

5DR01 Drama Exploration

This unit requires students to practically explore a theme, topic or issue (A01/Paper 01) and then to evaluate this process of exploration in a 2,000 word Documentary Response (A03/Paper 02).

Detailed information about the delivery and administration of this unit can be found in the **2DR01 GCSE Drama Specification 2012 document** and the **Administrative Support Guide (ASG)**. There is also useful information on the Controlled Assessment aspects of the unit in the **Controlled Assessment Teacher Support Book for GCSE Drama (TSB)** and on the features of student performance within this unit in the 2014 series in the Report of the Principal Moderator.

All documents are available to download free at

<http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/qualifications/edexcel-gcses/drama-2009.html>

The Record of Work:

While this document is not moderated, it remains a vital piece of evidence to support the moderation process. There is specific guidance on the ROW updated for 2015 in the ASG.

In this case, the centre has chosen to explore the theme of Persecution. The ROW is in a grid/chart format, with columns linking to the requirements and rows linking to each session. This concise and helpful format allows clear identification of the unit requirements by the moderator. Although there are no specific timings included, the length of the sample session (approximately 1 hour prior to the process of editing for standardisation) confirms that 6 hours of exploration has been delivered. The confirmation of timings and annotation (ticks) would have helped to confirm to the moderator that all planned activities had been completed in 6 hours, as per unit requirements.

ROW meets requirements for the unit:

- *Evidence of the use of at least four strategies – still images, thought-tracking, marking the moment, role play*
- *A range of Drama mediums including movement and space, though voice is used in the majority of sessions and one session allows students a free choice of mediums*
- *Key elements: characterisation, contrast and rhythm/pace/tempo*
- *Range of stimuli material of different types: Anne Frank extract, Rules for Jewish people, Images and a letter. More than basic requirements – allows for both depth and breadth.*

Other comments:

While from this document, exploration appears to be well-structured and challenging, the theme title could perhaps have been narrowed slightly as the 6 hour exploration appears to focus on the persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany rather than on the theme of Persecution in more general terms.

Paper 01 Sample Session

Moderation of the 6 hour exploration is based on a sample session, submitted on DVD. There is detailed guidance on the Sample Session and the DVD in the ASG document. Good practice seen in the 2014 series as regards student identification and filming can be found in the Principal Moderator's Report for the unit.

DVD Overview

A clear introductory line-up has been produced by the centre although muted to meet the requirements of data protection.

There is excellent practice in terms of identification here:

- *Students each wear a t-shirt clearly labelled with name and candidate number (obscured in standardisation for data protection purposes).*
- *Student groups are rotated frequently allowing each group a slot in front of the camera while working in groups.*
- *Exploration work of all students is shared allowing moderators to both see and hear the work of individual students.*
- *Further the teacher-assessor uses student names throughout the recorded session, reinforcing identification of sample students for the moderator.*

The Sample Session is hour 6 from the ROW although the standardisation recording begins from the second activity. Students work in pairs on a hot-seating tasks involving each student adopting more than one role and developing their understanding of the post-liberation world of survivors. They then share their work with the class. This is followed by group exploration using the form of an abstract dream sequence exploring the viewpoint of the German soldiers

Throughout the session, exploration is well-paced, with students sharing as 'work in progress' two specific outcomes; each task demonstrates the potential for exploration in depth and shows a clear grasp of the theme. However, the flow of the students' exploration is often interrupted by questioning from the teacher-assessor. It is worth remembering that **all marks for this part of the unit are awarded for practical drama exploration**. Students' verbal responses therefore carry no marks within the session but will support students in completing their documentary responses and also may support judgements of the teacher-assessor and moderator. It is also worth noting that while the teacher does use some performance vocabulary ("rehearsing" for example), clearly the work is explorative.

**for standardisation purposes, some of the sharing was edited out as was the first activity in the session.*

Candidate A

Long blond hair. The first candidate in the identification line up.

Works in a pair with candidate B in task 1 and in a group including candidate E in task 2. "Jenny"

Centre Mark	34
Moderated Mark	34

This student is straight to work in her pair, showing strong commitment and plenty of ideas. There is evidence of an outstanding understanding of drama through her creative responses. She is fully collaborative both within the pair and the group work which follows. There is a high level of understanding demonstrated here especially given the fast-paced nature of the work and the changes in exercises.

Hot-seating pair task - This shows a strong sense of characterisation, with an outstanding level of focus and commitment, and a considered and thoughtful response, particularly in terms of the character switch.

Abstract dream group work – Outstanding creativity in evidence here. There is strong evidence that she is leading the group. She considers the use of music to enhance the drama, her use of the medium is precise and shows well-considered movement. She also listens and responds well.

