

Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

June 2015

Pearson Edexcel Advanced
Subsidiary GCE in Performing Arts
(Single Award: 8781)

Pearson Edexcel Advanced GCE in
Performing Arts
(Single Award: 9781)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2015

Publications Code UA040840

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Contents

General Comments on the 2015 Series	4
Some Key Messages	4
Moderation Arrangements	6
Unit One: – Developing Skills for Performance	9
Unit Two: – Planning for a Creative Event	11
Unit Three: – Performing to a Commission	13
Unit Four: - Employment Opportunities in the Performing Arts	15
Unit Five: – Advanced Performance Practice	18
Unit Six: - Advanced Production Practice	21
Unit Seven: – Production Delivery	22
Summary section	25

General comments on the 2015 series

It is pleasing to report that enthusiasm for the specification continues in centres and the content free nature of the specification continues to result in a wide range of course programmes offered across a range of centres. The full range of disciplines is being offered, including Dance, Drama, Music and Musical Theatre remaining the most popular routes.

The free choice of repertoire results in a range of work being performed and a range of skills being developed. This series again saw some creative individuals and groups demonstrating imaginative and inspiring work.

Some Key Messages

The following issues are improving however they continue to occur and still need addressing in some centres.

1. Candidates should not create portfolios in any other format than A4 (unless they are offering design skills) and not unnecessarily decorate their work (this type of approach is not indicative of AS/A level work).
2. The **written** components for units 3 and 7 should be marked prior to the moderation visit. This should be marked using the **Assessment Objective 2 criteria only**. The evidence for Assessment Objective 1 will be evidenced in performance along with Assessment Objective 3.
3. Practical performances (units 3, 5/6 & 7) **must** be recorded and Candidates **must** be identified at the start of performances. Centres must keep copies of all recordings.
4. Recordings of units 3 and 7, in the correct format, must be available if requested by the moderator no later than one week after the moderation.

5. Centre assessor annotation or signposting on candidate work should indicate where marks have been credited against the criteria.
6. For units 3 & 7 centres should adhere to the rubric concerning the running time of the performances and group size. Where performances exceed this it can lead to a negative outcome for the candidates. Where the minimum number of performers is not met, it can limit access to some of the assessment criteria.
7. When more than one teacher in a centre marks work it is important to carry out internal standardisation. This should also take place across any different pathways or routes the centre offers.
8. All sources of information should be appropriately referenced.

Moderation Arrangements

The moderation process was mostly straightforward again this year with the moderation window between April 1st and the 30th June. Very few centres had organised dates without consultation with moderators but it is worth reiterating that the moderation date is to be agreed with their moderator through negotiation and that centres should not decide on dates and assume that the moderator will be available. Similarly when dates and times have been agreed they must not be altered unless the moderator agrees.

Postal moderation was undertaken for a number of centres this series. The centres concerned are thanked for their cooperation and hopefully this gave some increased flexibility in terms of setting dates for performance work. Whilst it is very beneficial to have an audience for the practical work, units three and seven must meet the requirements of the specification which therefore must take precedence over audience considerations.

OPTEM Forms

The procedure remains as follows: Centres must complete OPTEM forms (or the online equivalent) for units 1, 2, 4 and 5/6 prior to the moderation visit and send/enter the marks to Edexcel at least a week before the agreed visit date. The yellow copies of the OPTEM forms (or the online equivalent) should be kept with the candidates work.

Recording of Practical Units

Please note that the recordings of performances for units three and seven must be available if the moderator requests them. If this is the case, they must be sent to the moderator within seven days of the visit together with their marked yellow copy of the OPTEM for each unit (or the online equivalent). For a postal moderation, all work is sent together by the agreed date after the performance has taken place.

Some centres still failed to identify candidates at the start of the performances.

The recording of performance work must be in an appropriate format. The most suitable is on DVD in a format that will play on a commonly used laptop. It is important that candidates are wearing the same costume that they use in the performance and that they state their name and candidate number and preferably the role/roles that they are playing at the start. Since candidates' concentration and performance preparation could be disrupted, it is advisable that the identification process is carried out prior to the actual performance but obviously at the beginning of the tape that will be used to record the work.

Portfolios

All portfolios must be available for the moderator and these must be marked by the centre's assessor(s) and internally standardised where appropriate. The centre marking should indicate where candidates' work has been credited against the criteria through suitable annotation or signposting.

Moderators again reported that many centres had managed this very effectively and noted several cases of good practice. In most centres work was well presented for moderation.

