

2025 ASSESSMENT REPORT

DNC315124 DANCE

General Comments

Overall, student performance in the 2025 Dance Level 3 course reflected a broad range of abilities and creative approaches, with a significant increase in both examination centres and candidate numbers compared to 2024. Many students demonstrated strong engagement with the course, and higher-achieving candidates showed consistency across both solo and group performances, as well as a clear ability to explore contrasting intentions. A common trend was that solo works were generally stronger than group works, suggesting a need for more structured time dedicated to group choreography, rehearsal and refinement. Teachers are encouraged to assess group work under examination conditions prior to the external assessment period to better prepare students. Areas for improvement were most evident in folio submissions, where proofreading issues, lack of clarity in ideas and inconsistencies in language conventions impacted results; in some cases, suspected AI use highlighted the importance of verifying authorship through documented draft development. Feedback from teachers should explicitly address each element of Criteria 4 and 5 to support student improvement. With many new teachers delivering the course, it is strongly recommended that teachers engage with supporting materials, professional learning opportunities, moderation processes and practical examinations to build confidence and consistency in course delivery and assessment.

Practical Component

Criterion 1

Criterion 1 was the lowest-performing practical criterion across the state, with many candidates demonstrating a limited understanding of choreographic and compositional devices, as evidenced in their proforma and finished works. Group pieces did not always reflect the range and effective use of devices expected at this level. While canon and motif were commonly applied, higher-achieving candidates distinguished themselves by using more sophisticated devices such as retrograde, transposition and embellishment to meaningfully develop their ideas. Stronger works clearly established an intention, progressed purposefully through each section towards a climax and resolved with a clear and considered ending. Teachers are encouraged to explicitly teach a broad range of choreographic devices and support students to use these to develop and resolve their intention.

Criterion 3

Candidates generally demonstrated the ability to execute a range of movements; however, many relied on simplistic or isolated choices. When works are presented in draft form, more targeted feedback on how to manipulate space, time, and dynamics would support greater sophistication, as candidates often focused on exploring a single element of dance in isolation. In some centres, movement development and abstraction were limited, highlighting the need for explicit teaching of

abstraction and contemporary technique. Music choices were most successful when they supported the development of the choreographic intention rather than driving movement decisions. Although lighting and costume do not impact final ratings, insufficient rehearsal with props or costume occasionally inhibited movement quality and detracted from the choreography.

Criterion 8

Overall, Criterion 8 was a strength across the state, with many candidates demonstrating strong technical skill, basic artistry and an ability to work effectively with others, reflecting the recommended prior dance experience outlined in the course overview. To further improve, candidates should continue to focus on resolving their choreographic work through performance, particularly by varying facial expression, dynamics and projection to show contrast and deepen intention. Those achieving the highest standards were able to apply their technical skills and artistry with sophistication, integrating abstract movement choices alongside known vocabulary to deliver confident, expressive and well-resolved performances.

Folio Component

Criterion 4

Overall, candidates who clearly discussed sections of their works and identified form were more successful in conveying choreographic intention and analysing development. While the Critical Analysis was generally completed to a satisfactory standard, higher-performing candidates strengthened their responses by embedding judgement statements throughout their writing, rather than confining evaluation to the conclusion. In the Performance Proforma, many candidates described what they did in the choreographic process but did not sufficiently analyse how movement was developed; for example, references to stimuli such as universal writing were often listed without evaluating how time, space or dynamics were manipulated to support intention. Limited understanding of choreographic devices and dance terminology affected outcomes in some cases, particularly where candidates were unable to analyse how selected devices contributed to the development of their work. Artistic problem solving was also underdeveloped in some proformas, with candidates focusing on logistical issues rather than creative challenges. Candidates are encouraged to clearly identify artistic problems, explain how these were addressed and evaluate how the solution improved the realisation of their intention.

Criterion 5

In Criterion 5, candidates were most successful when they focused on explaining the choices they made and how those choices were informed, rather than stating what they did not do. Some candidates used valuable word count defining terminology or concepts such as choreographic intention, when the assessment instead requires discussion of how these ideas were applied in practice. As the course carries a literacy tick, the use of a formal writing style is essential; however, colloquial language, universal statements and informal phrasing limited some candidates' ability to demonstrate authentic understanding of their own work and that of others. Referencing was generally attempted with sincerity, though in some cases it was overused, with unnecessary referencing of dance terminology or TASC documentation. To improve outcomes, candidates should prioritise clear, formal expression, purposeful explanation of choreographic decisions and selective use of referencing that directly supports analysis and evaluation.