When the work is shared, she demonstrates some interesting and creative ideas e.g. the doll-like movement and the use of synchronisation. A strong response clearly but a little under-developed at this stage in terms of development and understanding of the stimuli/theme.

This student is an "Outstanding" candidate and the DVD evidence for this session confirms the teacher-assessor's mark of 34:

- *Assured use of strategies with some extremely creative ideas.*
- *Collaboration shows leadership, commitment and imagination.*
- *Meets all criteria for Level 1 - just - but a slight lack of depth/development prevents reaching her from achieving higher up in Outstanding.*

Candidate B

**Appears 14th in the identification line up. Penultimate candidate.
Scraped back brown hair, short in height.
Works in a pair with Candidate A in task 1.**

Centre Mark	32
Moderated Mark	32

Hot-seating pair task - Seated at the back on the right working with Candidate A. Can both be heard really engaging with the development of their pair work: interviewing a survivor from the Holocaust. She engages energetically in this task responding quickly to teacher instructions throughout.

When sharing, she shows energy and commitment to the two roles created. She uses the medium of voice with assurance to show two different characters, though perhaps roles are a little superficial in content. Creative approach to the transition – shows imagination.

Abstract dream group work – She works with the group on far right hand side and when they move in front of camera can be seen leading ideas, offering suggestions on dialogue and positioning and listening to others. She explains ideas to camera – and while this does not gain her any marks, her use of the language of drama is strong supporting the judgement that she is working at a high level understanding. She is focussed and committed whenever she is seen on camera.

Creative ideas demonstrated when the work is shared, for example the use of voice to hum the lullaby and support mother’s role, the use of positioning/proxemics, use of synchronisation and canon – clearly a leading and creative student in this group.

The evidence on the DVD confirms that in this session, her mark of 32 at the top of Level 2 “Excellent” is accurate:

- *Assured use of strategies.*
- *Committed collaborator - clearly has an impact on other students’ work.*
- *Meets all criteria for Level 2 indicating top of the level.*
- *Edging towards the next level but lack of depth/development required for a mark in Level 1 Outstanding.*

Candidate C

**Tall boy with hair swept to side.
10th in line up. Tie is visible above T-shirt collar.**

Centre Mark	27
Moderated Mark	27

This candidate’s sense of commitment is clear throughout. He works consistently and with some assurance showing understanding and imagination.

Hot-seating pair task - He immediately adopts his role in the pair work and can be seen offering ideas throughout this first task. He is fully involved and both initiates and listens to the ideas of his partner, showing high level collaboration. His understanding is evidenced particularly by his physicality in role as the concentration camp survivor and by his use of voice.

When sharing, his level of understanding and use of mediums/elements appears consistent with the paired exploration.

Abstract dream group work – This level of working remains consistent in the exploration of the next task and can be seen when his group works in front of the camera. His comment on symbolism reflects a mature level of understanding, supporting the level of understanding evidenced by his practical work. He appears less strong on collaboration, with another student operating as leader, ably supported by this candidate. However there is excellent use of the medium when the work is shared, for example his fall to the ground when ‘killed’ and therefore we have enough consistency and depth of understanding to justify this mark.

A secure “Excellent” mark of 27 accurately reflects his achievement:

- *Assured use of drama strategies.*
- *Secure creative and collaborative involvement with some effect on other students’ work.*
- *Meets criteria for Level 2 securely but not fully.*
- *Lacks the level of creativity and collaborative impact required for the top of the level.*

Candidate D

**Female candidate. Tie is visible above T-shirt collar.
Dark hair with fringe – 4th in line –up.**

Centre Mark	24
Moderated Mark	20

She is an example of a candidate who feels very uncomfortable when directly in front of the camera but works better when she thinks she is not being seen. The teacher-assessor may have 'seen' more in the live session however all evidence for this paper is based on the recording. While it is not required for centres to view the recording, clearly this would be good practice.

Hot-seating pair task – She begins at the far left of the screen. Stays still, plays with her hair whilst partner gets chairs. Slightly obscured during this part of the exploration and when teacher asks for responses, she does not put her hand up. No marks for verbal responses but this is an indicator perhaps of confidence/understanding.

When sharing, she appropriately uses the strategy of hot-seating, making good choices of words/dialogue but her use of vocal medium is less consistent and imaginative. While this is not a performance unit, marks are awarded for using the strategies and mediums to show understanding.

Abstract dream group work - Group work is done on rotation but her group spends the majority of time far right. There is a lot of time where she is not seen on camera and therefore the moderator must assume that work off-camera is consistent with what is seen on camera in the remainder of the session. Mid-way through the session, she and her group can be seen far right exploring synchronised movement and offering an idea. She is co-operative and appears positive but tending towards the passive. In role she is seen appropriately exploring as child. When directly questioned by teacher, she responds well which indicates that she does have a "good" if "irregular" understanding of the theme.

