

AS Drama and Theatre notes and guidance: NEA 2021

As a result of the changes to specifications for 2021, we've produced this notes and guidance document to help you to understand how the marking criteria will be different this year.

All changes to mark schemes **appear in red** and content that has been removed has been ~~struck through~~. Further guidance is provided in the footnotes.

The Appendices contain further information regarding alternative evidence and the scaling up of marks on the Performance of Extract 2.

Component 2 – Marking the Performance of Extract 2 (section 4.5.1 of the specification)

| Mark | Level of theatrical skill ¹ | Appropriateness of interpretation to play as a whole | Sensitivity of interpretation to context | Consistency of interpretation with dramatic intentions and methods of the chosen practitioner ² | Contribution to the effectiveness of the piece | Success in realising/explaining individual artistic intention ³ |
|------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 5 | Exceptional level of skill, demonstrating faultless execution. | Exceptionally appropriate interpretation which is entirely appropriate to the playwright's intentions. | Exceptionally sensitive to the context of the play, in an interpretation which achieves total clarity of dramatic intention. | Exceptionally consistent interpretation, emulating the practitioner's approach in every aspect. | Exceptionally effective piece. | Exceptional success in realising/explaining individual artistic intention in a completely sustained way, engaging the audience fully throughout the performance. |

¹ Regarding the 'Level of theatrical skill' column of the mark scheme, students and teachers are directed to Appendix A, which details the full list of alternative evidence that should be used in the place of a live performance to demonstrate students' theatrical skills.

² We have removed the 'Consistency of interpretation with dramatic intentions and methods of the chosen practitioner' column from the mark scheme. Students will still need to apply a practitioner to the performance as this will still be assessed in the Portfolio. However, due to the possibility of much shorter performance lengths than usual and the potential difficulty of evidencing some practitioner's dramatic intentions and methods in very short performances, this will not be assessed in performance in 2021. Teachers will, therefore, mark the Performance of Extract 2 element out of 25 and, using the scaling grid in Appendix B, convert this mark into a mark out of 30.

³ Regarding the 'Success in realising individual artistic intention' column of the mark scheme, students and teachers are directed to Appendix A, which details the full list of alternative evidence that should be used in the place of a live performance to demonstrate students' artistic intentions.

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| 4 | Excellent level of skill, demonstrating near perfect execution. | Highly appropriate interpretation which is almost always appropriate to the playwright's intentions. | Very sensitive interpretation to the context of the play which demonstrates an excellent degree of clarity of dramatic intention. | A unified and consistent interpretation which clearly reflects many aspects of the practitioner's approach. | Excellent level of effectiveness. | Highly successful in realising/ explaining individual artistic intention in a well-sustained way, engaging the audience throughout the performance. |
| 3 | Good level of skill, demonstrating competent execution. | An appropriate interpretation, which is generally appropriate to the playwright's intentions. | A thoughtful interpretation of the context of the play which demonstrates some clear dramatic intentions. | A generally consistent interpretation which reflects some aspects of the practitioner's approach. | Good level of effectiveness. | Largely successful in realising/ explaining individual artistic intention in a mostly focused way, engaging the audience for most of the performance. |
| 2 | Reasonable level of skill, demonstrating mainly secure execution. | A reasonable interpretation which is occasionally appropriate to the playwright's intentions. | Some awareness of the context of the play which demonstrates under-developed dramatic intentions. | An inconsistent interpretation which reflects a few aspects of the practitioner's approach. | Reasonably effective piece. | A degree of success in realising/ explaining individual artistic intention, engaging the audience at a number of points during the performance. |
| 1 | Limited level of skill, demonstrating insecure execution. | A limited interpretation which is rarely appropriate to the playwright's intentions. | Limited awareness of the context of the play which demonstrates imprecise dramatic intentions. | An incoherent interpretation which reflects few or no aspects of the practitioner's approach. | Limited effectiveness. | Limited realisation/ explanation of individual artistic intention, rarely engaging the audience. |
| 0 | Nothing worthy of credit. | Nothing worthy of credit. | Nothing worthy of credit. | Nothing worthy of credit. | Nothing worthy of credit. | Nothing worthy of credit. |