For units five and six it is important to remind centres that the recorded evidence of the production must be available with the portfolios and suitable technology available to view the work at a moderation visit. Likewise, it is essential that candidates be identified clearly at the beginning of the recording.

Candidates should be discouraged from submitting work in any other format than A4 and must not use plastic wallets. The content is the only material

that moderators will consider and the decoration of folders and unfiltered Internet downloads are best placed in an appendix as appropriate.

The only candidates who need to work outside this framework are those offering design skills where plans and/or design sketches might be larger than A4 format.

This may be also the case for the promotional material in unit 4.

Practical Units Three and Seven

Once again moderators reported that they had viewed a wide range and variety of performance work both in the application of performance styles and techniques and in the creative responses to the commission briefs. No style of performance was overriding and a broad range of skills appeared to be demonstrated.

For unit three, the externally set commission briefs continue to offer the opportunity for all centres and candidates to access the marks available across broad areas of interest and selected disciplines.

For unit seven most centres now appear to understand the focus of the unit but it is worth stating once again that candidates' should focus on developing their own interpretation from existing performance repertoire. It is important to read carefully the information given on the Production Brief for the relevant assessment window.

Process documentation to accompany practical units three and seven was managed effectively this year with centres applying the full range of marks for this component. Again only a very small minority of candidates omitted to submit written supporting evidence.

Unit Details for the 2015 Series

Unit One: – Developing Skills for Performance

There was a wide range of skills developed and different techniques and exercises were explored and applied, with predominantly successful outcomes detailed in the evaluation of the development process.

The Audit (AO1)

Candidates were guided by the majority of centres to produce thorough and detailed audits, written independently. Candidates were then able to identify a personal skills development programme as a result of the audit. At the other end of the mark range candidates tended to use templates provided by the centre or a series of questions, which prompted brief, and often under developed responses. These candidates did not then use the audit to inform how they could identify the skills they wished to develop.

This series saw a greater number of candidates focusing the development process on a specific skill, which was pleasing to see. As an applied subject, candidates are encouraged to replicate professional practice and it would not necessarily be realistic to explore and develop skills in a wide range of areas within the time frame of this unit.

Again, good and impressive practice was seen in several centres, where candidates clearly understood how to assess their initial skills level, and then signposted a focused area they were going to develop with an action plan of individual and independent intentions.

The Reports (AO2 & AO3)

It appeared again this year that some candidates are producing diary style notebooks or files of what they did in every lesson, often including trips to the theatre, interviews with professionals, workshops etc. This often led to a lack of focus on the skill(s) that an individual candidate was planning to develop.

There was evidence of many candidates taking responsibility for their own development and they often clearly communicated the process of their development and the impact it had on their own practice.

Video evidence is still often no more than a record of taking part, and lacks precise evidence of an understanding of a development process. Where this was undertaken and explicitly supported the development process it was helpful to the candidate.

Photographic evidence was often used and this was valuable when annotated with a written explanation of exercises and techniques being used.

Many reports were too descriptive and included everything a candidate had done during the unit rather than the candidate selecting the appropriate and relevant evidence for assessment.

Candidates in centres who had a secure understanding of the unit produced evidence that communicated to the moderator the process they had gone through and repeatedly linked their development to professional practice.

Many centres guided candidates into developing a skill for a specific performance and then the performance became the focus of their development, rather than just concentrating on the development of a skill. Health and safety issues were often successfully addressed within the context of the candidates chosen skill development.

Evaluation (AO4)

Fully reflective evaluations were again evident this year. Stronger candidates tended to evaluate throughout the portfolio and had a separate summative evaluation. Most candidates' work included the correct terminology and spelling, punctuation and grammar was secure. Less able Candidates tended to describe their enjoyment of the activities they had taken part in rather than evaluating the methods they had used to develop specific skills.

Overall this series the evidence presented at moderation was fit for purpose and in line with the demands of the unit and the weightings of the Assessment Objectives.

Unit Two: – Planning for a Creative Event

Appropriate creative events were the focus of this unit. Where the event was of a realistic scale this tended to give candidates more ownership of the event and the decision-making and self-management required.

Some candidates made it very clear how the group was organised and jobs allocated. However, again we saw many candidates seeming to multi-role, and this often led to difficulties in differentiating individual ability for assessment purposes. Some candidates were fortunate in being able to interview a professional whose job related to the role they were taking on or did the relevant research into their job role and they applied their new knowledge to the planning process. It is appreciated that not all candidates can access the former but there are many resources available for candidates to research professional practice in their chosen job role.

