4.1 HL: The contemporary music maker

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 25 marks**

KEY WORDS musical collaboration • curation

HL: The contemporary music maker

Objective

Supported preparation: Plan a collaborative real-life music project with roles and a deliverable; Document proposal, process and evaluation as one continuous presentation. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

> **Contemporary-maker toolkit.** HL only (30%): a collaborative real-life project (real deliverable, real audience, all the course's roles in the team) documented as ONE continuous multimedia presentation evidencing three parts: the project proposal; the process and evaluation (failures kept, evidence quoted); the realized project or curated selections of it (the curation keeps the proposal moment, one failure with its fix, and the strongest excerpt). Worked: "Corridor Sessions", three released live-session podcast episodes.

2 Practice

2.1 Name the three things the multimedia presentation must evidence. [3]

2.2 What form must the submission take, and what must it document? [2]

2.3 Whose competencies does the project draw on? [3]

2.4 What makes the project real-life (two things)? [2]

2.5 Name the two documentation failures. [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Proposal style.)* Draft the project proposal for the worked "Corridor Sessions": the aim, the roles, the deliverable. [4]

3.2 *(Evaluation style.)* Episode two lost its audience inside the intro. Draft the process-and-evaluation entry: what was tried, what the evidence says, what changes. [6]

3.3 *(Curation style.)* The team has 40 minutes of footage and a 15-minute presentation. State the curation rule, and name what must survive the cut. [3]

Solutions

2.1 The project proposal (1); the process and evaluation (1); the realized project or curated selections of it (1).

2.2 One continuous multimedia presentation (1); documenting a real-life project (1).

2.3 The researcher's (1); the creator's (1); the performer's (1): the project draws on all the course's roles.

2.4 Inspired by real-life practices of music-making (1); a real deliverable for a real audience beyond the classroom, such as released episodes rather than a classroom simulation (1).

2.5 The highlights reel (finished product only, no process) (1); the diary (feelings recorded, nothing evaluated against the aim) (1).

3.1 Aim: record and release three live sessions by local artists in the school corridor (1); roles: one researcher selects and briefs the artists, two creators arrange the intro music and the session order, all four perform the interval set (2); deliverable: three released podcast episodes with artwork, the release date fixed in the proposal (1).

3.2 Tried: a ninety-second news-style intro before the first song (1); evidence: the audience data shows listeners leaving inside the intro (1); verdict: the intro buries the session's best moment (2); change: episode three opens inside the music, the artist introduced over the fade, and the failure stays in the evaluation (2).

3.3 Curation rule: the selection must still evidence all three parts, not just the performance (1); what survives: the proposal moment (1); one process failure with its fix and the strongest complete excerpt (1).

Local review guidance: (R1) 3.1 argues the brief, not ambition; 3.2 quotes data as evidence; 3.3 keeps all three parts in the cut. Authored guidance.