2015 NZ Scholarship Assessment Report



Music

Part A: Commentary

Comment on the overall response of candidates to the 2015 examination.

The level of work submitted in the portfolio and the examination continues to improve. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they read the requirements of the portfolio, specifically in regard to the formats in which the portfolio should be submitted. The quality of audio (and video) should be considered and where possible candidates are encouraged to present live recordings of compositions. The quality of the critical reflective analysis was exceptional in many cases. Students who present an in-depth analysis prepared over an extended period of time showing considered thought benefit significantly.

Part B: Report on performance standard

Scholarship with Outstanding Performance	 Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance commonly: demonstrated depth of understanding and ongoing development of professional practice and ideas in their critical reflections made pertinent and insightful reference to score extracts within their essays showed internalisation of the musical score (for example, recognising Brahms' Lullaby in Cartoon Music) justified their responses with musical arguments and reasoning provided a thorough and detailed relevant annotated score in questions that asked for this (Q2, Q4) structured their written responses and focused on the key elements of the questions in their responses demonstrated highly advanced performance, musicology or composition skills in their portfolio.
Scholarship	 Candidates who were awarded Scholarship commonly: demonstrated understanding in their critical reflections made occasional reference to score extracts within their essays, or provided relevant and focused score annotations in questions that required this (Q2, Q4) used musical reasoning as part of their response used some structure in their written essays and addressed both parts of the question.
Other candidates	 Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship commonly: covered only surface aspects in their critical reflection gave responses to Q5 that described character features of the animals concerned, but did not relate this directly to the music described the scores rather than analysed them covered a wide range of material, but only some of it was musical or related to the score extracts presented had a strong essay and a weak essay, or only partly addressed one or both sections of a question showed little skill in their portfolio and lacked depth in their critical reflection discussion.

Standard specific comments

Some portfolio submissions did not meet the requirements which are clearly outlined on the New Zealand Scholarship Music page.

(http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/qualifications-standards/awards/new-zealandscholar ship/scholarship-subjects/scholarship-music/)

In particular:

A number of Performance portfolios were submitted without musical scores. The recording quality of these was also very varied, with some being of poor audio quality.

Some Composition portfolios were submitted as MIDI files or Sibelius files rather than audio files.

The following points were also noted by the markers:

Performance portfolios of the highest quality were achieved when students selected and prepared a performance especially for Scholarship rather than reusing or recycling a previous performance.

Composition portfolios of the highest quality were achieved when candidates wrote music that took into account the qualities of real instruments (rather than being composition software focused) with some candidates submitting live performances of their works.

The critical reflections continue to improve in standard, with several candidates showing real depth of discussion in their essays. It is also evident that many candidates are looking at the exemplar for this online, and it is worth reminding teachers and candidates of the importance of original thinking here.