

Moderator Commentary
School A

5DR02

Documentary Responses and Responses to a Live Performance

The play text being explored here is *Our Country's Good*.. There is strong evidence in the Record of Work that a variety of explorative strategies have been employed as an integral part of the process. It provides opportunities to look at the changes of characters within the play and important moments in the play – this is effective and an example of good practice. There are a variety of elements and mediums used in this Record of Work.

The centre is reminded that although the six-hour practical assessment is implicit in this Record of Work it is good practice to highlight the specific in-task timings for the moderator. Centres are reminded that the evaluation of work can help the documentary responses but no marks can be awarded for evaluation in the six-hour practical assessment.

Student A

Score: DR 6/10

This student's documentary response is largely inconsistent. There are elements that are good but there are some inadequacies in their explanation and development. There is evidence here of a good understanding and application of drama language, for example, 'hot seating', 'still images', 'soundscapes' and 'gesture'.

The importance, and clarity of the criticism, of the students own work and the work of others is crucial for this piece of work. Within this documentary response, the clarity of the deconstruction and development of points is lacking in detail. There are some interesting points raised but they are not fully realized or developed to warrant a higher mark.

The work of others is mentioned but again, under-developed and inconsistent. More specific and concrete examples are required for a higher mark.

This student states that 'I decided that a bright fluorescent green light WOULD have helped the audience', it is important to point out here that the hypothetical is of no consequence. It is the journey and the exploration that is assessed in this unit, not the final outcome or performance.

Score: RLP 14/20

Within this student's response to a live performance, the first paragraph is entirely irrelevant. Centres are reminded that student should be advised to **to make sure all work within the word limit is appropriate.**

There are some inconsistencies here too. It is important that students comment upon the production seen, not about the play text. In this example the third paragraph is commenting upon the play text and not directly the production. Therefore it is irrelevant and cannot be marked against the criteria for this section of 5DR02.

Contrary to these inconsistencies, the quality of written communication is expressive and, at times, very good.. The language used is sometimes very expressive, for example, 'the sun-yellow glow that flooded the stage'.

The understanding of choral speaking and shared lines shows a potentially sophisticated response. Although in this case it is let down by the inconsistencies and under-developed points.

There is clear understanding in relation to the transitions between scenes in this production. There is a strong sense of understanding of the separate elements of a production within this response too. The student clearly understands the roles of the director, costume designer and actors. Many of the elements that we

would expect to be mentioned in a student's response to a live performance are mentioned here. There is a clear understanding and appreciation of the performance elements within this response. The role of the director within a professional production is also understood and highlighted within this piece of work.

Student B

Score: DR 6/10

From the opening paragraph, you can tell that this student is aware of the different drama mediums by their use of 'I used mime to portrait a convict'. This shows a good use of drama language and an understanding of the drama medium. This knowledge and usage of drama specific language continues throughout this piece of work including 'body language', 'movement', 'thought tracking' and 'soundscape'.. The play *Our Country's Good* is at the centre of this response throughout and this cites this piece of work within the good level. There are some limitations to this response - sometimes some points are under-developed for a higher mark, namely in the final paragraph, 'it also helped me to show how the aborigines reacted to the arrival of the British'. This point is not developed further.

This piece of work does not achieve a higher mark mainly because of the lack of detail when evaluating the work of others. The majority of this documentary response is centred around the students own work. It is vitally important that students evaluate, not only their own work, but the work of others, in order to access the higher marks.

Score: RLP 13/20

The opening paragraph to this response to a live performance is irrelevant. The quality of written communication is uneven and inconsistent. There is fluidity to their writing with some mistakes, both grammatical and spelling. There is a clear sense here though that this student has understood the performance and can deconstruct the separate elements in order to fully evaluate it.

There is clarity to their deconstruction at times, for example, 'the medium of sound helped to create an even more realistic atmospher' and 'as well he shows anxiousness through facial expressions'.

There is strong evidence of how drama elements come together in performance and a sense of synergy. This student has systematically gone through the different drama elements and mediums in order to successfully deconstruct the performance. Evidence of an understanding of how contrast in performance was used is also present within the response.

At times the response is very good, at times excellent. Overall it just nudges in to the excellent level due to the consistency of written communication despite the occasional under-developed point.

Student C

Score: DR 5/10

This documentary response is more descriptive than that of Student B. They tend toward the descriptive instead of fully analysing their own work and the work of others. Throughout this documentary response there are some good insights into the six-hour practical assessment.

Some of the self-evaluation is good, 'I said this in a quiet voice because the convicts have no energy to talk'. There is a good example of evaluating the work of others in paragraph three, 'I thought that Olivia showed the presence of an officer very well by using good strategies of still image, her facial expressions really showed that too'. In order for this comment to achieve a higher mark it needs to fully deconstruct the work of Olivia.

This documentary response cannot achieve a higher mark because of the lack of detail when evaluating the work and the under-developed points of reference, which on occasion lack clarity.

Score: RLP 8/20

The quality of written communication within this response to a live performance is lacking in accuracy and fluidity. There are some significant errors throughout, notably in the second paragraph, 'the lights were used in different ways some to set a scared scene when the convicts where on stage also powerful strong lighting when officers came on the sound effects where live mostly improvisation by wind noises and waves crashing'.

This response to a live performance is largely descriptive with little full evaluation. When there is some evaluation it falls short of fully deconstructing the elements in performance; as if it is missing a beat. The student mentions that they are going to focus on the character of Mary, when the purpose of this written response is to evaluate the performance as a whole.

There is little by way of contextualisation throughout this response; many of the points and comments are left hanging in the response without justification. The student mentions the 'stage was well spaced' which is a perfect example of not developing a point fully.. Further justification and development of the point would have assisted this response.

Student D

Score: 4/10

The opening of this documentary response is very general and lacking in detail. For example in the second paragraph the student states that 'this resulted in a series of monologues, still images, role play, and narrations which was all relevant to a greater understanding of the play'; this shows an understanding of the drama elements and mediums but does not accurately begin to deconstruct or evaluate them.

Throughout this response the comments lacks development and justification. There is evidence here of some exploration during the six-hour assessment but little with direct reference to the student's personal journey. The diagrams lack clarity and detail; they are more doodles than justified diagrams of evaluation. That being said, there are some moments in the response which can justify a mark within the adequate level.

Score: RLP 6/20

The quality of written communication throughout this response to a live performance is adequate with limited elements; for example, 'another scene I found really affective was when Ralph Clark was wrighting in his jurnal'. There are several inaccuracies and only an adequate application of written communication is evident.

The first three paragraphs in this response are irrelevant. It is important to ensure that students comment directly about the performance and not about the play.

This response is largely descriptive with limited analysis. The majority of the points raised and discussed by the student are under-developed and merely stated rather than deconstructed.

It should also be noted here that the final page or pages of this response are missing and that the commentaries and marks are based on the materials we can see.