

## Moderator Commentary

School A  
5DR01

The Record of Work supplied by the centre is detailed and highlights the work undertaken by the students. There is a good variety of activities highlighting the explorative strategies used during the six-hour practical assessment. This Record of Work gives the students opportunities to explore the selected theme. The inclusion of individual task timings is good practice.

Centres are reminded that the evaluation of work within the six-hour practical assessment does not carry any marks but can assist in the creation of the documentary responses.

It is noted that the centre mentions social, cultural and historical elements within the Record of Work but this is not a requirement of the specification.

Student A  
Score: 16/20

This student has a fluid writing style throughout this documentary response. There is evidence of a very good use of drama language, namely 'role play', 'flashbacks', 'narration', 'voice'.

Within the first paragraph there is evidence of a strong analytical response, 'I used hopeful, persuasive tones to bargain with the shop keepers', which further develops throughout the response. Later within paragraph two, this student states that '[I] could've used a bit more movement and voice to show my distressed and alarmed state better'. This is a good example of student A analysing their own work and expressing how they might improve their development in the future. There is a clear sense of reflection on the theme and the work undertaken by the student at this centre.

This student deconstructs the work of others within their group well, 'which really showed me how their thoughts were constantly with their lost ones' (paragraph ten) although some comments are not fully developed, 'I thought that our group could've thought more about the meaning of the song'. There are no examples of the sophisticated level of deconstruction, which would warrant a mark in the higher level.

There is a good balance between the evaluation of their own work and the work of others within this documentary response.

Although this student comments well upon the activities within the six-hour practical assessment, they fail to fully develop their points. For example, they state that they 'could have used more movement and voice', but fail to elucidate further. For marks in the higher level, this student needed to be more specific in their analytical responses to the work undertaken and more detailed in their development of strategies.

Student B  
Score: 15/20

Although this student's writing style is not as fluid as Student A's, there is a certain fluidity and maturity to the writing. This piece of work tends toward the descriptive at times rather than toward the analytical. There is a good and strong knowledge of drama language that is used wholly appropriately. This student mentions 'symbolic ideas', 'facial expressions' and 'still image' in appropriate contexts.

The opening paragraphs of this piece of work are descriptive – the emphasis here is more on 'what we did' rather than the 'why we did it'. There is a brief sense of the whole six-hour practical exploration but not reflectively. There is not sufficient reflection of the theme as a whole and no real overview.

There is a sense of the evaluation of the student's own work and the work of others, but this only occurs toward the latter half of the documentary response. In order to achieve a mark in the higher band, this student needed to strike a better balance between their evaluations of their own work and the work of others. Their discussion points sometimes fall short, for example, 'this whole scene was completely different to everything we had done before' (paragraph three) does not explain in detail the specifics.

On the back page of this documentary response there is a diagram. This is a diagram that shows an understanding of drama mediums and elements, although it is quite simple. It is important that if students include diagrams that they are fully justified and are linked to the body of the documentary response and not left merely hanging. These diagrams can be deconstructed as too simplistic.

Although this piece of work is excellent and securely within the excellent level, it does seem to miss a beat when deconstructing and evaluating the points of the six-hour practical assessment. This final attention to detail would have assisted in securing a higher mark.

Student C  
Score: 10/20

This documentary response is largely descriptive. There is a strong focus of this piece of work on the 'what we did' instead of 'why we did it'; this secures it within the good level.

This student tends to describe rather than fully analyse the information. For example, the student states that 'we also incorporated facial expressions into the piece as it helped emphasise the emotions our characters felt to the audience' and whilst this is primarily analytical it does not fully deconstruct why or how the facial expressions were used.

This documentary response is inconsistent. There are times when the student does deconstruct something and other times when points are under-developed. Some sections of this documentary response are very good but others are good and close to adequate. This inconsistency negates a higher mark.

There is a diary entry sense to the whole piece of work. The student has looked at the six-hour practical assessment by highlighting activities lesson-by-lesson instead of looking and analysing the overarching themes of the exploration.

The sense of this piece of work tends toward the 'I did this' rather than exploration and explanation of why.

In light of these elements, there is no understanding of the wider world here; some points are myopic. In order to achieve a higher mark there needed to be a greater sense of an understanding of the bigger picture within the six-hour practical assessment.

More positive moments in this piece of work include, 'I learnt how dance can be interpreted by others and that special awareness can play a large part in understanding a performance' (although 'special' should be 'spatial') and 'this helped me to feel empathy towards these politically restrained people who were living there everyday lives in fear' (this shows real insight into the theme of the practical assessment). Unfortunately these more positive moments are too inconsistent throughout this piece of work to fully warrant a higher mark.

Student D  
Score: 7/20

This documentary response is highly descriptive. It is led by the student's description and rarely gives way to include any formal deconstruction or analysis. It is noted here that this student has self-penalised by submitting a documentary response of only 1400 words.

There is a sense of journey within the six-hour practical assessment for this student but all of the points are under-developed, with some sentences left incomplete.

This student does use appropriate drama language in this piece of work, but they are basic words and infrequently used.

Student D does highlight how they may have improved their characterisation (although there is a strong performance focus here which is not examined under this unit), they state that 'this would have made my character stand out more whilst roleplaying'. Although this statement is accurate it is under-developed. There is no sense of how or why this development would take place and to what end.

The evaluative comments within this piece of work are under-developed. They are missing the final piece of information that would have moved them higher on the mark scheme.

This documentary response is within the adequate level.