Report (AO1)

Again this series, most reports were fit for purpose in content and style, however to a varying degree. Some reports did not begin by communicating what the event was or detail clear creative intentions. The presentation and organisation of the majority of portfolios was this year more appropriate in terms of structure and style.

The best reports were reflective and retrospective documents written after the event had taken place and presented in a formal structured way and reported against clear aims and objectives.

It was again found that many candidates wrote an overview of how to plan an event rather than present their report with the context of their specific creative event. Stronger responses had a clear understanding of the

planning process and submitted reports describing in detail the key factors that had been considered.

Action Plans (AO2)

It is always worth stating that it is essential that all centres recognise that this assessment objective carries 50% of the marks available. In order for candidates to access the full range of marks the action planning evidence must be of sufficient detail and be verification of skills acquisition relating to planning an event.

There was again some concern that candidates offered generic action plans (not annotated or personalised), often without deadlines as evidence of secure or comprehensive planning.

Where candidates produced comprehensive individual plans with realistic aims and targets it provided a much stronger response to the demands of the assessment objective.

Evaluation (AO4)

Many Candidates were able to document the process effectively but need to be more critical and analytical in their reflections. Stronger candidates were able to evaluate the planning and its consequence on the implementation of the event rather than the event itself.

The evaluation should cover all the key stages of the planning process from initial ideas to post event conclusions. The strengths and weaknesses of the planning processes should be understood in relation to the relevant decisions and actions undertaken. Critical analysis rather than description of tasks is required.

Unit Three: – Performing to a Commission

Moderators reported a wide range of responses across all disciplines to the commission briefs. Where Candidates had genuinely created work in direct response to the demands of the selected commission, the finished product was more in line with the demands of the assessment criteria.

The most popular response was again to Commission 1 and explored 'institutions'. However this series saw another increase in the number of centres responding to Commission 2 with a number of Theatre in Education style pieces being performed on 'Time and Place'. This series saw commission 3 being a less popular choice with a smaller number of centres presenting work that looked at 'world celebration'.

Responses to the commission briefs **(AO1)** were comparable to the previous series but centres had again benefited from previous moderation reports and feedback. Therefore, the approach adopted by centres, with a similar cohort of candidates, was again more focused and successful. Most centres ensured that the realisation of the brief was handled in a professional manner to create a developed performance targeted at a specific target audience and with a clearly defined intended effect. Again, moderators reported some highly engaging, creative and inspiring performances.

Most centres presented the work for an appropriate audience. A few centres however did not pay sufficient attention to production values and sense of occasion.

It was less evident this series that centres were presenting work to no audience, with only the centre assessor and moderator present however a small number of centres are still doing this. It was felt that in such cases, an audience would have benefitted the candidates.

A small number of centres had not monitored the maximum and minimum time limits for the work and this usually was to the detriment of the piece.

In pieces that were too short candidates were not always able to demonstrate their abilities and in over long productions they often failed to maintain their concentration, focus and energy. Centres should ensure that the productions are within the allowed timeframe with smaller groups of three or four adhering to the shorter time and groups above ten using the higher allocation of time. The style of work should also be considered when calculating an appropriate running time.

Most performances were effective responses to the commissions but weaker groups frequently displayed very tenuous connections with the commission brief and sometimes presented performances that were simplistic in concept and lacked sufficient intensity or commitment to engage an audience.

The written log should demonstrate clearly how the work stems from the commission, details any relevant research and conveys the creative process that the candidates engaged in. The written log should be assessed prior to the moderation visit against the **(AO2)** criteria only.

With very few exceptions, moderators were impressed with the commitment shown by candidates towards the work they produced **(AO3)**. They were equally complimentary about the professional approach of centre assessors and the approach to the marking, in the majority of centres this was through a clear focus on the assessment criteria.

Most centres were clear about the need to submit the group pro-forma designed to provide the moderator with the context for the piece, identify candidates and their roles, confirm the performance style, and target audience.

Identification of candidates remained an issue in some centres when candidates were part of a large group and dressed in similar costumes. Whilst it is recognised that the integrity of the performance is important centres must also remember that it is an examination and the moderator must be able to distinguish individuals within the group.

Most centres responded to the requirement to send a recording if requested to do so which was appreciated.