When sharing the abstract dream it is clear that she uses the medium with some understanding, for example, the pace of her 'digging' in the concentration camp flashback.

This candidate is a secure rather than a strong Level 3 "Good" student:

- *Inconsistent use of strategies and mediums.*
- *Irregular collaboration tending towards a lack of contribution at times.*
- *Good understanding of theme demonstrated at times but uneven overall.*
- *Meets criteria for Level 3 but lacks the security in collaboration particularly to justify a mark at the top of the level.*

Candidate E

**Dark haired boy. 6th in line up.
Works in a group including Candidate E in Task 2.**

Centre Mark	17
Moderated Mark	15

A solid adequate candidate who mostly maintains focus but is often rather passive and cautious. Clearly he lacked confidence and fluency in front of the camera, but these improved when he was preparing in the background when he could be seen and heard adding ideas and showing some collaborative involvement especially in task 1.

Hot-seating pair task – Overall he cooperates with his three for task 1 and appears focussed if passive during the exploration section. When sharing it is clear that he is able to attempt two roles. His group shares first for this task and his choice of words/dialogue in the sharing shows understanding with there is an attempt at using the mediums of voice and gesture here. However, overall his work appears rather undeveloped and uneven.

Abstract dream group work - The camera appears to make him a little self-conscious as does the teacher questioning. Remember that while verbal contributions/teacher prompts can be a useful tool, marks for this paper must only be awarded based on practical drama exploration.

He tends to be rather passive within this group, indicating a lack of real commitment. When sharing work in progress, he displayed some understanding of the task and was able to use elements and medium with some effect although he struggled with using the very physical and expressive chosen form and style.

This candidate is at the top of Level 4 “Adequate” rather than at the lower achieving end of Level 3 “Good” in this session:

- *Inconsistent use of strategies and mediums.*
- *Irregular collaboration, passive with a lack of clear contribution.*
- *Lacks security in collaboration and commitment/focus.*
- *Uneven understanding of theme.*
- *Lacks security of understanding/use of mediums and elements to justify a mark in Level 3.*

Paper 02 Documentary Response

Moderation of the documentary response is based on a sample from the work of the whole cohort at the centre, with each selected student's response submitted on paper. There is detailed guidance on the sampling process and on the submission of the documentary response in the **ASG** document. Good practice seen in the 2014 series can be found in the Principal Moderator's Report for the unit and there is helpful information as regards the administration and delivery of the Controlled Assessment aspect of the unit in the **GCSE Drama TSB**.

Key aspects of assessment for this paper:

The criteria asks for an evaluation of the student's understanding of the explored theme, topic or issue but this understanding must be connected to the drama exploration. Factual content unconnected to the drama exploration carries no marks.

Evaluation must focus on the student's own use of the drama strategies, mediums and elements of drama and on the work of others. Speculative evaluation, focussing on work not actually completed in the 6 hour exploration, carries no marks. General evaluation is less supportive than very specific examples. Responses marked in Level 1 and at the top of Level 2 will typically demonstrate a balance between examples of their own work and the work of others.

There is no requirement for students to write about all the sessions/activities completed in their response. Where students focus in too much depth on one or two sessions, their response is likely to lack depth. Equally where all sessions/activities are covered, evaluation will probably lack depth.

Responses marked in Level 1 and at the top of Level 2 will typically demonstrate both depth and breadth of understanding.

Candidate F

Centre Mark	19
Moderated Mark	17

This is an articulate and well-written response, showing a clear understanding of the theme, and of the journey undertaken, making effective evaluative judgements throughout. While occasionally focussing on stimuli without connection to the exploration, outcomes and on the effects for an audience, overall the response demonstrates both depth and some breadth and is - just - an Outstanding piece of evaluation for a student at this level.

In the introduction and in paragraph 2, page 10, for example the student compares the stimulus photographs and reflects on the effect of these images rather than focussing on understanding gained from using these stimuli. However, paragraph 1 on the same page demonstrates a strong level of analysis and developed understanding, albeit with a slight sense of audience as a focus of intentions.

Similarly the example on paragraph 5, page 9 ('canon task') shows a highly perceptive appreciation of the collaborative involvement required, although again, the focus is on the audience. Equally page 10, paragraphs 2-4 show a considered and detailed evaluation of the work of others, supported by precisely analysed examples.

Candidate F analyses and evaluates the use of the medium of Drama more frequently than the use of drama strategies although there is evaluation of 'marking the moment' on page 11. The final paragraph concludes by summarising issues to do with the theme and the student's views of the theme without a clear connection to the drama that affected these changes.

