

GCSE Music Exemplars - Performance

General guidance to teachers:

General comments:

- We advise that teachers listen to the exemplars more than once and to assess the piece using the grids before reading the marks and comments
- Students may also find this a useful process to understand the requirements of these components of the course
- Teachers need to apply the new mark scheme and do not compare or apply the old mark scheme
- To decide on a level, read all of the statements within the level. (use the statement from the unit 3 guidance).

1. Solo exemplars

Candidate 1				
Title: Cantina Band				
Difficulty Level: 5 – more difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	3 Level 2	3 Level 2	2 Level 1	8 raw marks 12 marks in total
Commentary	<p>1. Best fit for level 2. Demands of the piece, in places, are beyond the ability of the performer. In places, the tone quality is convincing but technique not consistent.</p> <p>2. Performer struggles to keep up with the tempo. In this case, the candidate would have benefitted from rehearsing and recording with a live accompanist. There was limited articulation to shape the opening section. Very limited dynamic contrast with a mechanical quality to the contrasting section.</p> <p>3. Several obtrusive errors and omissions starting at bar 39. Fluency is severely compromised in the contrasting section, the return of the opening material and the coda.</p>			

Candidate 2				
Title: Canon				
Difficulty level: 5 – more difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	7 Level 4	6 Level 3	7 Level 4	20 raw marks 30 marks in total
Commentary	<p>1. Candidate demonstrates technical control with convincing pedalling throughout. However, the sonority and tone slightly suffered in places with heavy handed left hand accompaniment.</p> <p>2. Well controlled phrasing but limited dynamic contrast. The subtlety of tempo was not always exploited e.g. in Piu Mosso section.</p> <p>3. The performance is largely accurate with only minor errors. Fluency was compromised in a couple of places by slight hesitation</p>			

Candidate 3				
Title: Bist du Bel Mir				
Difficulty Level: 4 - Standard				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	3 Level 2	4 Level 2	5 Level 3	12 raw marks 15 marks in total
Commentary	1. Thin, coarse tone quality and many intonation problems but some technical control e.g. bowing. 2. There is limited musical playing and involvement with the music. Limited use of dynamics, phrasing and articulation. The tempo, however, is appropriate. 3. Performance is reasonably fluent and coherent but with some errors			

Candidate 4				
Title: Make you feel my love				
Difficulty level: 4 - Standard				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	5 Level 3	4 Level 2	5 Level 3	14 raw marks 18 marks in total
Commentary	1. Basic technical control was in place. Breath control was good throughout but diction lacked clarity. There were a few places where the piece was beyond the ability of the candidate. Notes in the lower register needed greater support. 2. Some shaping of the music through dynamics. In verses 3 and 4, the sound is more mechanical. 3. The performance was mainly fluent, however there are two notable places where there were obtrusive errors of pitch/rhythm.			

Candidate 5				
Title: Sugar				
Difficulty level: 5 – more difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	5 Level 3	5 Level 3	6 Level 3	17 raw marks 26 marks in total
Commentary	1. Basic technical control was shown but during the improvisation, problems were shown at the extremities of the pitch range and moments of technical difficulty with split notes and insecure intonation. 2. Some use of dynamics and articulation to shape the music in the head, but contrasts were lacking in the improvisation. 3. The performance is fluent and demonstrates a mostly accurate performance of the stimulus with some successful melodic development. The improvisation relies heavily on repetition and is somewhat formulaic.			

2. Ensemble Exemplars

Candidate 1				
Title: Gavotte				
Difficulty Level: 5 – More difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	7 Level 4	7 Level 4	7 Level 4	21 raw marks 30 total marks
Commentary	<p>1. This is a 'best fit' for Level 4. The demands of the music were well within the ability of the performer and they demonstrated technical control and breath control despite some blemishes in tone quality.</p> <p>2. Tempo is appropriate and the dynamics were well controlled and contrasting. The phrasing was musical. The staccato is not as crisp as it could be. There are some missed opportunities with regards to the balance of the different parts.</p> <p>3. Largely accurate with only minor errors and was coherent and fluent. Some adjustment to other parts is evident</p>			

Candidate 2				
Title: March				
Difficulty level: 3 – Less difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	2 Level 1	1 Level 1	1 Level 1	4 raw marks 4 total marks
Commentary	<p>Clarinet 2</p> <p>1. In places, poor co-ordination in places, for example the semi quavers in bar 4. Candidate struggled with the passages involving a leap. Breath control was convincing in places.</p> <p>2. Little or no shaping of the music through dynamics and articulation. Little awareness of balance. The candidate fell behind the tempo of the ensemble</p> <p>3. Multiple errors of pitch and rhythm</p>			

Candidate 3				
Title: Take 5				
Difficulty level: 5 – more difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	4 Level 2	3 Level 2	2 Level 1	9 raw marks 14 total marks
Commentary	<p>1. This is a 'best fit' for level 2 as the performer demonstrates some basic technical control. There are a number of places where the demands of the music are beyond the ability of the performer. Finger and breath co-ordination are lacking from bar 16. The tone control is not always secure.</p> <p>2. Limited use of dynamics and articulation. Occasional awareness of balance.</p> <p>3. The performance has numerous obtrusive errors of pitch and rhythm throughout and fluency was compromised.</p>			

Candidate 4				
Title: Jupiter				
Difficulty level: 5 more difficult				
Mark:	Grid 1	Grid 2	Grid 3	Total
	8 Level 4	7 Level 4	8 Level 4	23 raw marks 30 marks in total
Commentary	<p>1. Convincing technical control throughout for example detailed pedalling. A wide variety sonority which was well controlled.</p> <p>2. Dynamics could have shown greater range particularly exploiting the quiet end e.g. 17 to 19. In places, there was an excellent awareness of balance, but in places, the pianist dominated e.g bars 51 and 52</p> <p>3. The performance is accurate and fluent throughout. The performer reacts to changes of tempo in the oboe part.</p>			