Candidates who offered a technical support role within the group often demonstrated great resourcefulness and expertise in their technical achievements. The ten-minute presentation to the centre assessor to contextualise their work was mostly useful to both candidate and assessor.

There were very few candidates who elected to work in administrative roles but when this did occur they used the presentation time to demonstrate the range and quality of their input to marketing and promotion or front of house activities. Moderators again relied more heavily on the centre assessor's knowledge of the candidates input into these areas and despite the potential difficulties, moderators were again happy with the reliability of the marks awarded.

It is also important to confirm again that unit three must not be used to deliver unit two 'Planning for an Event'.

Unit Four: - Employment Opportunities in the Performing Arts

Unit 4 places Candidates work within the context of the Performing Arts industries. It asks learners to research into employment contexts, jobs and roles, industry standards and conditions and progression routes and opportunities and then make connections between what they have analysed and their own artistic practice. This combination should inform their acquisition of skills, understanding and knowledge.

The summary below gives a brief outline that is expanded on in the report:

A report detailing three roles in the performing arts industry is required **(AO1)**. This should include general contextualisation in the form of an introduction. A conclusion should identify the candidate's vocational progression route; this is generally into employment but can include HE or

pre-professional training. Case Studies may provide additional evidence but should not form the only basis of the report.

A portfolio of evidence of a candidate's experience of practical work should be organised with promotional intention and linked to their chosen vocational progression route **(AO2/3)**. This should be developed as the result of a selection process. It should be underpinned with knowledge and understanding of the practice and industry conditions of their chosen vocational area and include evidence of their experience and expertise. The portfolio should be presented with a promotional intent. It should have less emphasis on skills development and more on skills promotion. Candidates should avoid including unedited, generic taught material on the industry.

An evaluation (AO4)

Evidence that there has been a considered analysis of the work from the report through to choice of promotional material in the portfolio should be included. It should also have accounts of how the portfolio has been focused and structured.

The title of the unit is Employment Opportunities in the Performing Arts. Once an overview of the industry has been established in the report (AO1) employment opportunities should refer to the candidates own opportunities and not to opportunities in the industry as a whole.

This is not a skills development unit; the candidate should assume that they are already at an appropriately developed stage in their artistic and creative careers and progressions.

A report (AO1)

This should outline employment opportunities generally in the performing arts industry and go on to describe three jobs specifically, one each from performance, technical support and administration. Better responses gave very informed, critical accounts of the roles in great depth that had been contextualised by accounts of the creative industries as a whole.

Some centres had produced discrete, stand-alone reports. This was not always a good indication of contents but it did show an appropriate understanding of the demands and structure of the unit. They then went on to give a brief context to their own artistic role of choice and vocational progression route that underpinned the rest of the portfolio.

Reports were mostly structured appropriately with an overview of the performing arts industry and links to the three job roles.

Reports would benefit from an introductory 'overview' of the performing arts industry prior to detailing the research into three job roles.

A Portfolio of evidence (AO2, AO3)

As indicated some centres continue to misunderstand the context of the unit producing more of the report's contents in the portfolio section; identifying a progression route is not justification to include details of several university or conservatoire courses along with bulky prospectuses. There is some value in contextualisation especially when there is a decision to work on an audition piece for one of the courses.

Evidence of work on an audition speech by itself does not constitute sufficient evidence for AO2 and AO3. To re-iterate the portfolio of evidence needs to respond to the vocational, practical and professional demands of the unit contextualised by the individual progression route.

In more developed portfolios the progression route indicated the extent to which the Candidates skills and experience was edited, selected and presented to give maximum promotional intention and thus increase opportunities for employment.

It needs to be structured with promotional intention to sell and market the candidate in their chosen role.

Candidates should be confident to provide more examples of practical work to support accomplishment in the higher mark bands.

Some centres focussed on employment rather than solely on higher education and training and this resulted in candidate evidence that had much more promotional intent.

More centres this series submitted evidence in well-produced portfolios. These included show reels, well-annotated photographs and websites. Some candidates produced very slim portfolios consisting of CVs and photos only. Centres that did encourage a rigorous editing and shaping of material included full appendices. Appendices of this kind help to structure portfolios appropriately, while calming concerns of not including some good researched or taught material.

Evaluation (AO4)

Candidates should analyse how their skills, knowledge and understanding have been developed and informed by both their own work and the vocational context of that work. The other part of the framing of the portfolio section evidence is the evaluation. These generally were not problematic in terms of the demands of the unit since candidates have experience in producing them.