There is some outstanding analysis in place, with a very clear grasp of impact and relationship with drama elements such as tension and anti-climax (see p.10). There is a consistent reflection on and evaluation of the contribution of students.

The response demonstrates a mark of 17 at the lower end of Level 1 "Outstanding" rather than at the top of the level:

- Clear sense of explorative journey and of learning achieved.
- *Balance of evaluation of own work/work of others.*
- *Evaluation supported by precise examples.*
- *Grasp of theme effectively demonstrated.*
- *Some inappropriate focus on impact on audience.*
- *Some analysis of stimuli/theme lacking clear connections to the drama exploration.*

Candidate G

Centre Mark	16
Moderated Mark	13

This response is structured episodically, considering each workshop in turn rather than the evaluating the 6 hour exploration as a whole. There are clear moments in which the student is able to demonstrate both understanding and evaluation to fall within the “Excellent” level – level 2 but these lack the development, detail and coherence to justify a higher mark within that level.

There is evidence of a tendency to describe an exercise or task and then to move onto evaluation, although that evaluation is not always completed in depth or fully-justified. Clear examples of this can be seen in the analysis of the still images produced for workshop 1 (pages 13-14) and in the concluding section of Workshop 1, paragraph beginning “*This enhanced my understanding of the theme of community...*” Clearly the candidate is making sound evaluative judgements here but has also slightly missed the focus of the unit on the chosen theme of Persecution.

Drama language is used thoughtfully and with understanding for example in the third paragraph for Workshop 2: “*We used the drama medium.....*” The use of the concept of mirroring shows secure excellent understanding which has not been fully developed. The “episodic” structure gives a slightly “disconnected” or “separated” feel to the experience of the student in each of the workshops, which in turn does not help to communicate the through-line of understanding or evaluation. There is a sense of “telling the story” of each of the practical workshops, rather than of a secure evaluation of what was achieved and learned.

This candidate often tends to focus on the outcomes for an audience, rather than an evaluation of the experience of the individual, which again indicates a lack of consistent excellence to the response. For example the final section of Workshop 2: The paragraph beginning “*I used the drama mediums of body language and facial expression.....*” focusses on the external experience for the audience rather than the internal experience for the student. The final paragraph attempts to sum up the learning in this workshop without clear connection to the drama exploration undertaken. A similar approach is taken in both Workshops 3 and 4, with a very real feeling that the student ‘ran out of words’ in Workshop 5. There is no conclusion to the piece.

The response demonstrates a mark of 13 at the lower end of Level 2 “Excellent” rather than at the top of the level:

- *Understanding of use of drama strategies in place.*
- *Sense of process/exploration demonstrated.*
- *Evaluation supported by examples of own work/work of others.*
- *Grasp of theme demonstrated periodically.*
- *Lack of connections made between each session/understanding of theme.*
- *Some inappropriate focus on impact on audience.*

Candidate H

Centre Mark	9
Moderated Mark	7

This response shows evaluation of all six sessions which necessarily spreads the depth of evaluation out; despite this, the full word count has not been maximised. This response makes use of a rather descriptive style, using some clear narrative examples from the practical work, followed by basic evaluation. There is quite a simple use of language throughout but often a sense of personal response. For example, in the examples on "Family Life" the bulk of the words here describe the still images created in fairly simple terms. There is some evaluation, such as "with their body language spread out to show it was a massacre" - however this is fairly simplistic.

Similarly, the comment on "Life as we know it" suggests a very personal level of evaluation: "I really liked in our two scenes the space and levels we used because we started with the parents sitting..." Further evaluation is often focused on performance rather than the process of exploration and often a consideration of what the candidate could "do better if" in performance terms, for example, towards the bottom of page 17: "If I could improve on thing about our performance was if I used voice more confidently and shouted louder to show my anger more clearly." Clearly marks are awarded for this paper for students making links between the drama exploration process and the theme explored.

A further tendency is to offer factual information about the theme un-connected to the exploration, for example the final section of "Life as we know it" where the student reflects on the injustice of the rules for living but does not link back to the drama exploration.

By the end of the piece the evaluation tails off and the students appear to lose sight of the overall theme of persecution with a tendency to evaluate the effectiveness of the "performances". There is some reference to the work of others but evaluation where it occurs is very general and lacks specific supporting examples.

The response demonstrates a mark of 7 at the upper end of Level 4 "Adequate" rather than at the lower end of Level 3 "Good":

- *Some understanding of use of drama strategies.*
- *Evaluation supported by general examples/examples of own work.*
- *No real focus on collaborative involvement/process.*
- *Some connections made to theme.*
- *Lack of clear connections between each session/understanding of theme.*
- *Some factual content unconnected to drama exploration.*
- *Some inappropriate focus on performance.*