, little to no sources, and minimal evidence
- lacked originality in their critical reflection, drawing on structural elements and / or wording from previous exemplars.