Unit Five: – Advanced Performance Practice

The unit is based on building a balanced relationship between documentation of processes and the application of skills and techniques in a production. A working notebook logs the acquisition through research of knowledge and understanding of a specific performance role and the application of that knowledge and understanding through appropriate skills and techniques in a production.

Candidate evidence should include written documentation of the processes in the form of a working notebook showing research which focuses and contextualises the chosen performance material, a rehearsal and preparation programme which reveals professional practice and commitment, evidence of regular practice including scheduling and organisation and an evaluation with use of specialist terms.

There should also be a recording of the performance of existing repertoire (not devised) to an audience where Candidates are clearly identified.

AO1, AO2 and AO4 are evidenced through the working notebook and **AO3** through the performance recording. There is equal weighting between the working notebook and the performance.

Centres generally encouraged candidates to make choices of roles within a production that provided sufficient evidence to meet the full range of assessment criteria. Good choices of topic are those that generally represent repertoire where there is a substantial body of theoretical and practical context for research to be meaningful. The repertoire choices combine historical, cultural and social contexts with the need to research contemporary professional practice that underpins AO1 assessment. They also provide the opportunity for planning necessary to meet AO2 that should see evidence of advance scheduling as well as retrospective accounts of rehearsals.

Most centres this series selected repertoire that gave sufficient opportunity for character development and a development of an accomplished personal style.

Candidates' portfolios were mostly well presented this year and clearly signposted, with detailed and supportive assessor feedback. There was a clear sense of progression as the process was documented. There was clear recognition that the unit is a synoptic unit and there was some excellent linking of theory and practice. Candidates tended to be straightforward and perceptive in documenting the process.

As with other A2 units editing and selection is a key skill and candidates should make use of appendices for including researched work that does not specifically relate to their chosen material or performance. This should avoid the inclusion of generic, taught or replicated notes. The inclusion of material on practitioners is useful if it states how it informs the work. At this level it

is expected that any Internet researched material is fully referenced and annotated.

Most of the scheduling documentation seen was fit for purpose. There was evidence of regular practice as well as advanced scheduling that revealed a clear and robust understanding of the creative and logistical needs of the chosen material.

The best notebooks were an engaging insight into the performance process underpinned with good knowledge of the techniques and genre.

Again this year it needs to be stated that evaluations could be more detailed and focus more on individual and group performance rather than the production realisation. There was again **AO4** evidence being credited for description where it required analysis. Candidates need to be more specific in terms of their evaluation of their own and the group's performance and to make links with professional practice.

The strongest candidates embedded evaluation in their working logs and provided a summative document with good quality of written communication. Weaker responses were written in everyday language and were a descriptive report of the performance.

Performance standards in **AO3** were again high and demonstrated commitment to stylistic and professional practice considerations. Communication with the audience was consistently good as was the demonstration of a secure understanding of the creative process. AO3 has a wide range of descriptors relating to performance and assessors should avoid crediting it all rather than carefully applying those aspects that best fit candidate evidence from across the bands.

There is sometimes a misunderstanding of the levelness of A2 within the context of the demands of this unit, which is predicated on *advanced* performance practice, *advanced* skills and techniques and critical and analytical research.

In AO1 there is a tendency to credit breadth of research material rather than depth. AO2 can lack accuracy in the crediting of contextualised research and the extent to which candidates provide advanced schedules and plans rather than descriptive diaries.

The technical quality of recordings was generally good, with only a very few difficulties experienced in viewing candidates' work.

Unit Six: - Advanced Production Practice

As the optional unit sitting alongside unit five, unit six shares much of the demands and assessment criteria but relates more specifically to technical areas. This report should therefore be read in conjunction with the one for unit five.

As with unit five the unit is based on building a balanced and fluent relationship between acquisition through research, knowledge and understanding of a specific production role (eg, lighting, sound, set or costume design, make up, or across a number of roles in a small company) and the application of that knowledge and understanding through appropriate skills and operations during a production.

Candidates should produce a working notebook showing evidence of research into style and technical requirements including plans of the design and/or management ideas, documentation and DVD of the realisation of the ideas and an evaluation.

AO1, AO2 and AO4 are evidenced through the working notebook and **AO3** through the performance recording or documentation. There is equal weighting between the working notebook and the performance documentation but there may be some replication of materials and some evidence may be seen that cuts across AOs.