Component 2 - Portfolio - Marking Section 1 (section 4.5.1 of the specification)

| Band | Mark | Description |
|------|-------|--|
| 4 | 16-20 | <p>Excellent response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanations given in Portfolio evidence excellent skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning in the extract(s) studied • evidence of a sophisticated response to the material • evidence of full development and refinement of skills and the piece • precise details are provided throughout • structure and reasoning is logical and systematic • responses make insightful connections between dramatic theory and practice. |
| 3 | 11-15 | <p>Good response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanations given in Portfolio evidence good skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning in the extract(s) studied • evidence of a sensitive response to the material • evidence of a good degree of development and refinement of skills and the piece • a number of precise details are provided • structure and reasoning is clear and consistent • responses make thoughtful connections between dramatic theory and practice. |
| 2 | 6-10 | <p>Reasonable response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanations given in Portfolio evidence reasonable skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning in the extract(s) studied • evidence of purposeful engagement with the material • evidence of some concerted development and refinement of skills and the piece • only some details are given and/or details may lack precision • structure and reasoning is present but not always clear • responses make some useful connections between dramatic theory and practice. |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | 1-5 | <p>Limited response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanations given in Portfolio evidence limited skills in creating and developing ideas to communicate meaning in the extract(s) studied • evidence of unimaginative engagement with the material • evidence of little development and refinement of skills and the piece • details are rarely given and/or, where details are given, are imprecise • there is little or no structure or reasoning present • responses make undeveloped or no connections between dramatic theory and practice. |
| 0 | 0 | Nothing worthy of credit. |

Component 2 – Portfolio – Marking Section 2 (section 4.5.1 of the specification)

| Band | Mark | Description |
|------|------|--|
| 5 | 9-10 | Well-developed and insightful analysis and evaluation referring in precise detail to the individual’s contribution to the success of the final outcome and how successfully they applied the ideas of their chosen practitioner. ⁴ Compelling and fluently structured. |
| 4 | 7-8 | Thorough and thoughtful analysis and evaluation referring in detail to the individual’s contribution to the success of the final outcome and how successfully they applied the ideas of their chosen practitioner. Engaging and well structured. |
| 3 | 5-6 | Useful and relevant analysis and evaluation referring in detail in places to the individual’s contribution to the success of the final outcome and how successfully they applied the ideas of their chosen practitioner. Clear with some structure. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Underdeveloped and unfocused analysis and evaluation referring in limited detail to the individual’s contribution to the success of the final outcome and how successfully they applied the ideas of their chosen practitioner. Not always clear, unstructured. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Largely irrelevant and misunderstood analysis and evaluation referring in negligible detail to the individual’s contribution to the success of the final outcome and how successfully they applied the ideas of their chosen practitioner. Unclear and disorganised. |
| 0 | 0 | Nothing worthy of credit. |

⁴ Regarding the phrase ‘...contribution to the success of the final performance’, students working on their own (rather than in a group) must make sure that they explain clearly how their ideas for their selected specialism would have contributed to the final monologue.

Appendix A – Alternative evidence for Component 2

Evidence must include either a complete and unedited audio-visual recording of the text-based performance and/or presentation of each discrete aspect/each student's individual contribution.

Alternative evidence for **performers** must include the following. No other forms of alternative evidence will be accepted:

- audio-visual recording of some acting performance without the need for fully designed set/lighting/costumes.

Alternative evidence for **directors** and **designers** must include one or more of the following, as appropriate. No other forms of alternative evidence will be accepted:

- prototype of product – to clearly demonstrate key design features that would be realised in the final product
- original photography – to clearly demonstrate students' own realised designs
- drawings or annotated sketches of designs – to clearly demonstrate the key features of the design, for example, size, shape, fit, effect etc
- annotated scripts – to clearly demonstrate cues and effects throughout the performance
- video or written account – a detailed explanation of the effects students would have wished to create and the theatrical skills/methods they would have employed in order to do so in the final live performance
- physical demonstrations – an audio-visual recording to clearly demonstrate:
 - a director's interaction with other members of the group
 - the effects created by the direction
 - how costumes fit and move
 - sound effects
 - lighting effects
 - set design
 - size, shape and operation of puppets.

Appendix B – Conversion grid for marking the Performance of Extract 2

Once the teacher arrives at a mark out of 25 for the Performance of Extract 2 they should use the grid below to **convert** that mark into a mark out of 30 that is then recorded on the Candidate Record Form.

| Teacher mark out of 25 | Converted mark out of 30 |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 7 |
| 7 | 8 |
| 8 | 10 |
| 9 | 11 |
| 10 | 12 |
| 11 | 13 |
| 12 | 14 |
| 13 | 16 |
| 14 | 17 |
| 15 | 18 |
| 16 | 19 |
| 17 | 20 |
| 18 | 22 |
| 19 | 23 |
| 20 | 24 |
| 21 | 25 |
| 22 | 26 |
| 23 | 28 |
| 24 | 29 |
| 25 | 30 |