



Internal Assessment Report 2010: Drama and Theatre Arts (16)

The purpose of this report is to provide feedback to centres on verification in National Qualifications in this subject.

National Qualifications (NQ) Units

Titles/levels of NQ Units verified

D193 10: Drama Skills
D193 11: Drama Skills
D196 12: Investigative Drama
D199 13: Devised Drama
F5KY 12: Drama: Acting Skills

General comments

In the majority of cases, assessment evidence was clearly presented. Centres demonstrated a clear understanding of national standards.

Centres had pitched their assessments and judgements at the appropriate levels. Teaching staff were using the correct documentation and they appeared familiar with Unit specifications, NABs and exemplification materials.

In a minority of cases, marking schemes which are included in the NABs were not being implemented accurately.

Also, in a few cases, there was no indication of how marks had been awarded.

In the new Unit *Drama: Acting Skills* some of the candidate evidence presented was different from that contained in the Unit specification and assessment support pack (ASP).

In the majority of centres, Assessors were very familiar with the Unit specifications, instruments of assessment and exemplification materials.

Summative observational checklists, journals and logs of ongoing evaluation were being used effectively.

In most cases, the marking schemes published in the appropriate NABs were being applied correctly.

The only area where understanding of Evidence Requirements was not totally clear was in the new Unit *Drama: Acting Skills*.

In one centre visited, three of the candidates presented monologues for one of the two acting pieces although the Unit specification states that monologues should not be used.

In the other centre visited for this Unit, the second acting piece was from the previous Higher exam. While this was different from the first acting piece, it also came from a published text. The Unit specification states that it should be from a devised piece or observation.

The majority of centres were pitching their assessments and judgements at appropriate levels.

All centres used the marking schemes and assessment advice contained in either the NABs or ASPs.

Some centres had devised their own detailed observation checklists for practical activities.

In both the centres which offered *Drama: Acting Skills*, the visits were arranged at times when candidates' practical work could be observed. This allowed discussion with teachers regarding interpretation of national standards, which the staff found extremely helpful as this was a new Unit and new ASP. This also provided an opportunity for discussion with the candidates themselves.

The majority of centres had clearly laid out IV procedures, which in small departments often involved cross marking as well as sampling. In single teacher departments, procedures for IV were less clear.

Areas of good practice

In the majority of centres, good practice was observed. This included good written feedback to candidates on their written work, especially evaluations, detailed marking schemes, and good advice to candidates in their logs and acting journals.

In one centre, a detailed Investigative Drama evaluation pro forma was used by each candidate. This clearly outlined the required content for each section, and helped the candidates structure their responses. The marks allocated for each of the separate sections were also included and clearly indicated on the scripts.

In a few cases, good quality student handouts explaining the purpose and assessment procedures of the Unit, with learning outcomes clearly explained, were used.

In both centres where visiting verification took place, good practice was observed in terms of peer assessment and evaluation. Assessors gave excellent oral feedback to candidates on their practical work, with clear helpful advice on how to improve their acting skills.

Areas for improvement

Centres should clearly indicate how marking schemes have been used. For example, in one centre, candidate scripts appeared to have been marked and then the marks erased. This made it impossible to verify how the marking scheme had been applied.

Centres should ensure that all required evidence is submitted for verification.