Again, choice of material is crucial in this unit and must not only provide the range and depth necessary to meet the assessment criteria but also provide sufficient technical and logistical needs to satisfy *advanced* practice. This can be difficult in centres that may have enthusiastic candidates but basic equipment and limited access to replications of professional standards.

Some candidates did produce work of a high standard although the balance between practical skills and technical documentation remains problematic. Often the technical and practical demands dominated the process and this is to be expected in some of the large-scale productions seen but candidates need to be provided with the capabilities to be able to produce the same documentation as unit five candidates. There should be fully contextualised research, scheduling and planning and evaluative statements but with the added demands of the particular technical skill base and a recorded presentation as additional evidence.

It should be noted that centres should ensure very careful selection of skills that accurately reflect the level and depth of work expected, the resources of the centre, the demands of the production and the likely replication of professional standards and documentation.

Unit Seven: – Production Delivery

Unit seven enables candidates to engage with the subject in a very practical manner but demands a very sophisticated and refined level of performance. To fulfil the demands of the criteria, candidates need to be completely secure in the skills they employ and demonstrate them through a fully developed and practiced performance with clearly defined intentions.

Most centres recognised that the unit is about candidates developing their own interpretation of existing material from the performance repertoire rather than the creation of devised work. As a result, there were some very interesting versions of a wide range of material involving many styles and genres within the performing arts.

Most centres appeared to have accurately understood the Production Brief, and responded with the production of appropriate performances. The response to the specific demand and challenge of the production brief **(AO1)** is essential to access all the marks available.

The most successful candidates presented their work with a clearly defined focus on either performance style or dramatic intention to convey a particular message or achieve a particular effect for an identified target audience.

Most groups showed an excellent understanding of their source material in both their logs **(AO2)** and performance **(AO3)** and a wide range of skills and practices were explored. There was again a broad use of the performance space with varying levels of production support.

In most cases moderators confirmed that candidates were dedicated and truthful to their work and frequently demonstrated individual *flair and imagination*, and that the performances were well rehearsed and of the high standard expected of A2 work.

Most centres clearly understood the need to develop their own interpretation of the chosen material with the most successful presenting their interpretation of an existing play or choreography. In a small minority of centres, the requirement to interpret the production brief had not been fully understood and, again, skill development rather than interpretation seemed to be the focus along with a devising process.

Written support materials were for a minority of candidates, lacking in depth and evaluative detail and tended to be descriptive rather than analytical with some clearly having been submitted at the last minute.

It is important that candidates explain their interpretation of the source material, show any relevant research and detail the creative rehearsal process.

In general, centre assessors had differentiated between candidates very effectively and again this year rewarded this component accurately.

The most effective responses to the brief had a clearly outlined creative intent and thoroughly and imaginatively interrogated original sources.

There was again considerable evidence of a professional approach and full commitment to the performances and attempts to reflect industry demands and standards. There was also evidence of understanding and appreciation of the creative decisions made at the advanced level. Much of the work displayed the professional refinement that the specification requires with excellent levels of concentration, imagination and accuracy that revealed a thorough understanding of methods and an excellent aptitude to communicate with an audience through a sophisticated language of performance.

In most cases, the work was performed in front of the intended target audience and proved a suitable platform for a range of skills to be demonstrated. In the strongest work, communication between the performers and audience was evident and in the best performances there was clarity of intent where relevance and meaning were conveyed with confidence and accuracy.

The strongest candidates produced consistently skilful performances, demonstrating fully developed performance styles and techniques. Candidates frequently did well in this part of the specification but centre assessors were in a small number of cases inclined to reward effort and enthusiasm rather than awarding marks against the technical ability aspects of the criteria.

The majority of candidates elected to be assessed on performance skills as actors, dancers and musicians but there was the usual range of design and technical support candidates. Presentations by technicians or designers were usually very informative and clarified their contribution to the realisation of the group's work overall.

Summary Section

Based on the performance this series, candidates should:

- Select repertoire, where a unit demands this, that has the demand and substance appropriate for AS or A2 study
- Present work in A4 format without unnecessary decoration
- Fully consider the weightings of the Assessment Objectives for each unit and respond in the type and amount of candidate evidence presented
- Undertake critical analysis and genuine reflection where evaluation is required, and move beyond the description of activities undertaken
- Place all the work within the context of the Performing Arts industry and underpin tasks and activities with professional practice
- Fully consider the externally set commission briefs (unit 3) / production brief (unit 7) for the relevant series
- Present evidence for assessment that has been produced specifically to meet the requirements of the assessment criteria

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

