

Moderator commentary Unit 1

5DR01 Paper 01 Drama Exploration

General Comments

The session is balanced between a whole group/individual task and exploration in small groups. All groups share their work which is helpful. The completion of notes is part of the session and although this supports students in recording ideas while still fresh in their minds, it is worth considering how helpful this is to the moderation process.

Students are not all on camera for the whole session and although the camera angle does change at times, students' group positions do not change; the back-lit effect does also make some students hard to distinguish from one another. It is worth considering a range of techniques which can be used to support the moderation process in terms of both student identification in centres and the filming of the Sample Session; the Chief Examiner's report for 2012 contains examples of good practice reported by moderators for this series.

The Record of Work includes a wide ranging series of stimuli which have no specific connection to each other beyond the idea of change; it is worth considering how supportive to students such an approach might be. The specification requires that students respond to a minimum of two different kinds of stimuli with no upper limit, but all students must complete their exploration over 6 hours.

Specific Moderator commentary

The comments below include timings of specific examples of Paper 01 achievement as evidenced by the sample students. There are references to verbal responses/discussion as part of this bank of evidence as these indicate further the level at which candidates are exploring, but no practical marks have been awarded for these comments, as marks awarded for A01 Exploration must be awarded for practical work only.

Paper 01: Sample Session on the theme of Change. Stimulus: lottery ticket

Candidate F/ 01

- At 8:03 very animated thought-track in response to the lottery ticket
- Very animated/over-excited use of the medium during the numbers draw section at 9:25 onwards, shows depth of character and understanding of concept of change
- Look of disbelief after winning the lottery at 10:15; excellent use of medium
- At 12:00 onwards continues to offer suggestions in whole class situation (by hand up) indicating a confident understanding
- Is in the left hand group from 14:00 and there is evidence from 17:00 that he is leading the group
- Strong evidence of group guidance as opposed to dictatorial leadership- is seen leading small group discussions but is prepared to be led by others when appropriate, EG at 24:40
- At 24:50 onwards his characterisation is central within the improvisation
- In the sharing of work in progress at 40.00, the following was evident:
 - Strong initially in terms of physicality
 - Strong voice in the presentation
 - Excellent level of characterisation in the improvisation/mime section
 - Clear sense of the theme evidenced throughout

Summative Comment

An excellent candidate overall, this student shows a secure understanding of the first task and uses the drama medium consistently at this stage of the exploration. As the session moves into small group exploration, he demonstrates slightly uneven qualities, for example, appearing to take a while to 'get going' on the main task, and adopting a less consistently active role within the group. From 25.00 onwards however there is a clear sense of quality and understanding as well as a more active style of collaboration, incorporating clear commitment and understanding. The work was therefore judged at being a secure Level 2 "Excellent". **29/40**

Candidate G/ 01

- From 3:50 is offering answers with hand up - indicates that she is motivated and committed
- NB Off camera from 6:50 for the entirety of the next exercise; back on screen at 14:30
- Initially listening actively and engaging as part of the whole group, increasingly taking a full role in this group discussion
- At 15:34 offering suggestions to the group; does allow other members of the group to voice their opinions; continues to offer suggestions
- Strong evidence around 19:00 of the use of physicality
- Continues through the next two minutes to be fully engaged and offering suggestions
- At 24:25 evidence of directorial skills and able to use the medium actively and creatively
- At 25:07 seems able to deconstruct the work in order to improve it
- At 30:25 candidate working well as part of the exploration
- In the sharing of work in progress at 40.00, the following was evident:
 - Secure, creative use of drama medium especially voice
 - A strong member of the group, though role is not prominent
 - Subtle understanding of theme evident throughout

Summative Comment

An excellent candidate overall, this student works extremely well within the group task, showing a clear skill as a collaborator/facilitator. Her ideas seem to be central to the group with a real sense of her leadership, however, her explorative use of the drama medium and of the elements of drama is less securely evidenced than her ability to collaborate, resulting in a mark for this session which places her securely in Level 2 “Excellent”. **28/40**

Candidate H/ 01

- At 8:27 offers a thought track, showing understanding but lacking depth of expression (medium) or character (elements).
- Some use of the medium in terms of facial/vocal expression on winning the lottery but without clear sense of purpose or characterisation.
- At 12:00 onwards the candidate appears passive rather than active within the whole group, for example, does not offer a suggestion by hand up.
- Candidate is in far right group from 14:00 and it is clearly allowing other members of her group to lead
- While she appears passive throughout the process and development, there is evidence that she is a willing and engaged collaboration throughout the exploration
- Evidence of secure ‘adequate’ use of medium (physicalisation) at 23:30
- In the group presentation at 57.00 evidence of the following:
 - Engaged and focussed
 - Some characterisation and understanding of task
 - Uses drama medium at a very secure adequate level
 - Some understanding of the theme of ‘Change’ in place

