

ARTISTIC PAIR

MID FAIR

PALE BLUE & WHITE COSTUME

SCORE 2.1

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Pretty equal in skill development--Body technique needs attention (posture, extensions, turn out etc.). Head back on spin. Grabbing cut backs. Free hand and leg lines are not precise. There's a lack of clarity in approach to their training.

P/U: frequently not timed together.

COMPOSITION

--Only rhythmic understanding of the music. Waiting for music. Staging of material could enhance the program more. 3 modes-simplistic (expected in entrance levels); 1 vertical spin, some flip & swing combinations, long arm and cutbacks not tracked. Working above skills at times. Floor design basic (all back and forth). Designer could consider doing less and develop more quality within their skills.

Exchanges: Basic exchanges in aerial and contact, no roll exchanges.

PERFORMANCE

--On and off presentation skills. Fades during double demands. Lower body technique not precise (leaps, kicks, tour jete and illusions). Frequently ahead of the musical phrases. Little regard to the musical demands. Very little communication with each other or audience. Lack of experience as performers is indicated through their slow reaction to errors and the constant looking at each other to make sure they're on the same page.

Drops: 2

<p style="text-align: center;">ARTISTIC PAIR MID AVERAGE BURNT RED COSTUME</p> <table border="1"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">SCORE 4.4</td></tr></table>	SCORE 4.4
SCORE 4.4	

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

--not locking ankles on 5th position relevés. Illusions are off pattern.

--Starting to detail freehand position. -- Leg lines not always precise. -----Flat footed on transitions.

Strong opening statement technically—above the expectations of average. As the program progressed the quality of what they presented weakened.

Skill levels are compatible

P/U: 60%--timing off at times.

COMPOSITION

--V and H rolls-basic—need fill in's at times (waiting for musical phrases frequently). 3 modes covered at skill level (rolls weakest because not completed). Floor design was good. The opening slow section of the music was musically strong and indicated a good sense of phrasing and skill. The breakdown of the roll execution created a lack of momentum as the music was building at the end.

Exchanges: nice contact on opening. Nice variety of exchanges for this level. Roll exchanges not completed.

PERFORMANCE

--one dimension of expressions. Expressions fade during demanding material. Not feeling the music, just using the basic rhythm.

Drops: 3

ARTISTIC PAIR

MID GOOD

BLACK, RED & GOLD COSTUME

SCORE 6.1

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

--Leg patterns slightly off on double illusion. Male lacks turn out from hips. --at times flat footed.—Lower body technique needs addressing.

P/U: 75%-Lack of precision is sometimes breaking down the unison.

COMPOSITION

--Nice add-ons to exchanges (by variety of catches).—3 modes covered (cut back and pop combinations, swing and flip combinations, variety of aerial material). Could use more dimension of floor coverage (diagonal and curvature).

Exchanges: 3 modes within exchanges. Nice travel complex exchange.

Composition seems to be driven by tempo and counts. Nice moments and events aren't given time to be appreciated before moving on to the next thought.

PERFORMANCE

--choreographed expressions—Interpretation of music is designer driven but athletes are not feeling the emotions. At times, communicating with each other, but not maintained.

Drops: 2

<p style="text-align: center;">ARTISTIC PAIR MID EXCELLENT BLUE & BLACK COSTUME</p> <table border="1"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">SCORE 7.2</td></tr></table>	SCORE 7.2
SCORE 7.2	

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

--Lower body technique not precise for this level (releve, turn outs, extensions etc.). One member touched hand to ground on double illusion.

–good variety of baton demands.

--work well together—approach by both members is similar and their skill levels are well matched.

P/U: 80%

COMPOSITION

--nice add ons to aerials with variety of catches.—Highlights i.e.-partner walk over.

–continuous interplay with material of program. 3 modes covered well. Vertical and Horizontal and dual pattern within program.

Exchanges: 3 modes covered within exchanges. Was the main strength. –good floor coverage and used variety within the space allowed.

There were memorable moments in this program that were compositional in nature and not driven by success of execution as a reliable source of positive reaction.

PERFORMANCE

--Could communicate and interplay more with each other facially.

--Could show more variety of emotions to add to the interpretation of the music.

Extremely confident and secure as a pair and the viewer is never worried about their ability to execute.

Drops: 1



TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

--Slight cross over on spins.—isolated stationary areas to re-group.—one member lost control on early roll section. Excellent control of contact and exchange material. Could show more dance technique and demands to meet the level of their baton handling, however shows good flexibility and extension on lay backs and kicks.

P/U: 90%

COMPOSITION

--Revolutions, control, general handling and dexterity of contact combinations raised the scores. 3 modes covered equally. Vertical pattern dominant, could use some horizontal and dual patterns on aerial material. Designer set program to show their strengths.

Exchanges: 3 modes in exchanges. —roll pops and flip exchange combo well done. Sustained exchange sections with add on catches. —variety of release and catches.

Abstract styling is used intermittently and could be developed more thoroughly.

PERFORMANCE

--Abstract style, new approach to the music and successful. At times, broke away from the style.—could develop more communication with each other facially. Appear forced at times and the viewer tends to tense up as a reactionary response to their performance approach.

Drops: 0