Summative Comment

A student with some uneven qualities, this student is a passive/co-operative rather than an active collaborator. There are moments of good use of the drama medium within both the exploration work in groups and evidenced in the sharing of work in progress but this lacks consistency for a mark at level 3. Overall the mark at the top of level 4 “Adequate” best fits the work completed by this student in the sample session. **16/40**

5DR01 Paper 02 Evaluation

General Comments

The centre has produced a Controlled Assessment booklet in which students can record their notes regarding the six hour exploration. This document supports a clear focus on evaluation and offers students reminders of the need to evaluate their own work and work of others and of the connections between practical tasks with the theme. Like many writing frames, the closed structure of the tasks may not fully encourage the creativity and element of choice for students working securely within the upper levels. It is notable that there is little sense of the whole six hours or of cross-reference between the tasks.

Specific Moderator commentary

Candidate A/ 01

Good initial paragraph setting out the work undertaken by the candidate and their classmates. There are some secure evaluative statements early on in this documentary response. The chosen topic is deconstructed to a good standard although there is lack of connection at times to the practical work undertaken.

There is a good use of subject specific language in this response, including understanding of levels, still images, thought tracking and this understanding supports the evaluation for example:

- Good understanding of physicality and body language in the third paragraph.
- Some understanding of the power of image within the fourth paragraph.
- Good examples of strategies utilized are evident throughout the response.

There are some stronger evaluative statements within paragraph seven. More of a sense of performance is evident here instead of the six hour workshop. The focus on exploration and on the theme of change needs to be more explicit and developed further.

There is a reasonable balance throughout of evaluation of both the candidate's own work and the work of others.

It was noted also that this documentary response is significantly under the maximum word count.

Overall, this is a good response which covers all the criteria for level 3 very securely. **12/20**

Candidate B/ 01

There is evidence of a good use of headings throughout this documentary response. There are some good examples of subject specific language, for example, thought tracking, still image, physical theatre, and this supports the evaluation to some degree.

There are some brief evaluative statements in the opening three paragraphs, although these lack development. This documentary response does tend to stray into the descriptive at times.

There is a clear understanding of the work of others if not fully evaluated and developed. Some good deconstruction in the Seven Ages of Man section is evident.

There is no clear sense of the entire six hour session here; this 'journey' needs to be more explicit. While understanding is evident, for example on the use of physicality and of working in unison, this remains a secure level 3 response. **11/20**

Candidate C/ 01

There is some understanding of status in the opening paragraph. This tends to be more descriptive on the whole. The explanations of what occurred in the six hour workshop are sometimes superficial, rather brief and lacking a clear evaluative focus, although there is a sense of understanding.

There is evidence of subject specific language in evidence, for example, still image, facial expression, proxemics, and these support the evaluation to some degree.

Good understanding of the exploration of the theme in another group's work is evident and discussed with understanding in places, for example, in relation to facial expressions being 'sad and distressing'. The Shakespeare section is quite descriptive.

There is some sense of the six hour workshop in places but this is not explicit. There are some missed opportunities for further deconstruction and evaluation. There is a sense of the candidate demonstrating a tenuous knowledge of the medium and strategies with many of the ideas and thoughts in this documentary response a little under-developed.

This is a piece of work that just meets the criteria for level 3 "Good". **9/20**

Candidate D/ 01

This is a descriptive documentary response overall. There is evidence of some subject specific language used; still images, physical theatre, levels and space, which does support the sense of understanding, and some relevant comments and evaluative statements in place; however, these do tend to be under-developed.

Knowledge and understanding is largely implied rather than communicated clearly, for example, in the evaluation of the work of members in the other group.

There is a secure example showing understanding of the concept of proxemics and some understanding of the dramatic potential of the medium.

The descriptive style to this response allows clear communication of ideas but without any real sense of how these ideas were explored over the six hour workshop.

This response therefore meets all the criteria for level 4 "Adequate" **8/20**

Candidate E/ 01

This is a short documentary response, narrative rather than evaluative in style. There is evidence of some subject specific language; thought tracking, still image and an attempt to use this to support the evaluation.

Some understanding of exploration is evident and there are moments of clarity for example the comment: 'her hand gestures was [sic] waving about showing her anger' and the secure understanding of the use of voice and levels in the eighth paragraph. However most examples remain undeveloped, for example, the thought tracking section and the comment on the work of others: 'they used their space really well', where the candidate does not develop this.

This is a securely adequate documentary response, justifying mark towards the top of level 4 "Adequate". **7/20**

